May 21, 2014

Dr. Timothy White, Chancellor
The California State University
401 Golden Shore, Room 641
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

Dear Chancellor White:

At its meeting on May 15-16, 2014 at CSU headquarters in Long Beach, the Academic Senate of the California State University discussed and acted upon a number of matters.

Enclosed is a copy of the items upon which the Senate took action. These documents are sent to you for consideration and action as appropriate.

Sincerely,

Diana W. Guerin, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

Attachments

Distribution list:
   Members, Academic Senate CSU
   Chancellor’s Office Representatives
   Board of Trustees
   Presidents
   Provosts/Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
   Chairs, Campus Academic Senates
   CSU Alumni Council
   California State Student Association
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RESOLUTIONS
ACADEMIC SENATE CSU PLENARY – MAY 15-16, 2014

The system-wide Academic Senate (ASCSU) met at the Chancellor’s Office in Long Beach last week and approved the following resolutions.

Advice Regarding Unit Limit Exception Requests (AS-3166-14/AA)
The Academic Senate CSU reaffirms its recommendation (AS-3158-14/AA) urging the Board of Trustees to amend Title 5 to re-establish appropriate unit limits for engineering degrees. In the past, Title 5 set the unit limit for engineering at 140 semester units. Board action reduced the limit for all BA/BS degrees to 120 semester units. We recommend engineering degrees be limited to 132 semester units, consistent with other program exceptions currently included in Title 5.

Although Title 5 permits exception requests to the 120 unit limit, consultation with campuses showed that requests were not permitted to go forward from some campuses. In other cases, a different unit limit than 120 was set at the campus for the exception requests. Although some campuses submitted exception requests over a year ago, to our knowledge none have been granted. AS-3166-14/AA provides advice on the review of exception requests.

Creation of California State University Discipline Councils (AS-3167-14/APEP/AA)
Academic discipline councils are generally composed of department chairs of a given discipline from the CSU campuses. The Academic Senate urges the Chancellor’s Office to facilitate formation of academic discipline councils to support intra-and inter-system efforts such as SB 1440 transfer degrees, Early Start Program, and CourseMatch. Such meetings can also enable the sharing of best practices beyond the curriculum, such as facilities, equipment, safety, and faculty recruitment.

Designation and Compilation of Course Modalities (AS-3169-AA)
The Academic Senate recommends that a modality designation be attached to every course taught in the CSU by fall 2016. An array of instructional modalities is now used in the CSU. Additionally, the CourseMatch program and increasing availability of online courses in the CSU facilitate greater numbers of students taking courses at CSU campuses other than their own. Six designations are suggested, based on a review of existing campus policies and practices.

Recommendations Regarding Changes to Title 5, Section 40510, The Master’s Degree (AS-3171-14/AA)
The ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee was asked to review three changes relating to Title 5, Section 40510. We believe the proposed changes are prudent and strengthen the rigor of CSU master’s degrees.
In Support of AB 2324 (Williams) Pertaining to CSU Faculty Trustee (AS-3172-14/EX)
AB 2324 (Williams) provides for a faculty trustee holdover appointment when a successor faculty trustee appointment is delayed. We appreciate the inclusion of AB 2324 on the CSU Legislative Program and request members of CSU community to register support for it as it moves through the legislative process.

Eligibility Status for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Awards (AS-3173-14/FA)
This program supports activities that contribute to faculty teaching and student success. The Academic Senate commends the Board for reinstatement of the program and encourages campuses to make faculty of all ranks (lecturers, assistant, associate, and full professors) eligible for such awards.

ASCSU Calendar of 2014-15 Meetings (AS-3174-14/EX)
This resolution establishes calendar for Academic Senate CSU meetings in 2014-15.

**FIRST READING WAIVER ITEMS ACTED UPON**
The Academic Senate waived the first reading and acted upon the following resolutions at the May 15-16, 2014 plenary.

Formation of a Task Force to Review the Role of Student Success Fees across California State University Campuses (AS-3175-14/FGA)
Questions have been raised about Student Success Fees proliferating this year across the CSU. The Academic Senate identifies a number of concerns and encourages formation of a task force to undertake a system-wide assessment of the role of such fees, including review of Executive Order 1054 California State University Fee Policy.

Request for Annual Progress Reports on Access to Excellence Strategic Plan through 2018 (AS-3178-14/EX)
The ten-year CSU strategic plan, Access to Excellence, was adopted by the Board in 2008. The plan included eight goals/commitments and an Accountability Plan with performance quality indicators. Given that the half-way point of the strategic plan has passed, the Academic Senate recommends an annual assessment of progress toward achieving each of the eight goals using an appropriate number of performance indicators selected in consultation with faculty.

**COMMENDATIONS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Commendation in Honor of Trustee A. Robert Linscheid (AS-3168-14/EX)

Resolution upon the Retirement of Gail Brooks, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources at the California State University (AS-3176-14/EX)

Resolution of Commendation for James Till, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Initiatives and Partnerships (AS-3177-14/FA)
FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The ASCSU website includes committee information, approved agendas/minutes, reports, resolutions, and contact information. [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/?source=homepage](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/?source=homepage).

*Faculty-to-Faculty*, the ASCSU newsletter, is published following each plenary meeting (five times per year). The newsletter includes the chair’s report, committee reports, invited articles on current events, and committee recommendations. To receive an electronic notification when each issue is available, subscribe at [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Newsletter/](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Newsletter/).

The [Outstanding Faculty of the California State University](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen) website is maintained by the Academic Senate CSU and the Chancellor’s Office. Visit the website to meet the faculty honored at each of the 23 CSU institutions for their contributions to the research/scholarship/creative activities, teaching, and service mission of the university.

ABOUT THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSU

*The Academic Senate CSU* is the official voice of the faculty in matters of system-wide concern. The Academic Senate CSU provides the means for the faculty to participate in the collegial form of governance, which is based on historic academic traditions and recognized by California law. The primary purpose of the Academic Senate is to promote academic excellence in the California State University. [www.calstate.edu/AcadSen](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen)
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its stance on unit limits as outlined in AS-3158-14/AA, “Recommendation to Amend Title 5 to Re-establish Appropriate Unit Limits for Engineering Degrees”; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU strongly urge Chancellor White to ensure that faculty requests for exception to unit limits be allowed to move forward to the Office of the Chancellor without obstruction from campus administrators; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU strongly urge Chancellor White to prohibit campus administrations from unilaterally imposing alternative unit limits on requests for exception; and be it further

RESOLVED: That when exception requests are reviewed, the ASCSU recommend the following conditions apply:

a. the charge, composition and timelines of any advisory group to be convened be established prior to the commencement of the group’s deliberations;

b. the curricular impacts on degree programs, General Education, and other initiatives be assessed;

c. the review process not be based on separate consideration of discipline impacts and GE impacts;

d. programs not be required to compare their curricula with similar programs on other campuses when submitting requests for exception;

e. programs be subject to only one review process to avoid multiple requests for resubmission based on the application of subjective or changing criteria; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to CSU Chancellor, CSU Board of Trustees, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, and CSU Engineering Deans.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU has reviewed a letter from Chancellor White to Chair Guerin and others dated March 19, 2014 concerning Title 5 unit limits. In the letter, he invites input regarding the processes for reviewing unit limit exception requests. This resolution offers a partial response to Chancellor White’s invitation that we engage in further discussion.
There appears to be a two-pronged approach to addressing exception requests: the commissioning of an advisory group, as contrasted with “procedures underway articulated in a February 11, 2014 staff memo titled, “120 Review and Exception Process.” The Chancellor conceives his advisory group to be “supplementary and complementary” to these existing procedures, but nothing in the Chancellor’s letter indicates the procedures will be constrained by the timelines or activities of the advisory group, or vice versa. The ASCSU believes it is necessary to bring into alliance the efforts of the advisory group and the efforts of the Chancellor’s Office staff so that the two can, in fact, be complementary. In the spirit of shared governance and faculty curricular control, we offer our objections to the procedures outlined in the February 11 memo, and suggestions for moving forward.

Our objections include:

1. **The use of a comparative standard that dismantles campus autonomy.** Campuses will be asked to compare their programs a) to the range of units across all campuses collectively, and b) to counterpart degree programs who have achieved compliance. Such comparisons are counterproductive in ways too numerous to list here.

2. **The use of an iterative process with no discernible limits.** The procedure outlined calls for programs to resubmit exception requests after a program compares itself to others. However, it places no bounds on how many times a program may be required to resubmit. Instead, extremely troubling criteria will be used to determine if further iterations of a program’s exception request are required. The Chancellor’s Office will require resubmission “if a campus program seems uncharacteristically high” (emphasis added), but such a determination is quite subjective. Similarly, iterative resubmission will be required until “it is clear that a campus has exhausted all strategies for reducing units in a degree program” (emphasis added). How it will become “clear,” and when all strategies will be considered “exhausted” is, of course, unknown, giving license to an unlimited iterative process that promises to exhaust faculty in order to exhaust strategies.

3. **The perpetuation of an existing process that has not been corrective.** The process that has been used thus far is characterized by intense pressure on faculty to conform, and by administrative abuses such as blocking of exception requests and setting of alternative unit caps. The ASCSU has

---
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repeatedly brought these issues to the attention of the Chancellor’s Office, whose staff asserts that their inquiries do not reveal problems they can do anything about.

Our recommendations include:

1. The data gathered should be aggregated, such that all exception requests in particular disciplines would be considered holistically, en masse, prior to further consideration of individual program exception requests. Such an approach is entirely consistent with Chancellor White’s desire “to assess more accurately and completely what we have in front of us”7 after the submission deadline.

2. Relatedly, based on a holistic review, the ASCSU recommends to the Chancellor that he explore the full range of available options afforded by Title 5, in particular discipline-based system-wide exceptions. Chancellor White indicated “nothing is off the table,”8 when queried about such a prospect.

Finally, the ASCSU would like to offer specific suggestions on such issues as the charge, composition, and timeline of any advisory group to be convened. Assessment issues may also warrant advice, i.e., exploration of the ways in which unit reductions impact programs, general education, and other initiatives such as SB 1440. Participating in the procedural decisions affecting these important matters maintains the faculty’s curricular control and fosters shared governance.

Approved Unanimously – May 16, 2014

---

7 March 19, 2014 letter from Chancellor White
8 Remarks at the ASCSU plenary, March 20, 2014
MEMORANDUM

Date: 2/11/14

To: Ephraim P. Smith
   Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

From: Christine Mallon,
   Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development

Subject: 120 Review and Exception Process

This process has been designed in accordance with Title 5 and with the hope that goodwill efforts at the campuses will result in programs of high quality through which students will achieve the programs’ student-learning outcomes and complete the degree requirements in an efficient manner. The use of curriculum maps allow demonstration of the contribution that each required course makes to student learning, in meeting licensure or accreditation requirements, and in meeting system and campus requirements.

Campus Requests for 120-Unit Exceptions
Campus proposals will be reviewed if they are accompanied by campus-approval documents, a rationale, and a curriculum map. Proposals missing any of the required documentation are being returned for resubmission. Proposals that do not specify the total number of units proposed are being returned and may be resubmitted.

Completed requests (with curriculum maps included) will be analyzed first by discipline, and campuses will be shown the range of units currently required in the discipline for which an exception has been requested. If a campus program seems uncharacteristically high, the campus will be asked to compare curricular approaches and to resubmit a report/request for exceptions. In keeping with Academic Affairs Division’s responsibility for reviewing CSU degree programs’ compliance with systemwide policy, Academic Programs staff, including faculty on assignment to the Chancellor’s Office, will prepare analyses and reviews, and will communicate with the campus Academic Affairs offices.
Campuses will be invited to share successful approaches with campuses that have counterpart degree programs with higher unit totals.

When it is clear that a campus has exhausted all strategies for reducing units in a degree program, that program and other CSU programs in the discipline will be analyzed and discussed with the executive vice chancellor to determine next steps.

If it appears that an imposed reduction in units could be appropriate, per Title 5 section 40508, the chancellor will convene review groups of discipline faculty and other appropriate individuals to review and recommend to the chancellor whether the curriculum should be accepted or amended.

§ 40508. The Bachelor's Degree: Total Units
In fulfillment of this regulation, the Chancellor after consultation with discipline faculty and other appropriate individuals may require adjustments to program requirements in order to achieve the 120-unit maximum.

Campus Requests for GE Exceptions
The chancellor may review and approve campus-approved requests to require fewer than the number of GE units required by Title 5:

§ 40405.1. (a)(5)California State University General Education - Breadth Requirements.

The specification of numbers of units implies the right of discretion on each campus to adjust reasonably the proportions among the categories in order that the conjunction of campus courses, credit unit configurations and these requirements will not unduly exceed any of the prescribed semester or quarter unit minima. However, the total number of units in General Education-Breadth accepted for the bachelor's degree under the provisions of this subdivision (a) shall not be less than 48 semester units or 72 quarter units unless the Chancellor grants an exception.

§ 40405.4. (b) Procedures for Implementing Programs to Meet General Education Requirements.

(b) The Chancellor may grant exceptions to the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 40405.1 for high unit degree major programs on a program-by-program basis.

The Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee will be invited to review and comment on each complete GE request submitted. Campus GE exception requests must be accompanied by campus-approval documents, a rationale, and a curriculum map.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Name</th>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Major Code</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Proposed Field Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09093</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09102</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>19021</td>
<td>Physics, Electrical Engineering Option</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>134, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>206, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09131</td>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>204, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09061</td>
<td>Engineering (Biological)</td>
<td>check this</td>
<td>186, 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>no recent reduction</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>no recent reduction</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>no recent reduction</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09252</td>
<td>Geomatics Engineering</td>
<td>no recent reduction</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>no recent reduction</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>129, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Need to confirm DGS listing</td>
<td>120, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>129, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>129, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Engineering, Undeclared</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>129, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09051</td>
<td>Engineering-Biomedical and Clinical Option</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09221</td>
<td>Engineering (w/option Environmental)</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09134</td>
<td>Engineering (w/option Manufacturing)</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09011</td>
<td>Engineering (w/option Rehabilitation)</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09236</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering, USCG Option</td>
<td>asked for tie courses outcomes</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering, Third Asst Option</td>
<td>asked for tie courses outcomes</td>
<td>128, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering, ME Option</td>
<td>asked for tie courses outcomes</td>
<td>164, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>49044</td>
<td>Marine Transportation</td>
<td>asked for tie courses outcomes</td>
<td>159, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09258</td>
<td>Marine Engineering Technology</td>
<td>asked for tie courses outcomes</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>had to wait until after ABET review</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>had to wait until after ABET review</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09254</td>
<td>Construction Engineering, Management</td>
<td>had to wait until after ABET review</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>had to wait until after ABET review</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09134</td>
<td>Manufacturing Engineering</td>
<td>had to wait until after ABET review</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09021</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09061</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering, Geospatial Option</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering, General</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering, Environmental Option</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09131</td>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09254</td>
<td>Construction Engineering, Technology</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09255</td>
<td>Engineering Technology, Mechanical/Manufacturing</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09104</td>
<td>Marine Technology</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>delayed until 2015</td>
<td>198, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09093</td>
<td>Electric and Electronic Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>137, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>138, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09254</td>
<td>Construction Management Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>139, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>201, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09021</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>working on it</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09254</td>
<td>Construction Engineering (Technology Management)</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09221</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>working on reducing</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>126, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>129, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>128, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>129, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09031</td>
<td>Bioresource &amp; Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>192, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>07071</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>01141</td>
<td>Forestry and Natural Resources (Wildlife Biology)</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>192, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09151</td>
<td>Materials Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>190, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>07052</td>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>192, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09022</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering (Aeronautics)</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>196, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09021</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering (Aerospace)</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>196, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09041</td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>204, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09051</td>
<td>General Engineering (Bioengineering)</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>191, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09111</td>
<td>General Engineering (Individualized Course of Study)</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>191, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09254</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>198, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>09011</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>188, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Submitted Year</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09081</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>196 189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09094</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>193 193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>194 194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09221</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>196 190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09131</td>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>196 190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09134</td>
<td>Manufacturing Engineering</td>
<td>196 192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (Heating, Ventilating, Air Conditioning and Refrigerating)</td>
<td>198 198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09102</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (Mechatronics)</td>
<td>198 198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09012</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (Manufacturing)</td>
<td>198 198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09021</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering (Astronautics)</td>
<td>196 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>BS 09101</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (General)</td>
<td>198 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>BS 09091</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>At 124, still working to reduce 128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 20, 2014

Dr. Diana Guerin, Chair  
Academic Senate, CSU  
The California State University  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

RE: January 23-24, 2014, Senate Resolutions

Dear Dr. Guerin:

Thank you for forwarding the packet of resolutions adopted by the Academic Senate of the California State University at its January 23-24, 2014 meeting. We are pleased to provide the responses below:

1) AS-3154-13/AA: Recommendations Related to Nursing Preparation

The Academic Affairs Division appreciates the faculty support for students in nursing programs as well as for those who wish to be admitted to nursing programs. As demand for nursing enrollments surpasses the university’s ability to matriculate students into said programs, we value the suggestions advanced in the resolution. The CSU will do the following:

- Continue political advocacy in support of four-year nursing degrees.
- Continue with long-term budget planning for expanded nursing education.
- Continue systemwide efforts with health-college advisors and associate deans to improve advising for students with interests in pursuing health careers.
- Strongly encourage provosts to honor GE satisfaction for courses taken while students were pursuing nursing or pre-nursing coursework.
- Encourage the development of curricula to meet the demand for health-related degree programs.
2) **AS-3156-13/FA: Reinstatement of Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Fund**

The CSU faculty is widely recognized for their research, scholarship, and creative activities. To support these endeavors, campuses have distributed funds and the Chancellor’s Office created the RSCA Program, which has added to the pool of available resources. Regretfully, the support for RSCA was eliminated due to lack of funding.

We agree with the spirit of this resolution and the Chancellor has approved funding that has been earmarked to support faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities. Details of the funding distribution are being finalized.

3) **AS-3158-13/AA: Recommendation to Amend Title 5 to Re-establish Appropriate Unit Limits for Engineering Degrees**

Because the CSU is operationalizing a policy enacted by the Board of Trustees, allowing it time to unfold and mature under its current structure has merit. Engineering programs on our campuses are working with faculty to determine if 120/180 units are feasible for a degree in their programs. We realize that not all programs are similar but there is compliance in some of our prestigious programs, which has created a healthy dialogue within the context of curriculum reform. Above all, policy will be followed and language for exceptions has been included in the policy.

4) **AS-3159-14/EX: Commendation of Faculty Trustee and ASCSU Senator Bernadette Cheyne**

We are very pleased to endorse the commendation of former Faculty Trustee Bernadette Cheyne. The resolution was perfectly framed and written. As Bernadette moves into retirement, we hope that her future will be filled with many more happy and productive years. She has served the CSU with honor.

Sincerely,

Ronald E. Vogel
Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

c: Dr. Timothy P. White, Chancellor
Dr. Ephraim P. Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Ms. Sally F. Roush, Interim Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance
Mr. Garrett P. Ashley, Vice Chancellor, University Relations and Advancement
Ms. Gail E. Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Dear ASCSU Members and Campus Senate Chairs:

We write to provide an update on AS-3158-13/AA Recommendation to Amend Title 5 to Re-Establish Appropriate Unit Limits for Engineering, which was approved unanimously by the Academic Senate CSU on January 23, 2014. Letters of support were also received from many campuses. Please share this communication with interested colleagues.

Post-Plenary Timeline
The ASCSU Executive Committee met with Chancellor White and the Vice Chancellors on February 10th, which was a regularly-scheduled meeting to discuss ASCSU resolutions and initiatives. We made it clear that we had concerns about the process as we understood it was being implemented and requested information about the status of the campus reports on unit reduction, specifically engineering. Chancellor White directed that we be provided with this information and that we meet with EVC Smith to discuss it. We received the requested information on February 12th (a spreadsheet and a memo explaining the process that would be followed by the Chancellor’s Office), but we were unable to meet with EVC Smith until February 20th. Upon examining the process document provided on February 12th, we continued to have significant concerns. On February 14th, we requested that a moratorium on the process be put in place until (1) the meeting with EVC Smith had occurred and (2) the Chancellor’s Office (CO) response to AS-3158-13AA was known. This request was not acted upon.

The spreadsheet detailing the campus reports (referenced above) was forwarded to academic senators and to campus senate chairs in the subsequent days. (In response to our inquiry, we were asked not to distribute the memo on the process). ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee Chair Chris Miller shared an analysis of the spreadsheet on February 17th, concluding that “…the preponderance of engineering programs seek exceptions to the limits, even in the face of what, on many campuses, has been intense pressure to conform.”
The CO response to AS-3158-13/AA was received on February 20\textsuperscript{th}, and it stated:

Because the CSU is operationalizing a policy enacted by the Board of Trustees, allowing it time to unfold and mature under its current structure has merit. Engineering programs on our campuses are working with faculty to determine if 120/180 units are feasible for a degree in their programs. We realize that not all programs are similar but there is compliance in some of our prestigious programs, which has created a healthy dialogue within the context of curriculum reform. Above all, policy will be followed and language for exceptions has been included in the policy.

Executive Committee Actions Subsequent to CO Response
Of course, we had hoped that the recommendation in ASCSU’s unanimously-approved resolution, accompanied by support from multiple campuses, would be accepted. In response to our request for a moratorium on February 14\textsuperscript{th}, Chancellor White informed Chair Guerin on February 21\textsuperscript{st} that he is committed to a clear and transparent process that corresponds with the Trustees’ goal of reducing degree units. He recognizes that exceptions can be made to allow degree units to exceed the 120/180 limits for solid academic reasons. He directed us to work with EVC Smith to find agreement on the process.

On February 25\textsuperscript{th}, Executive Committee thanked Chancellor White for his response and requested a suspension of communication between the CO and campuses concerning unit reductions in engineering programs until such time as there is agreement on the process to be used in “operationalizing” the policy.

Process as Described in Title 5
When changes to Title 5 were approved by the Board of Trustees directing, “As of the fall term of the 2013-14 academic year, no baccalaureate degree programs shall extend the unit requirement beyond 120 semester units,” provisions were also included stipulating that the Chancellor “may authorize exceptions to system or campus requirements for degree programs. In fulfillment of this regulation, the Chancellor may require adjustments to program requirements in order to achieve the 120 semester unit maximum.”

What these exception provisions specify is that Chancellor White has three options if he determines that programs have legitimate reasons to exceed unit caps: 1) establish a systemwide exception; 2) establish a campus-based exception; or 3) impose adjustments on programs to achieve 120/180 units. In this last scenario, the CO has indicated that faculty review panels will be convened before adjustments are imposed. It is our understanding that the Chancellor does not want to impose adjustments to achieve unit limits, so review panels may not be needed, but in the event they become necessary, we believe strongly that prior agreement between the CO and the ASCSU on the composition and duties of such panels is imperative.
Areas of Concern Regarding Implementation

- **Submission of Exception Requests:** Although the process described in Title 5 allows faculty to request exceptions to the 120/180 unit limit, our understanding is that exception requests were not permitted from any engineering programs on at least one campus. We have also been informed that faculty on another campus were given an alternative unit cap (albeit higher than 120/180), and only requests meeting that unit cap would be forwarded. Although these are the most egregious breaches of what we understood to be the process of faculty stewardship of this curricular matter, we have been made aware of other incidents where faculty efforts to retain control of their major program and general education curricula were stymied by administrative fiat. For instance, more than one campus was told that no exception requests would be forwarded unless unit counts were lowered first—they were not allowed to submit current programs for exception consideration. All of these examples are at odds with what we understood to be permissible under Title 5.

- **Administrative Review at CO:** According to the process description provided on February 12th, exception requests from campuses are initially checked for completeness (campus approval documents, rationale, curriculum map). Requests with incomplete documentation are returned to campuses. This is certainly appropriate. Per the process established in Title 5, our understanding was that exception requests would next be considered by the Chancellor.
  - Requests with solid academic reasons would be given exceptions, either systemwide or on a programmatic basis.
  - Remaining requests would be referred to review groups of discipline faculty and other appropriate individuals to review and recommend to the chancellor whether the curriculum should be accepted or amended.

As implemented, however, according to the process document with which we were supplied, exception requests are instead being reviewed for more than completeness before being forwarded to the chancellor. They are being compared to those of other campuses, and will apparently be returned with directions to resubmit another report and request for exceptions, until all strategies for reducing units have been exhausted. Exception requests will then be analyzed to determine next steps. Thus, the originally-submitted curriculum map and its attendant Request for Exceptions form will not be the only materials considered when acting on exception requests. We are deeply concerned about the comparative and subjective standards of evaluation in use and that no limit is specified for how many rounds of new reports and new assessments may be required. The potential to use this iterative process to force faculty compliance with curricular compromises and undermine the diversity of programs so that they all roughly match the “compliance” realized in some prestigious programs (as described in the CO response of February 20) is of major worry.

- **Review Panel Composition:** Should the chancellor reject an exception request and decide instead to impose unit reductions as specified in Title 5, the review groups to be convened will have legitimacy in the eyes of the faculty only if they include faculty representatives
appointed by the ASCSU. Faculty currently on assignment at the CO are not sufficient to provide the analysis required in such review groups. Given that the engineering degrees are more than just the engineering major, we expect that both disciplinary and general education faculty will be included on the review panels.

- **Requests for Exceptions by Existing Degree Programs:** More recently-established engineering degree programs have been held to the 120/180 unit limit. We expect that they would also be allowed to request exceptions to the 120/180 minimum following the same procedures used to govern unit reductions, with the goal of improving program quality in meeting desired student learning outcomes.

In sum, the ASCSU Executive Committee is deeply concerned that faculty authority with respect to development, review and control of the curriculum has been undermined by administrative actions both at the system and campus levels. Our perspective is that the "process" described last year to ASCSU has become much more iterative and paperwork-laden, wherein programs requesting an exception may be required to "prove" their rationale multiple times and forced repeatedly to explain why their programs are not the same as some other "model" [read 120 unit] program. Historically, one of the strengths of the CSU has been that faculty at each campus design programs customized to their specific student population. That diversity needs to be valued rather than deprecated. This process as it is currently being “operationalized” shows a disconcerting emphasis on conformity and compliance.

**Moving Forward**
As we work with the CO Academic Affairs Division to solve the problems we see in this process, we believe we have several areas of potential agreement.

- The process must be transparent and clear.
- Academic quality must be maintained or improved. ABET accreditation is a sign of quality in engineering programs, and should be an expected outcome for all CSU engineering programs.
- Accreditation demands offer legitimate grounds for granting Title 5 exemptions, as is done for other professional preparation baccalaureate degrees (e.g., BFA, BM), whose unit limits are set at 132 semester/198 quarter units.
- Programs with unit requirements exceeding the caps for other accredited professional preparation programs exempted in Title 5 can be examined by the campus faculty and compared to other accredited engineering programs; outliers can be asked to account for their curricular choices and provide solid academic reasons for an exception.
- The process must allow programs/campuses to forward exception requests as per Title 5.
- Campus curriculum change and approval processes must be followed.
- Students should be able to complete the engineering degree in a timely fashion.

As directed by Chancellor White, we will be working with EVC Smith toward agreement on this process.
Finally, we understand that a meeting of engineering deans will be held March 3rd at CSU Northridge. Faculty Trustee Steven Stepanek has arranged to be in attendance and will provide a report to the ASCSU Executive Committee. On the next day, Trustee Stepanek and Chair Guerin are scheduled to meet with Chancellor White to discuss shared leadership concerns involving academic issues and the ASCSU.

ASCSU Executive Committee
Diana Guerin, Chair
Steven Filling, Vice Chair
Glen Brodowsky, Secretary
Darlene Yee-Melichar, Member-at-Large
Susan Gubernat, Member-at-Large; and
Christine Miller, ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee Chair

CC:
Chancellor Tim White
EVC Ephraim Smith

Attachments:
AS-3158-13/AA
Chancellor’s Response to January 2014 Resolutions
Spreadsheet Showing Status of Campus Exception Requests (from CO)
Analysis of Spreadsheet by Committee Chair Miller
February 28, 2014

MEMORANDUM

By March 31, 2014, Please send campus reports to 120units@calstate.edu

TO: Presidents
    Provosts and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs

FROM: Ephraim P. Smith
      Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

SUBJECT: Extended Reporting Deadline: Trustees Title 5 Changes to Baccalaureate Degrees

With appreciation for all of the efforts put forth toward reducing total baccalaureate degree units, I am writing to offer an extension to March 31, 2014 for campuses that have not yet submitted all reports or exception requests. We understand that some programs have had to defer curriculum adjustments until accreditation processes were complete; while other campuses have been working on campuswide efforts to make adjustments. Additionally, we have found that some campus submissions lacked an academic rationale for the exceptions requested, and we are asking for resubmission in such cases.

For bachelor’s degree programs requiring more than 120 semester (180 quarter) units, campuses are required to submit an exception request accompanied by a completed worksheet and curriculum map. Templates are enclosed. Campuses that have previously submitted an exception request but no curriculum map are asked (by March 31, 2014) to submit a curriculum map depicting the skills and knowledge required of graduates—and the learning opportunities for developing these outcomes across the required major, general education, American Institutions, and campus-required courses. Curriculum maps help to ensure a fair and consistent process for all campuses, and we appreciate the effort invested by all involved.

The following programs remain defined separately in Title 5, retain the 120-unit minimum requirement, and are subject to the unit maxima specified below:

- Bachelor of Architecture (BArch) 150 semester units
- Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (BLA) 150 semester units
- Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) 132 semester units
- Bachelor of Music (BM) 132 semester units

Please direct any questions to Dr. Christine Mallon, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development. Chris may be reached at cmallon@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4672.
Presidents
Provosts
February 28, 2014
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ES/clm

Attachments

c: Mr. Bob Linscheid, Chair, Board of Trustees
Ms. Roberta Achtenberg, Chair, Trustees Educational Policy Committee
Dr. Timothy P. White, Chancellor
Dr. Diana Guerin, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
Campus Academic Senate Chairs
Mr. Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
Associate Provosts/Assistant Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Directors of Admission and Records
# Student Certification, Required for Accreditation, Outcomes

## CSU 120/180 Units Curriculum Map

- **Campus:**
- **Degree (BA, BS...):**
- **Major:**
- **Concentration:**
- **Current total units:**
- **Proposed total units:**
- **GE Area requirements double counted with major or other requirement:**

Please attach sheet detailing exceptions requested.

### Student Learning Outcomes (Identify all required for accreditation, certification, or licensure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Student Outcome</th>
<th>Content Level</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Apply math, sci and engineering knowledge</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Experiments, analyze and interpret data</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Design to meet needs within constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Work in multidisciplinary teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Identify, formulate, solve engineering problems</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Professional ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Communicate effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Breadth for understanding engineering in many contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Life long learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Use modern engineering skills &amp; tools for practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Outcomes

1. **Global citizen**
2. **Apply engineering knowledge in community service**
3. **Explain engineering concepts outside discipline**

### CSU GE Area A
- GE Area A1–Oral Communication
  - 3 units
- GE Area A2–Written Communication
  - 3 units
- GE Area A3–Critical Thinking
  - 3 units

### CSU GE Area B
- GE Area B1–Physical Science
  - 3 units
- GE Area B2 –Life Science
  - 3 units
- GE Area B3–Laboratory Science
  - with B1 or B2 course
  - 3 units
- GE Area B4–Math/Quantitative Reasoning
  - 3 units

### CSU GE Area C
- GE Area C1–Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater
  - 3 units
- GE Area C2–Lit, Phil, Language (not English)
  - 3 units
- GE Area C
  - 3 units
- GE Area C
  - 3 units

### CSU GE Area D
- GE Area D (Must be taken in more than one area)
  - 3 units
- GE Area D (Must be taken in more than one area)
  - 3 units
- GE Area D (Must be taken in more than one area)
  - 3 units

### CSU GE Area E
- GE Area E
  - 3 units

### American Institutions
- American Institutions: US History Constitution
  - Varying units
- American Institutions: California and local gov.
  - Varying units

---

*附件 5 to AS-3166-14/AA (Rev)*
March 5, 2014

Dear Campus Senate Chairs:

We write to provide an update to our February 26th letter pertaining to AS-3158-13/AA, Recommendation to Amend Title 5 to Re-Establish Appropriate Unit Limits for Engineering.

At our request, Trustee Stepanek attended a meeting of CSU deans of engineering at CSU Northridge on Monday, March 3rd. Trustee Stepanek and ASCSU Chair Guerin then met with Chancellor White on March 4th. At that meeting, Chancellor White discussed his plan to convene a diverse group of faculty and administrators to review the exception requests from engineering as a package and make overarching recommendations to him (as opposed to recommendations regarding individual program unit exception requests). He sought Trustee Stepanek’s and Chair Guerin’s input on the composition of the group, and they reported coming to quick agreement.

Yesterday, we also received a memo extending the reporting deadline for programs seeking an exception to the 120/180 unit limit on BA/BS degrees (Coded Memo AA-2014-04). The new deadline is March 31, 2014. The memorandum details the documents necessary to request the exception, which are as before (however, see clarification detailed in next paragraph).

As provided in Title 5, we encourage campus programs to submit requests for exceptions to the 120/180 unit limits if they have not done so already. **Campus senate chairs, the documentation submitted requires your signature.** This form has been corrected to clarify that the Campus Academic Senate Chair, in addition to the President or Provost, signifies that local curricular processes were followed. If you have not signed off on your campus exception requests, please follow up to insure your campus requests are complete.

Please work with your campus faculty and administration to submit any exception requests by March 31st so that this process can be concluded and faculty/programs can be notified of the outcome of their request as expeditiously as possible. Our analysis leads us to expect that 90 to 100 engineering programs have forwarded or may forward requests for unit limit exceptions.

Please share this information with relevant colleagues on your campus.

ASCSU Executive Committee
Diana Guerin, Chair
Steven Filling, Vice Chair
Glen Brodowsky, Secretary
Darlene Yee-Melichar, Member-at-Large
Susan Gubernat, Member-at-Large; and
Christine Miller, ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee Chair
Steven Stepanek, Faculty Trustee

**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
C:
ASCSU
Chancellor Timothy P. White
EVC Ephraim Smith
Dr. Christine Mallon
Dr. Ron Vogel

Attachments:
  • ASCSU Update on AS-3158-13AA, dated February 26, 2014
  • AS-3158-13/AA, Recommendation to Amend Title 5 to Re-Establish Appropriate Unit Limits for Engineering
  • Chancellor’s Response to January 2014 Resolutions
  • Spreadsheet Showing Status of Campus Exception Requests (from CO)
  • Analysis of Spreadsheet by Committee Chair Miller
  • Coded Memo AA-2014-04 Extended Reporting Deadline: Trustees Title 5 Changes to Baccalaureate Degrees and two attachments
March 19, 2014

ASCSU Senate Chair Guerin
Faculty Trustee Stepanek
EVC and Chief Academic Officer Smith
Assistant Vice-Chancellor Mallon

Colleagues,

I appreciate the conversations we have engaged in over the past few weeks regarding the matter of baccalaureate degree programs, and the trustees directive to reduce wherever possible the degrees to 120/180 credits.

As I understand matters, the procedures that are wrapping up this month with campus programs and CO academic affairs are campus-driven steely-eyed reviews --- including interactions with campus senates and CO academic affairs on details, development of curricular maps etc. --- of high quality degree programs at the campuses. The output from this is the analytical work, its outcome, and exception request if applicable for the full array of academic degrees that exceed 120/180 credits.

This is a big undertaking, as I understand several hundred degree programs are involved.

And because I believe this is new territory for the CSU in modern times, some of the procedures are being worked through. Moreover, a few weeks after I started as Chancellor, when this came around to the board in January 2013, there were strained relations as the issue was not vetted well in the spirit of shared governance at the system level. I have also heard clearly the frustration and angst about clarity, objectivity and fairness of procedures, timelines and the like.

I’d like to put these issues behind us and move forward…this is important work, and we cannot rush to decisions.

With respect to engineering degrees, the premise from our conversation is there could be some requests for exception. Therefore, as was discussed in our conversations, it is my intention to constitute a diverse, knowledgeable yet small advisory group* as supplementary and complimentary to the procedures underway. We will use this advisory group to discuss and clarify a priori the basis/criteria by which exceptions to 120/180 credits could validly be based in engineering disciplines …if and when exceptions are finally presented to me. This group is not going to make specific recommendations on any programs, and they have not yet been invited. In fact, I think it wise to wait until after the submission deadline at the end of the month to assess more accurately what we have in front of us, and then constitute the advisory group accordingly and set timelines, etc.

The trustee expectation is the vast majority of CSU undergraduate degree programs will be at 120/180 credits, unless compelling academic reasons prevail to a different total. If at the end of the day with any of the degree programs, if an exception to 120/180 credits is requested and I am able to support the request, then we are done and in line with Trustee policy.

If, however, there is a program that I am unable to support a request for exception (I hope this is a rare outcome), as I understand Title V it requires us then to constitute an appropriate committee - including discipline specific expertise - to recommend a solution. Any such committee will use the basis/criteria we develop with the advisory group if the request is in engineering. And if a request is made in another discipline, we will have to constitute knowledgeable folks accordingly.
In all cases, committees will be formed by appointees from both the ASCSU Executive Committee and Executive Vice Chancellor Smith.

As always, I am open to further discussion if this approach is insufficient to lead us forward on this important matter. If there are ways to simplify the process without losing its rigor, I am certainly open to suggestions.

* The advisory group shall have members appointed by the academic senate as well as myself.

We will serve the CSU best if the group constitutes individuals from various campuses reflecting the geographic distribution of campuses with engineering programs, the academic senate, and Academic Affairs in the CO.

I offer for your concurrence that I would chair the group, and that we have 10 additional members, including Faculty Trustee Stepanek and Senate Chair Guerin or her designee.

Moreover, I would appoint four others:
  - A campus president
  - A campus provost
  - A senior member from Academic Affairs
  - An engineering dean

And the ASCSU Executive Committee would appoint four others:
  - Three well-regarded faculty members with firm understanding of engineering and accreditation issues in the main sub-disciplines of engineering.
  - One faculty member with a solid understanding of general education issues across the CSU

The advisory group membership shall also be enriched by its diversity of campus geographic location, sub-disciplinary expertise, as well as gender, and race/ethnicity. While the appointment authority I suggest above would remain, it will require us to coordinate appointees so we don’t inadvertently become imbalanced.

Sincerely,

Tim White
Chancellor
Academic Affairs (AA) Committee

Analysis of Engineering Program Responses and Requests for Exception

Late in the day on Friday, February 14, 2014, Chair Guerin forwarded to the ASCSU a spreadsheet distributed by the Academic Affairs division of the Chancellor’s Office titled, “Overview 120 Responses Updated 2-14-14”. This morning (Monday, February 17), AVC Mallon supplied a summary spreadsheet titled, “Engineering Feb17_2014-1”. The latter focuses just on engineering programs exceeding 120/180 units. In preparation for the Academic Affairs Committee’s virtual meeting this week, I examined these spreadsheets closely. Since the first one was distributed to all senators, and since the second one will likely be of interest beyond members of the Academic Affairs Committee, I thought it appropriate to share my analysis with the Senate. I was keenly interested in the two spreadsheets, but I also consulted the “Search CSU Degrees” database and the list of ABET-accredited engineering programs in the CSU (excluding Computer Science programs on that list).

I hasten to add this was no easy task, because the four documents are not consistent with one another. To provide examples, the first spreadsheet says there are 19 CSU campuses with engineering programs, but the “Search CSU Degrees” database (hereinafter referred to as “database”) says there are 20; the second spreadsheet lists 6 engineering programs at Maritime but the database lists 3; the
ABET list says Cal Poly Pomona has 14 accredited programs, while the database says Pomona has 13; and the first spreadsheet indicates some campuses did not submit reports, while the second reflects a different status. With the information available to me, then, there is no way to account for the variances between the two spreadsheets, the database, and the ABET list, so all four are appended to the email distributing this report so as to provide specific details for further inquiry.

I will focus largely on the spreadsheets in my analysis, adding information from the database and the ABET list as appropriate. The analysis below will document my conservative estimate that at least 99 of the approximately 121 engineering programs in the CSU support establishing an exception to Title 5 unit limits, 13 programs have indicated they have or will achieve Title 5 limits, and 9 programs have not signaled their intentions.

Beginning with a summary of the spreadsheet results:

- 19 campuses have engineering programs (the four that do not are Channel Islands, Monterey Bay, San Marcos, and Stanislaus)
- 4 campuses have achieved 120/180 unit caps, or say they will by Fall 2015 (Bakersfield, Humboldt, Long Beach, and San Jose)
- 4 campuses have not submitted reports, so it is unclear if they will seek exceptions (Fresno, Northridge, San Diego, and Sonoma)
- 11 campuses have submitted exception requests (Chico, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fullerton, Los Angeles, Maritime, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, and San Luis Obispo).

Additional scrutiny of these results is in order, beginning first with the 4 campuses listed as achieving (or close to achieving) 120/180:

- Bakersfield could not submit exception requests, because their six non-ABET-accredited programs are already at 180 units. However, on January 30 the Bakersfield Academic Senate passed a resolution endorsing AS-3158-13, because they want “to build programs which can achieve ABET accreditation while adequately addressing the General Education Student Learning Outcomes established in Title 5.”
- Humboldt has one engineering program which the spreadsheet indicates has been reduced to 120 units (from 130).
- A senator from San Jose reported during our plenary that no exception requests for their 11 programs were allowed to be forwarded from the campus; 3 of the 11 programs do not appear to be ABET-accredited; units before reductions range from 130-135.
- Long Beach reports that they plan for 12 of their programs currently exceeding 120 to achieve unit reductions by Fall 2015; 5 of their 13 total programs do not appear to be ABET-accredited; units before reductions range from 120-130.
- The total number of programs on campuses reporting they have reached or will achieve 120/180 is 30, according to the spreadsheets and database.

With respect to the 4 campuses that do not appear to have submitted engineering reports:
- In two cases there is evidence indicating the will of the faculty: Northridge College of Engineering faculty unanimously endorsed AS-3158-13, and Fresno College of Engineering faculty strongly endorsed the resolution as well.
- San Diego and Sonoma did not submit formal responses to ASCSU.
- To put this category of campuses into perspective:
  - Northridge has 7 programs; 6 exceed 120; 1 non-ABET-accredited program is at 120; units range from 121-126.
  - Fresno has 6 programs; 5 exceed 120; 1 non-ABET-accredited program is at 120; units range from 120-130.
  - San Diego has 7 programs; all exceed 120, and are ABET-accredited; units range from 128-137.
  - Sonoma has 1 non-ABET-accredited program at 128 units.
- The total number of programs for which reports were not submitted is 21; 19 of those programs exceed 120 units.

Finally, according to the second spreadsheet, the number of programs exceeding 120/180 on the 11 campuses requesting exceptions can be broken down as follows:
Chico has 5  
Dominguez Hills has 1  
East Bay has 3  
Fullerton has 5  
Los Angeles has 6  
Maritime has 6  
Pomona has 13  
Sacramento has 5  
San Bernardino has 1  
San Francisco has 4  
San Luis Obispo has 22  

A total number of 71 programs on these 11 campuses currently exceed 120/180 units.

Units totals on these campuses range from 126-138, and 190-205
  - On semester campuses, 14 programs are between 126 and 129 units; 4 are 132-138 and above (excluding Maritime)
  - On quarter campuses, 20 programs are at 198 units; only 2 exceed 198; 22 programs are between 190 and 196 units

So, to summarize, according to the spreadsheets and database, 30 programs on 4 campuses are at 120/180, or will be soon; 19 programs exceeding 120 units on 4 campuses have not submitted reports; 71 programs above 120/180 exist on 11 campuses requesting exceptions.

However, as we now know, 2 campuses at 120/180 would have submitted exception requests if they could have (Bakersfield’s 6 programs, and San Jose’s 11 programs), and 2 campuses not yet reporting support the ASCSU resolution (Northridge, with 6 programs above 120, and Fresno with 5). Adjusting the numbers accordingly then, I believe a conservative estimate is that 99 engineering programs would like to see Title 5 exceptions, 13 programs report they have or plan to achieve 120/180, and the intentions of 9 programs are unknown.
Specific numbers aside, it is clear that the vast majority of programs find unit limits of 120/180 in engineering programs untenable. Therefore, in my estimation the data from the spreadsheet, the CSU degrees database, and the campus endorsements of AS-3158-13 collectively support the conclusion that faculty who have scrutinized engineering as well as general education degree requirements, along with accreditation demands, have determined that higher unit limits for engineering students are not simply appropriate, but necessary.

In sum, to conclude this report, the preponderance of engineering programs seek exceptions to the limits, even in the face of what, on many campuses, has been intense pressure to conform. These exception requests constitute clear evidence that faculty scrutinizing the curriculum believe it is not in the best interest of students or, by extension, the citizenry served by graduates, to limit unit requirements to 120/180 for engineering students.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine M. Miller
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly is committed to the principles of shared governance and the
primacy of the faculty in determining curriculum in the CSU; and

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustee’s Collegiality Statement affirms, in part, “Collegial governance
assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in
accordance with basic policy as determined by the Board of Trustees. This includes admission
and degree requirements, the curriculum and methods of teaching,...”; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate communicate to the ASCSU its support of efforts
to empower the engineering faculty of the individual campuses to establish appropriate
unit limits for their respective engineering degrees, up to a maximum of 132/198 units,
without having to seek waivers from the Chancellor; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to:
Dr. Diana Wright Guerin, ASCSU Chair
Dr. Jeffrey Armstrong, Cal Poly President
CSU Campus Senate Chairs

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: February 25 2014
Revised: March 13 2014
California State University, Maritime Academy
Academic Senate

Recommendation to Amend Title 5 to Re-establish Appropriate Unit Limits for Engineering Degrees

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California State University, Maritime Academy support Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) Resolution AS-3158-13/AA\(^1\), which asks that Title 5 be amended to establish a limit of 132 semester units for engineering degree programs, as this limit better accommodates the unit-intensive needs of engineering programs without jeopardizing the integrity of existing general education and practical training requirements; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California State University, Maritime Academy urge that when mandated unit reductions to any high-unit degree program—not just engineering—are considered in the future, the impact of such reductions on the quality of the entire baccalaureate degree be carefully considered; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California State University, Maritime Academy urge the Board of Trustees not to sacrifice intellectual breadth for the sake of a standardized unit ceiling.

RATIONALE\(^2\): Title 5 has been amended to remove the exception that allowed engineering degree programs more latitude in unit limits, thereby requiring them to meet the same 120/180 standard as other programs. A phase-in plan for all high-unit majors was put into place by the Office of the Chancellor. In order to reduce required units engineering programs across the CSU have enacted strategies such as adding/blending course objectives and double-counting units in the major simultaneously to satisfy general education (GE) requirements. Thus far, it has been reported that an average of 15 units of double counting of GE and engineering major requirements is occurring among programs system-wide. In addition, campuses are instituting waivers and substitutions of GE requirements and reducing elective options in the major. In spite of these efforts, Provosts, Deans, Department Chairs, and faculty across the system continue to report that programs are having a great deal of difficulty reducing the number of units to the new level.

The faculty of the California Maritime Academy feel that intellectual breadth is vital for the success of our graduates, our industry stakeholders, our state and our nation. This intellectual breath is best achieved when general education subjects are taught by GE faculty and we do a disservice to our students when we ask engineering faculty to teach those subjects through double-counting of units.

In conclusion, limiting engineering programs to 120 semester or 180 quarter units is untenable without significant sacrifices impacting the quality of the programs, as well as the integrity and goals of existing GE and practical training support programs. Therefore, it is appropriate to re-institute the exception to unit limits for engineering programs that existed previously in Title 5, consistent with the precedent set by other high-unit degree programs. To this end, the Academic Senate of the California Maritime Academy requests that the Office of the Chancellor work for the amendment to Title 5, accordingly.

---

\(^1\) Unanimously approved by the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) on January 23, 2014

\(^2\) Adapted from ASCSU Resolution AS-3158-13/AA
Distribution List:
Dr. Diana Wright Guerin, Chair of the ASCSU
Rear Admiral Thomas A. Cropper, President, California State University, Maritime Academy
CSU Campus Senate Chairs
Dr. Timothy White, Chancellor of the California State University
California State University Board of Trustees
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY SENATE

Resolution Regarding the Election of Faculty Representatives to
the 2013/2014 Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President

#06-13/14-EX – October 1, 2013

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU), acting in accordance with the California State University Board of Trustees’ Policy for the Selection of Presidents, decides that the candidates for the position of faculty representative to the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) meet the following criteria:

1. Candidates shall be tenured and hold the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor.
2. One candidate shall be selected from among the faculty of the College of Professional Studies (CPS) and one candidate shall be selected from among the faculty of the College of Natural Resources and Sciences (CNRS).

and be it further

Resolved: That the USHSU decides that the election of two faculty representatives be conducted according to the normal election procedures established under the Constitution of the General Faculty with an electorate comprised of all members of the General Faculty; and be it further

Resolved: That the criteria for the selection of the faculty representatives to the ACTCSP, laid out in this resolution, apply only to the present search.

Rationale: The California State University Board of Trustees’ Policy for the Selection of Presidents requires the election by the faculty of two faculty representatives to the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President. The Chair of the University Senate is included as a member of the advisory committee and is a faculty member in the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. By selecting two additional faculty members from CPS and CNRS, we ensure equal representation of the three colleges in the advisory committee.

University Senate: Passed, 10/01/13; forwarded as an Emergency Item

No further action required.
CREATION OF CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY DISCIPLINE COUNCILS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) urge the CSU Office of Chancellor to facilitate the formation of Discipline Councils, similar to, for example, the English Council and the Math Council, in all of the academic programs within the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that the Office of the Chancellor facilitate annual meetings of these discipline councils by providing resources, including, for example, a venue and web support for the councils; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, and CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs.

RATIONALE: Intra- and intersystem projects, such as Intersegmental Major-Preparation Articulated Curriculum, Senate Bill (SB) 1440, Early Start, and Calstate Online have demonstrated the value of communication and coordination among the individual academic disciplines in the CSU and the value of ongoing discussion and planning among the department chairs of those disciplines, who generally are the primary managers of articulation and academic planning within their disciplines. These settings have demonstrated that gatherings of discipline faculty have further benefits, such as sharing of expertise and best practices, assistance in navigating the complex bureaucracy of the CSU, and communicating lessons on facilities, equipment, safety, and recruitment of faculty and students.

Using the existing councils as exemplars, the councils should be composed of department chairs (or designees). Chairs have access to the time and funds (albeit limited) to attend these meetings and the groups have typically self-organized. The Office of the Chancellor could facilitate the formation of these groups with a minimum investment in personnel and web resources but would gain valuable venues for testing ideas and obtaining informed opinions on System policy issues.

Approved Unanimously – May 15, 2014
COMMENDATION IN HONOR OF TRUSTEE A. ROBERT LINSCHEID

WHEREAS, Trustee Linscheid has been a major supporter of the CSU, a resilient advocate in his role as Chair of the CSU Board of Trustees, and a strong proponent for public higher education; and

WHEREAS, Trustee Linscheid was an excellent Vice Chair of the CSU Board of Trustees during 2010 through February 2012; and

WHEREAS, Since March 2012, Trustee Linscheid has been a very effective Chair of the CSU Board of Trustees overseeing budget, programmatic and policy decision-making for the system; and

WHEREAS, Trustee Linscheid has shared his broad knowledge and community leadership as Managing Director of Innovate North State, CEO of three different chambers of commerce (Chico, Walnut Creek, Antioch), President & CEO of The Linscheid Company, and currently serves as President & CEO of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; and

WHEREAS, Trustee Linscheid has received numerous public service awards including the College of Business Person of the Year Award, Western Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives Executive of the Year Award, and Rotary District 5160 Humanitarian of the Year Award; and

WHEREAS, Bob Linscheid is a proud alumnus of the California State University (CSU) with a B.A. in Public Administration/Political Science and M.P.A. in Public Administration from CSU Chico; and

WHEREAS, Bob Linscheid has ably and consistently served the CSU Alumni Council since 2001, including two productive terms as President; and

WHEREAS, Trustee Linscheid has been an effective and articulate representative of alumni in the 23-campus system on the CSU Board of Trustees since 2005; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU bestow its thanks and gratitude upon Bob Linscheid for his exemplary service and contributions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate is extremely proud to claim Bob Linscheid as a CSU Alumnus and extends it’s very best wishes to him and wishes him well in his future endeavors.

Approved By Acclamation – May 16, 2014
DESIGNATION AND COMPILATION OF COURSE MODALITIES

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University recommend that a modality designation be attached to every course taught in the CSU by the fall of 2016, and that this information be readily available to students prior to registration; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that the CSU Office of the Chancellor provide a system-wide database for its campuses to designate modalities in course offerings, in order to maximize the potential for system-wide cross-enrollment, and allow for better assessment of learning across all modes of course delivery in the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU suggest the following designations for modality of instruction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td><strong>Face-to-Face, Traditional</strong>: Instruction occurs in real time (synchronously), with student(s) and faculty physically present in the same location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td><strong>Face-to-Face, Online</strong>: Instruction occurs in real time (synchronously), with student(s) and faculty present via technology (e.g. television, tele-conference, video-conference or chat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td><strong>Local, Online</strong>: Instruction occurs over the Internet (asynchronously). Scheduled face-to-face meetings may be required for orientation and student evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td><strong>Remote, Online</strong>: Instruction occurs over the Internet (asynchronously). Students do not need to be on campus for any portion of coursework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td><strong>Hybrid</strong>: A course offering that combines FT and FO/LO/RO. To be considered hybrid, a course will meet via FO/LO/RO for roughly 25%-75% of class sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td><strong>Flexible</strong>: Course allows for more than one modality; students choose the modality (or modalities) suiting their needs from instructor-identified options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU Academic Technology Services, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU campus Senate Executive Committees, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, CSU campus articulation officers, California Faculty Association, (CFA), Academic Senate for the
California Community Colleges, Academic Senate of the University of California, California Community Colleges’ Board of Governors, University of California Board of Regents, and Assembly member Marc Levine

RATIONALE:  AB 386 (September 2013, Levine D-San Rafael; Public postsecondary education: online-enrollment: online education at the California State University) requires that students enrolled at a CSU campus be allowed to take online courses offered at other CSU campuses without requiring additional fees or formal admission to the campus offering the course. To achieve that goal, the legislation requires that by January 1, 2015, the California State University, among other things, establish a uniform series of definitions for online enrollment for the CSU and an easily accessible online database of online courses available at all CSU campuses to provide CSU students with a streamlined process within the CSU system to allow them to find and enroll in courses that will earn them credit toward graduation, general education and major requirements (Legislative Counsel’s Digest). After a thorough survey (attached) of existing course modalities across the CSU, the Academic Affairs Committee offered these definitions and recommendations to ensure that students have useful information prior to registration.

Approved Unanimously– May 16, 2014
Assembly Bill No. 386

CHAPTER 363

An act to add Article 3.5 (commencing with Section 89225) to Chapter 2 of Part 55 of Division 8 of, and to add Chapter 9.6 (commencing with Section 66760) to Part 40 of Division 5 of, Title 3 of the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

[Approved by Governor September 26, 2013. Filed with Secretary of State September 26, 2013.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 386, Levine. Public postsecondary education: cross-enrollment: online education at the California State University.

Existing law establishes the California State University, under the administration of the Trustees of the California State University, the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the University of California, under the administration of the Regents of the University of California, as the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. Existing law authorizes any student enrolled in any campus of any of these 3 respective segments who meets prescribed requirements to enroll without formal admission or payment of additional fees, except as provided, in a maximum of one course per academic term at a campus of either of the other segments on a space-available basis at the discretion of the appropriate campus authorities on both campuses.

This bill would express legislative intent that, by the beginning of the 2015–16 academic year, students enrolled at a California State University (CSU) campus be provided an opportunity to enroll in online courses available at other CSU campuses. The bill would authorize any student enrolled at a CSU campus who meets specified requirements to enroll, without formal admission, and without payment of additional tuition or fees, except as provided, in a course provided entirely online, as defined, by another CSU campus on a space-available basis. The bill would require each CSU campus to inform students who may enroll in an online course pursuant to this authority of certain information related to the online course. The bill would require the trustees, on or before January 1, 2015, to establish an easily accessible online database of online courses available at all CSU campuses to provide CSU students with a streamlined process within the CSU system to allow them to find and enroll in courses that will earn them credit toward graduation, general education, and major requirements.

This bill would require the trustees to establish a series of uniform definitions for online education for CSU on or before January 1, 2015, as specified. The bill would require the trustees to report performance data
about online education to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2017, and
every 2 years until 2021, and would, on or before January 1, 2017, require
the trustees to report the performance data to the Legislative Analyst. The
bill would, on or before October 1, 2017, require the Legislative Analyst to
submit to the Legislature a status update regarding CSU’s implementation
of the provisions of this bill and an assessment of the extent to which CSU’s
online programs are operating in a manner consistent with legislative intent
and statutory requirements.

This bill would require the trustees to report to the Legislature, on or
before January 1, 2015, on the feasibility of developing an accelerated
bachelor’s degree completion program consisting of online courses aimed
at students who started college but never obtained a degree.

This bill would require the California State University to use specified
moneys appropriated in the Budget Act of 2013 for one-time startup costs
related to the provisions of this bill.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. It is the intent of the Legislature:
(a) That, by the beginning of the 2015–16 academic year, students
enrolled at a California State University (CSU) campus shall be provided
the opportunity to enroll in online courses available at other CSU campuses.
Students enrolling in online courses at a campus other than their home
campus shall be provided a streamlined process of transferring units for
credit at the home campus.
(b) That the 23 campuses of the CSU system coordinate their online
course offerings in order to provide students improved access to coursework
and the opportunity to accelerate their degree completion.
(c) To foster greater coordination among all segments of higher education
in the state, in order to improve student outcomes.
(d) That, in addition to intersystem coordination, the segments of higher
education shall take all steps possible to improve coordination within their
respective segments.
(e) That the segments of higher education appropriately allocate available
resources to accomplish the above-stated goals.
(f) That the segments of higher education appropriately use existing
online education resources to accomplish the above-stated goals.

SEC. 2. Chapter 9.6 (commencing with Section 66760) is added to Part
40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, to read:

CHAPTER 9.6. CROSS-ENROLLMENT IN ONLINE EDUCATION AT
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

66760. For the purposes of this chapter, the following definitions apply:
(a) “Chancellor” means the Chancellor of the California State University.
(b) “CSU” means the California State University.
(c) “Home campus” means the California State University campus at which the student matriculates.
(d) “Host campus” means the campus to which the student seeks access.

66760.5. By the beginning of the 2015–16 academic year, a California resident enrolled at a CSU campus who meets the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 66761 may enroll, without formal admission, and without payment of additional tuition or fees, except as provided in Section 66761.5, in a course provided entirely online by another CSU campus on a space-available basis. Nonresident and international CSU students who meet these conditions may also enroll in an online course provided by another CSU campus, but shall pay the per unit fees for this course at the host campus.

66761. (a) A student is qualified to participate in the program established by this chapter if he or she is enrolled at a CSU campus and meets the following requirements:
   (1) The student has attained a grade point average of 2.0 on a 4-point scale for work completed.
   (2) The student has paid appropriate tuition or fees, or both, required by the home campus for full-time enrollment for the academic term in which the student seeks to cross-enroll.
   (3) The student has no outstanding tuition or fees to be paid at the home campus.

(b) Each CSU campus shall inform students who may enroll in an online course pursuant to this chapter of all of the following:
   (1) The technical requirements a student must satisfy in order to successfully participate in, and complete, the online course.
   (2) Any prerequisite courses or other academic preparation deemed necessary for the online course.
   (3) Any materials, skills, knowledge, or other elements necessary to ensure a student’s opportunity to succeed in the online course.

66761.5. The host campus may charge participating students a reasonable administration fee and specific course-based fees, not to exceed an amount sufficient for the campus to recover reasonable administrative costs it incurs pursuant to this chapter.

66762. The chancellor’s office shall establish a convenient online methodology so that students meeting the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 66761 may do both of the following:
   (a) Be informed of the opportunity to access courses provided entirely online by another CSU campus.
   (b) Simultaneously enroll in courses at their home campus and enroll in courses provided entirely online at another CSU campus, as provided for in Section 66762.5.

66762.5. A matriculated CSU student shall have priority access to online courses provided at his or her home campus. A CSU student who meets the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 66761, and seeks to enroll in courses provided entirely online by another CSU campus, shall be able to enroll, provided that cross-enrollment students generally have an opportunity
to enroll in these online courses at any time after the priority enrollment period for continuing students, as determined by each host campus. The host campus enrollment policy shall, to the extent possible, encourage cross-enrollment as provided for in this chapter.

66763. A course provided entirely online pursuant to this chapter shall be accepted for credit at the student’s home campus on the same basis as it would be for a student matriculated at the host campus.

66763.5. The enrollment of a student at a host campus pursuant to this chapter may be counted in the calculation of headcount or full-time equivalent student enrollment at the host campus. The home campus and the host campus at which the student is cross-enrolled may count in the calculation of headcount or full-time equivalent student enrollment only those units for which the student is enrolled at each respective campus.

66764. On or before January 1, 2015, the trustees shall establish both of the following:

(a) An easily accessible online database of online courses available at all CSU campuses. This database shall provide CSU students with a streamlined process within the CSU system to allow students to find and enroll in courses that will earn them credit toward graduation, general education, and major requirements.

(b) Plans for an intrasystem cross-enrollment process to expedite student learning that will be operational at the beginning of the 2015–16 academic year.

SEC. 3. Article 3.5 (commencing with Section 89225) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 55 of Division 8 of Title 3 of the Education Code, to read:

Article 3.5. Online Education

89225. On or before January 1, 2015, for purposes of measuring the effectiveness of online education, the trustees shall establish a series of uniform definitions for online education. The definitions developed by the trustees under this section shall, at a minimum, include a systemwide definition for an online course where the course can be entirely completed remotely.

89226. (a) On or before January 1, 2017, and on or before January 1 every two years thereafter, the trustees shall report to the Legislature key performance data on online courses as defined in Section 89225, including, but not necessarily limited to, all of the following:

(1) The number of students enrolled at each campus.
(2) Course completion rates for courses other than online courses.
(3) Completion rates for degree programs that include no online courses.
(4) Grade point average for students enrolled in online courses.
(5) The number of students cross-enrolled in online courses at a California State University campus other than the campus at which they are matriculated.
(6) Course completion rates for students enrolled in online courses.
(7) Completion rates for degree programs that include online courses.

(b) (1) On or before January 1, 2017, the trustees shall report to the Legislative Analyst the key performance data described in subdivision (a).

(2) On or before October 1, 2017, the Legislative Analyst shall submit a status update to the Legislature regarding the California State University’s implementation of the provisions of the bill that added this section and an assessment of the extent to which the online programs of the California State University are operating in a manner consistent with legislative intent and statutory requirements.

(c) Student enrollment and completion rate data included in a report to be submitted pursuant to this section shall be made available by demographics, including age, gender, and ethnicity.

(d) (1) The requirement for submitting a report imposed under subdivision (a) is inoperative on July 1, 2021, pursuant to Section 10231.5 of the Government Code.

(2) The report prepared pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

SEC. 4. On or before January 1, 2015, the Trustees of the California State University shall report to the Legislature on the feasibility of developing an accelerated bachelor’s degree completion program consisting of online courses aimed at students who started college but never obtained a degree. The report prepared pursuant to this section shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

SEC. 5. The California State University shall use moneys appropriated in Item 6610-001-0001 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2013 (Chapter 20 of the Statutes of 2013) for one-time startup costs related to Sections 2 and 3 of this bill.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Modalities Across the CSU, 2014</th>
<th>CalPolySLO</th>
<th>Chico</th>
<th>CSUB</th>
<th>CSUCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASCSU Designations (Proposed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face, Traditional (Group or individual): Instruction occurs in real time (synchronously), with student(s) and faculty present in the same location. Also categorized as synchronous instruction.</td>
<td>Traditional instruction courses are offered in the traditional mode with an instructor holding class sessions where students are expected to be physically present. Traditional instruction is also synchronous, with both instructor and students engaging in activities simultaneously.</td>
<td>On-Campus Classes</td>
<td>Face-to-Face Course: A course in which an instructor delivers all course content in real time with students present in the same location. Web Facilitated Course: A course that uses web-based technology to supplement what is essentially a face-to-face course. No scheduled face-to-face class sessions are normally replaced with online activities.</td>
<td>Standard Course Offering: A course in which no more than 30% of the course sessions occur online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face, Online (Group or individual): Instruction occurs in real time (synchronously), with student(s) and faculty present via live tele-conference, video-conference or chat.</td>
<td>complete (e.g., a course in which all faculty/student interaction occurs using a web-based video conference tool).</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote, Online: Instruction occurs via the internet, via taped or written lectures. Discussion is conducted via email or discussion boards.</td>
<td>Online Instruction is instruction delivered via an electronic network such as the Internet.</td>
<td>WWWONLINE</td>
<td>Online Course: Course where most or all of the content is delivered online. There are commonly no face-to-face meetings</td>
<td>OL: Online. A course offering in which more than 70% of the course sessions occur online. Course sessions may be synchronous (meet online at the same time) or asynchronous (meet online different times).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended: The above course modalities are combined, with the percentage of RO instruction made clear.</td>
<td>Computer Mediated Interaction could be mixed (e.g., &quot;hybrid&quot; courses with some traditional classroom lectures supplemented by video conferencing)</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Hybrid (Blended) Course: Course that blends online and face-to-face delivery in which students attend class session on campus and in an online class.</td>
<td>Blended Course offering: a course offering that combines face-to-face class sessions with online sessions. To be considered blended a course will meet online for 30% to 70% of class sessions. Online class sessions may be synchronous or asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible: Course allows for more than one modality; students choose the modality (or modalities) suiting their needs.</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Course Modalities Across the CSU, 2014 - cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>CSUDH</th>
<th>CSUEB</th>
<th>CSUF</th>
<th>CSULA</th>
<th>CSULB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Traditional Instruction</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHTV (live)</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>Synchronous Instruction</td>
<td>no distinction from face to face</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Class or DHTV (rebroadcast)</td>
<td>Online Class. Meets entirely online except for test(s) which may require coming to campus or arranging an off-site proctored exam.</td>
<td>Fully Online Instruction. Courses in which 100% of course meeting time occurs in an online environment. These courses can include a variety of synchronous and asynchronous activities. Online instruction with required course meetings. Courses in which 80% of more of class meeting time occurs in an online environment.</td>
<td>Asynchronous Online/Distance. A course in which all or nearly all of the organized instruction is conducted online or by distance learning methodologies.</td>
<td>Distance Education Class. A course offering in which communication between faculty and student occurs primarily via academic technology, but it may also include off-site meetings.</td>
<td>A Local Online Class is a course offering in which the majority of the instruction occurs when the student and instructor are not in the same place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid:</td>
<td>Hybrid Instruction: Courses offered using a blend of traditional and online methods. Hybrid courses will have more than 20% but less than 80% of class meeting time taught online.</td>
<td>Combined/Hybrid. A Combined/Hybrid course is a course in which online (or other distance) instruction is combined with face to face instruction, where a substantial portion of the face to face instruction is replaced by online instruction.</td>
<td>Combined/Hybrid. A Combined/Hybrid course is a course in which online (or other distance) instruction is combined with face to face instruction, where a substantial portion of the face to face instruction is replaced by online instruction.</td>
<td>Hybrid Class: one-third to two-thirds of the student/faculty and student/student contact time uses academic technology to structure remote activities. The remaining communication is face-to-face, similar to traditional classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Face-to-Face with Online</td>
<td>Hybrid Instruction: Courses offered using a blend of traditional and online methods. Hybrid courses will have more than 20% but less than 80% of class meeting time taught online.</td>
<td>Combined/Hybrid. A Combined/Hybrid course is a course in which online (or other distance) instruction is combined with face to face instruction, where a substantial portion of the face to face instruction is replaced by online instruction.</td>
<td>Combined/Hybrid. A Combined/Hybrid course is a course in which online (or other distance) instruction is combined with face to face instruction, where a substantial portion of the face to face instruction is replaced by online instruction.</td>
<td>Hybrid Class: one-third to two-thirds of the student/faculty and student/student contact time uses academic technology to structure remote activities. The remaining communication is face-to-face, similar to traditional classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Face-to-Face with Off Campus</td>
<td>Hybrid Instruction: Courses offered using a blend of traditional and online methods. Hybrid courses will have more than 20% but less than 80% of class meeting time taught online.</td>
<td>Combined/Hybrid. A Combined/Hybrid course is a course in which online (or other distance) instruction is combined with face to face instruction, where a substantial portion of the face to face instruction is replaced by online instruction.</td>
<td>Combined/Hybrid. A Combined/Hybrid course is a course in which online (or other distance) instruction is combined with face to face instruction, where a substantial portion of the face to face instruction is replaced by online instruction.</td>
<td>Hybrid Class: one-third to two-thirds of the student/faculty and student/student contact time uses academic technology to structure remote activities. The remaining communication is face-to-face, similar to traditional classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Face-to-Face with Televised</td>
<td>Hybrid Instruction: Courses offered using a blend of traditional and online methods. Hybrid courses will have more than 20% but less than 80% of class meeting time taught online.</td>
<td>Combined/Hybrid. A Combined/Hybrid course is a course in which online (or other distance) instruction is combined with face to face instruction, where a substantial portion of the face to face instruction is replaced by online instruction.</td>
<td>Combined/Hybrid. A Combined/Hybrid course is a course in which online (or other distance) instruction is combined with face to face instruction, where a substantial portion of the face to face instruction is replaced by online instruction.</td>
<td>Hybrid Class: one-third to two-thirds of the student/faculty and student/student contact time uses academic technology to structure remote activities. The remaining communication is face-to-face, similar to traditional classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hybrid is a term used to describe a class in which at least one session is scheduled to be held online.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Modalities Across the CSU, 2014 - cont'd.</th>
<th>CSUMB</th>
<th>CSUN</th>
<th>CSUSB</th>
<th>CSUSM</th>
<th>CSUStan</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web-Facilitated Course. A course that uses web-based technology to facilitate what is essentially a face-to-face course. May use a course management system or web pages to post the syllabus and assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Broadcast Courses. Instructional television courses are produced by Learning Services for transmission to remote sites to regularly enrolled students at the CSU Stanislaus Stockton Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>OF (all course meetings online)</td>
<td>Fully Online</td>
<td>Online Course. A course where most or all of the content is delivered online. Typically has no face-to-face meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>OH (approximately half online, half on campus meetings)</td>
<td>Hybrid/Blended</td>
<td>Hybrid Course (Blended) – A course that blends online and face-to-face delivery. Substantial proportion of the content is delivered online, typically uses online discussions, and typically has a reduced number of face-to-face meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>OC (mostly online, some on campus meetings)</td>
<td>Hybrid/Blended</td>
<td>Hybrid Courses (where the course content is divided between online and in-person sessions).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Sac State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td><strong>Face-to-Face</strong>. Course meets f2f for all of the course contact hours. PW/web-assisted. Course meets f2f for all of the course contact hours. Some course activities are online and may require active student access.</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td><strong>Fully Synchronous</strong>. 100% of the course instruction is delivered in a synchronous instruction mode. Students do not need to be on campus for any portion of course work or evaluation. <strong>SL/Synchronous Local</strong>. 100% of the course instruction is delivered in a synchronous instruction mode. Scheduled face-to-face meetings may be required for orientation and student evaluation.</td>
<td>televised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td><strong>Fully Asynchronous</strong>. 100% of the course instruction is delivered in an asynchronous instruction mode. Students do not need to be on campus for any portion of course work. <strong>AL/Asynchronous Local</strong>. 100% of the course instruction is delivered in an asynchronous instruction mode. Scheduled face-to-face meetings may be required for orientation and student evaluation.</td>
<td>OL; WEB; ONLINE; Televised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td><strong>HA/Hybrid with Asynchronous Component</strong>. Course uses both classroom and online. <strong>HS/Hybrid with Synchronous Component</strong>. Course uses both face-to-face and synchronous instructional modes and meets face-to-face for 25%-75% of the course contact hours prescribed by the course type and units.</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Modalities Across the CSU, 2014 - cont'd.</td>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>SFSU</td>
<td>SJSU</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance: Online</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PW: (in-person, web supplemented)</td>
<td>Web-Facilitated Course. A course that uses web-based technology to facilitate what is essentially a face-to-face course. May use a course management system or web pages to post the syllabus and assignments. This is not considered online or hybrid format.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance: Blended/Hybrid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Streaming, Web-supplemented Televised, Web-supplemented</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance: Blended/Hybrid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W/W (Web-Only)</td>
<td>Online Course. A course where most or all of the content is delivered online. Typically has no face-to-face meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance: Blended/Hybrid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid Course (Mixed Mode)</td>
<td>Hybrid Course (Blended) - A course that blends online and face-to-face delivery. Substantial proportion of the content is delivered online, typically uses online discussions, and typically has a reduced number of face-to-face meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance: Blended/Hybrid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid Flexible (HyFlex) course, students can choose to attend class either in an assigned face-to-face environment or in an online environment, synchronously or asynchronously. Online technology is primarily used to provide the students with flexibility in their choice of educational experience, and to communicate with the faculty member inside and outside of office hours.</td>
<td>no designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Course Modalities Across the CSU System, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td><a href="http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/elearning">http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/elearning</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td><a href="http://rce.csuchico.edu/search/node/hybrid">http://rce.csuchico.edu/search/node/hybrid</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUCI</td>
<td><a href="http://senate.csuci.edu/policies/2012-2013/senate-policy-12-08.pdf">http://senate.csuci.edu/policies/2012-2013/senate-policy-12-08.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUDH</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.csudh.edu/class-schedule/fa14/key-symbols-abbreviations/index">http://www4.csudh.edu/class-schedule/fa14/key-symbols-abbreviations/index</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUEB</td>
<td><a href="http://www20.csueastbay.edu/ohsc/course/faq.html">http://www20.csueastbay.edu/ohsc/course/faq.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSULA</td>
<td><a href="http://web.calstatela.edu/academic/as/ce/online_hyb_teaching.php">http://web.calstatela.edu/academic/as/ce/online_hyb_teaching.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSULB</td>
<td><a href="http://www.csusm.edu/policies/active/documents/online_instruction.html">http://www.csusm.edu/policies/active/documents/online_instruction.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUMB</td>
<td><a href="http://schedule.csumb.edu/summer2014">http://schedule.csumb.edu/summer2014</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUSB</td>
<td><a href="http://tele.csumb.edu/special_programs/academic_technology/redesign.html">http://tele.csumb.edu/special_programs/academic_technology/redesign.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUSM</td>
<td><a href="http://www.csusm.edu/policies/active/documents/online_instruction.html">http://www.csusm.edu/policies/active/documents/online_instruction.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUSTan</td>
<td><a href="https://www.csustan.edu/oit-learning-services">https://www.csustan.edu/oit-learning-services</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td><a href="https://www.csu.edu/web/faculty-and-staff/463">https://www.csu.edu/web/faculty-and-staff/463</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td><a href="https://sunspot.sdsu.edu/schedule/">https://sunspot.sdsu.edu/schedule/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF State</td>
<td><a href="http://at.sfsu.edu/tl/modes_of_instruction">http://at.sfsu.edu/tl/modes_of_instruction</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ State</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sjsu.edu/at/ecs/courses/2143_pww_iframe/index.html">http://www.sjsu.edu/at/ecs/courses/2143_pww_iframe/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/office/policies/online-hybrid_instruction.html">http://www.sonoma.edu/office/policies/online-hybrid_instruction.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING CHANGES TO TITLE 5, SECTION 40510, THE MASTER’S DEGREE

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) endorse the proposed changes to Title 5, section 40510, subsections b.2.A and B, that establish a requirement that at least 70% of total units required by a master’s degree program must be completed in residence; and that specify courses in master’s degree programs must be “designed primarily for graduate study”; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that the percentage of courses “designed primarily for graduate study” be increased from 50% to 60% of the units required for the degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that campuses consider adopting policies governing the determination of whether a course is “designed primarily for graduate study,” and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, Chancellor, campus Presidents, Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, campus Senate Chairs, campus Graduate Deans, and campus Graduate Coordinators

RATIONALE: Three proposed changes to Title 5 language respecting master’s degrees have been reviewed by the Academic Affairs committee. The ASCSU believes these three changes are prudent and fortify the rigor of master’s degrees.

The first change relates to residency requirements, and converts reference to a specific number of semester/quarter units (21 and 32, respectively) into a percentage of total units required by a degree program (70%). This change seems appropriate given the variability in total unit counts among degree programs. Thus, no matter the actual number of units required to complete a master’s degree, 70% of those units must be completed in residence. As an example, for a typical 30 semester unit master’s degree, 70% is 21 units, so this revision to Title 5 language merely clarifies a ratio which has governed most programs historically. Since some degree programs exceed this typical unit limit, shifting to a percentage of the total number of units seems appropriate.

The second change similarly seems reasonable. Instead of describing courses as “organized primarily for graduate students,” the proposed language seems to promote more rigor because it specifies a certain percentage of courses shall be “designed primarily for graduate study.” In the case of the existing
language, it could be argued that pre-requisite courses or other preparatory work is “organized primarily for graduate students,” and yet such work might not rise to the level of a course “designed primarily for graduate study.” The ASCSU presumes courses designed for graduate study to include assignments and content that are graduate-appropriate.

Relatedly, a third recommendation made by the ASCSU, with the assent of the graduate deans, is that the requirement for the number of units designed for graduate study be elevated from 50% to 60% of the units required for the degree. If one-half of the units for a master’s degree are required to be in courses designed for graduate study, then axiomatically one-half of the units can be in non-graduate-appropriate courses, which calls into question whether the degree conferred can truly be deemed a graduate degree. At the barest of minima, the ASCSU maintains that a simple majority of the degree should be in graduate-appropriate courses. Moving beyond that standard to promote academic quality, the ASCSU contends that 60% is a reasonable requirement for course work designed for graduate study.

Approved Unanimously – May 16, 2014
Title 5. Education  
Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities  
Chapter 1. California State University  
Subchapter 2. Educational Program  
Article 7. Graduate Degrees  
§ 40510. The Master's Degree.

To be eligible for the Master's degree, the candidate shall have completed the following minimum requirements:

(a) Advancement to Candidacy. For advancement to candidacy for the Master's degree, the applicant shall meet the requirements of Section 41011, and such particular requirements as the Chancellor and the campus may prescribe.

(b) Requirements for the Degree.

(1) The completion of a specified pattern of study approved by the appropriate campus authority.

(2) A minimum of thirty semester units of approved graduate work completed within a maximum time to be established by each campus. Such maximum time shall be no more than seven years nor less than five years for each particular program. An extension of time beyond the limit may be granted by appropriate campus authority if warranted by individual circumstances and if the outdated work is validated by examination, in the relevant additional course or subject field of work or such other demonstration of competence as may be prescribed. In the degree program:

(A) Not less than 21 semester units (32 quarter units) At least 70 percent of the total units required by the degree program shall be completed in residence. The appropriate campus authority may authorize the substitution of credit earned by alternate means for a part of this residence requirement.

(B) Not less than one-half of the units required for the degree shall be in courses designed primarily for graduate study.

(C) Not more than six semester units shall be allowed for a thesis or project.

(3) Satisfactory completion of a thesis, project, or comprehensive examination, defined as follows:

(A) A thesis is the written product of a systematic study of a significant problem. It identifies the problem, states the major assumptions, explains the significance of the
undertaking, sets forth the sources for and methods of gathering information, analyzes the
data, and offers a conclusion or recommendation. The finished product evidences
originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate organization and format, and
thorough documentation. Normally, an oral defense of the thesis is required.

(B) A project is a significant undertaking appropriate to the fine and applied arts or to
professional fields. It evidences originality and independent thinking, appropriate form
and organization, and a rationale. It is described and summarized in a written abstract that
includes the project's significance, objectives, methodology and a conclusion or
recommendation. An oral defense of the project may be required.

(C) A comprehensive examination is an assessment of the student's ability to integrate the
knowledge of the area, show critical and independent thinking, and demonstrate mastery
of the subject matter. The results of the examination evidences independent thinking,
appropriate organization, critical analysis and accuracy of documentation. A record of the
examination questions and responses shall be maintained in accordance with the records
retention policy of The California State University.

(4) A grade point average of 3.0 (grade of B) or better in all courses taken to satisfy the
requirements for the degree, except that a course in which no letter grade is assigned shall
not be used in computing the grade point average.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 89030 and 89035, Education Code. Reference:
Section 89030, Education Code.
IN SUPPORT OF AB 2324 (WILLIAMS) PERTAINING TO CSU FACULTY TRUSTEE

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) thank the Board of Trustees for including the Faculty Trustee Holdover Appointment proposal in their Legislative Program for 2014; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU express its appreciation to Assembly Member Das Williams for introducing Assembly Bill 2324, *Trustees of the California State University: faculty member of the board*, on February 21, 2014; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that members of the CSU community register support for AB 2324 as it moves through the legislative process; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Chancellor, CSU Board of Trustees, Assembly Member Das Williams, CSU Office of Advocacy and State Relations, Assembly Committee on Higher Education of the California State Legislature, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State Student Association (CSSA), and CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA)

**RATIONALE:** The Faculty Trustee provides the Board of Trustees (BOT) with both expertise and a faculty perspective in areas of academic policy as well as matters of curricular and fiscal concern affecting the CSU. In addition, the presence of a Faculty Trustee strengthens faculty confidence in BOT actions.

In recent years, however, there have been lengthy intervals during which no Faculty Trustee has been appointed to the Board, the longest being the period from 2009 to 2011, which resulted in the Faculty Trustee position staying vacant for an entire 2-year term. This again occurred more recently in the summer and fall of 2013 – a period of several months during which the Board met twice without a Faculty Trustee.

AB 2324 addresses the ongoing concern raised by the ASCSU pertaining to the lack of a faculty trustee on the CSU Board of Trustees, most recently described in the ASCSU resolutions listed below.

AS-3153-13/FGA/FA, Ensuring the Continuous Presence of a Faculty Trustee on the California State University Board of Trustees

AS-3141-13/EX, Concern over Delay in Governor’s Appointment of CSU Faculty Trustee

Approved Unanimously – May 16, 2014
An act to amend Section 66602 of the Education Code, relating to postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 2324, as introduced, Williams. Trustees of the California State University: faculty member of the board.

Existing law establishes the various campuses of the California State University under the administration of the Trustees of the California State University. Existing law provides for the membership of the Trustees of the California State University to include 5 specified ex officio members, 16 appointive members appointed by the Governor and subject to confirmation by the Senate, one representative of the alumni associations, 2 student members appointed by the Governor, and a faculty member appointed by the Governor. Existing law establishes that the 2-year term of office of a faculty member commences July 1, and expires on June 30, 2 years thereafter.

This bill would allow a faculty member to remain on the board after his or her 2-year term expires for one additional 2-year term if the Governor has not appointed a successor, as specified.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 66602 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66602. (a) The board shall be composed of the following five ex officio members: the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the person named by the trustees to serve as the Chancellor of the California State University; a representative of the alumni associations of the state university, selected for a two-year term by the alumni council, California State University, which representative shall not be an employee of the California State University during the two-year term; and 16 appointive members appointed by the Governor and subject to confirmation by two-thirds of the membership of the Senate.

(b) (1) Two students from the California State University, who shall have at least sophomore year standing at the institutions they attend, and who remain in good standing as students during their respective terms, shall also be appointed by the Governor to serve on the board for two-year terms.

(2) In the selection of students as members of the board, the Governor shall appoint the students from lists of names of at least two, but not more than five, persons furnished by the governing board of any statewide student organization that represents the students of the California State University and the student body organizations of the campuses of the California State University. Any appointment to fill a vacancy of a student member shall be effective only for the remainder of the term of the student member’s office that became vacated.

(3) The term of office of one student member of the board shall commence on July 1 of an even-numbered year and expire on June 30 two years thereafter. The term of office of the other student member of the board shall commence on July 1 of an odd-numbered year and expire on June 30 two years thereafter. Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a student member who graduates from his or her college or university on or after January 1 of the second year of his or her term of office may serve the remainder of the term.

(4) (A) During the first year of a student member’s term, a student member shall be a member of the board and may attend
all meetings of the board and its committees. At these meetings, a student member may fully participate in discussion and debate, but may not vote. During the second year of a student member’s term, a student member may exercise the same right to attend meetings of the board, and its committees, and shall have the same right to vote as the members appointed pursuant to subdivision (a).

(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), during the first year of a student member’s term, the student member may vote at a board meeting if the other student member is absent from that meeting due to illness, a family emergency, or a medical emergency.

(5) Notwithstanding paragraph (4), if a student member resigns from office or a vacancy is otherwise created in that office during the second year of a student member’s term, the remaining student member shall immediately assume the office created by the vacancy and all of the participation privileges of the second-year student member, including the right to vote, for the remainder of that term of office.

(6) A student member shall have his or her tuition fee waived for the duration of his or her term of office.

(c) (1) A faculty member from the California State University, who shall be tenured at the California State University campus at which he or she teaches, shall also be appointed by the Governor to serve on the board for a two-year term. In the selection of a faculty member as a member of the board, the Governor shall appoint the faculty member from a list of names of at least two persons furnished by the Academic Senate of the California State University.

(2) The faculty member of the board appointed by the Governor pursuant to this subdivision shall not participate on any subcommittee of the board responsible for collective bargaining negotiations.

(3) The two-year term of office of the faculty member of the board shall commence on July 1, and shall expire on June 30 two years thereafter and the faculty member may remain in office after the term expires for one additional two-year term if the Governor has not appointed a successor under paragraph (1).
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) commend the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for the reinstatement of the Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) program as specified in the Education Code, (66010.4 part (b)); and be it further.

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize the value of research, scholarship, and creative activity to the quality of the faculty’s teaching as well as to our students’ learning; and be it further.

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that the 2014-2015 reinstated funding of RSCA is based on Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF), the calculation of which includes faculty of all ranks, including lecturers, and that many campuses allocate RSCA awards to the various segments of the campuses based on FTEF; and be it further.

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage campuses to allow faculty of all ranks, including lecturers, to be eligible to receive RSCA funding; and be it further.

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU campus Senate Executive Committees, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, the Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA), Faculty Development Centers/Institutes for Teaching and Learning, and the California Faculty Association (CFA).

RATIONALE: On March 10, 2014 Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Ephraim Smith distributed a memorandum to CSU presidents indicating the restoration of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) funds for the 2014-15 academic year. This memorandum indicated that the distribution of funds was tied directly to full-time equivalent faculty levels at each of the CSU campuses. The ASCSU affirms that because faculty of all ranks can engage in RSCA activities, and funding is provided without regard to faculty rank, faculty rank should not be used to exclude faculty from receiving RSCA funding.

In AS-2917-09 (Rev): A Resolution in Support of Reinstatement of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Awards for 2010-2011[^1], the ASCSU noted “RSCA awards were established by the California state legislature in recognition of the inexorable link between professional achievement and effective teaching and learning. In addition, the Legislature intended that these funds ‘ensure that faculty (1) remain current in their disciplines, (2) pursue new ways to enrich student learning and (3) contribute to knowledge that will strengthen California socially, culturally and..."
economically.’ And the Legislature explicitly called for the CSU to allocate the ‘$2.5 million for research, creative, and scholarly activities in a manner which affirms the commitment of the faculty to the instructional mission of the system.’” And while the legislature noted that such funding can especially help to “attract, develop, mentor, and retain junior faculty” faculty of all ranks benefit from engagement in RSCA, and obtain the intended outcomes of RSCA funding.

The teacher-scholar model is widely promoted within the CSU, recognizing that student learning and the quality of teaching can be improved when faculty are actively engaged in research, scholarship and creative activities, and especially when faculty connect these activities to course content and/or actively involve students in these activities. The 2008 Access to Excellence document reminds us “The CSU has long been committed to the development of new knowledge to benefit teaching and learning, to serve communities, and to contribute to regional and statewide economies. What are too often presented as either-or propositions in higher education are in fact integrative, defining, and essential dimensions of quality in the CSU: excellence in teaching and in scholarship; faculty and student research; stimulating economic development and meeting community needs.”

In 2008 the Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities report documented the results of a system-wide survey of 2006-07 RSCA award recipients³. The report indicated that of the 531 faculty who received awards, 74% reported that receipt of the award benefitted teaching and curriculum, and 62% indicated that students participated in the funded research, scholarship or creative activity (a high impact teaching practice that is positively correlated with retention and graduation). The survey findings clearly demonstrate that scholarly activities can directly influence teaching and learning. The report further indicated that over half of the recipients had been able to engage in a professional presentation or publish materials related to the funded project, and 41% reported enhanced collaborations occurred as a result of the grant funding. Of the 531 faculty surveyed, 338 were Assistant Professors (64%), 99 were Associate Professors (19%), 80 were Full Professors (15%), and 6 (1%) were identified as lecturers (the report did not indicate FERP status).

While the CSU should be providing support for probationary, tenure-line faculty to develop their research agenda, this need not occur at the exclusion of tenured and lecturer faculty. Faculty of all ranks engage in RSCA activities that can enhance the quality of student learning and achievement, and promote community needs and development, and all should have access to funding in support of these endeavors.

Approved Unanimously – May 16, 2014

² http://calstate.edu/accesstoexcellence/advantages.shtml
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following schedule for 2014-2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 3-5</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>January 21-23</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
<td>February 20</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5-7</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>March 18-20</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13-14</td>
<td>Academic Conference</td>
<td>April 17</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
<td>May 13-15</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the CSU be authorized to change the schedule of meetings approved, with adequate notice to the Academic Senate of the CSU, if the Trustees alter their schedule, or if budgetary constraints require a change.

RATIONALE: The California State University Board of Trustees is in the process of determining its meeting dates for 2014-2015, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Remaining meetings</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 22</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9-10</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12-13</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Tentative</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 27-28</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24-25</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19-20</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8-9</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17-18</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- Veteran’s day – Chancellor’s office is closed Tuesday, November 11, 2014
*The schedule for virtual meetings will be between the hours of:

- 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. - Executive Committee;
- 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. - Extended Executive Committee;
- 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. - All standing committees;
- 12:00 noon to 1:00 p.m. - Executive Committee liaisons to standing committees;
- 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. - Extended Executive Committee.

Approved – May 16, 2014
FORMATION OF A TASK FORCE TO ASSESS THE ROLE OF STUDENT SUCCESS FEES ACROSS CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU) CAMPUSES

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize the fiscal exigencies that have prompted the expansion of variously-named Student Success Fees on CSU campuses; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that questions have been raised regarding these fees, such as: impact on overall cost to the students, effect on access, possible inequities among campuses, lack of clear guidelines on their usage and effectiveness of the campus consultation process; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor to form a task force to undertake a system-wide assessment of the role of Student Success Fees that will:

- review Executive Order 1054 to determine if changes to CSU student fee policies are advisable,
- investigate the practice of “alternative consultation” in lieu of a vote by the entire student body, and
- evaluate and clarify the role of Student Success Fees within the broader context of the fiscal needs of the CSU and the future anticipated funding levels from the state; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to Chancellor Timothy P. White, CSU Board of Trustees, Assembly member Das Williams, Chair, Assembly Higher Education Committee, Assembly member Al Muratsuchi, Chair, Assembly Budget Subcommittee 2 (Education Finance), Senator Carol Liu, Chair, Senate Education Committee, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, California State Student Association (CSSA), California Faculty Association (CFA) and the CSU Emeritus & Retired Faculty Association.

RATIONALE: Since 2008 individual campuses in the CSU have introduced Category II fees, frequently referred to as Student Success Fee, in addition to regular tuition and other campus-based fees as a way of augmenting the state’s general fund support for instructional programs and other basic higher education needs. Eleven campuses have such fees and a proposal for a twelfth is currently under review. The size of the fees varies across campuses and ranges from $162 to $630 (3%-12% of tuition). While, traditionally, campus-based student fees have been used to cover incidental classroom costs (such as laboratory fees) or to support activities not covered by state funding or regular tuition (a student union expansion or a child day-care center), the Student Success Fee is primarily intended to support basic classroom instruction. The fees are proposed and approved by the students themselves under the process outlined in Executive Order 1054. The California State Student Association (CSSA) has taken up a resolution requesting a review of Student
Success Fees since the students no longer believe the State is willing to support higher education at a level necessary to ensure student access to a quality education. The ASCSU recognizes the fiscal pressures that have prompted campuses to establish Student Success Fees and applauds the willingness of students to help solve the problem of underfunding, even if it means taxing themselves to receive the education they deserve.

Nonetheless, the ASCSU remains sensitive to questions that have been raised about the manner in which Student Success Fees are being implemented in the CSU. First, and most fundamentally, the fees are being used to make up for the failure of the state of California to adequately support higher education. Guidelines as to the purposes to which the fees are to be used are unclear, yet, mostly, they are exactly those activities that state support (supplemented by regular tuition) should be funding. As such, they amount to de facto tuition hikes under a different name. Questions have also been raised about the consultation process by which students are asked to approve (or disapprove) such fee proposals; there appears to be a lack of consistency as to how this takes place among campuses, and it is not clear whether the “alternate consultation” system, which calls for approval by a student fee advisory committee, is sufficient to allow for genuine student consultation. Furthermore, the fees may run the risk of exacerbating differences in quality and opportunity among campuses as students on some campuses may be better able to support fee increases than others.

The introduction of Student Success Fees has the potential for unintended political consequences; such fees run the risk of being seen as an effort by the CSU to side-step the freeze on tuition increases that are part of the multi-year funding proposal for higher education proposed by the governor. Several newspaper editorial boards have commented on this, and more importantly, it has been noted in the Legislature. The Chair of the Assembly Budget Subcommittee 2 (Education Finance) recently observed that Student Success Fees were little more than a tuition hike by another name and that it was imperative that the existing tuition freeze be honored. He further stressed that the introduction of such fees would undercut the Assembly’s willingness to support a budget augmentation currently being requested by the CSU.

2013/documents/3113.pdf, the ASCSU holds that a system-wide assessment of Student Success Fees is warranted. The assessment should be carried out in the broader context of an examination of the fiscal needs of the CSU, the anticipated levels of state funding, and the appropriate role of tuition and fees in meeting the costs of a quality education within the CSU.

Approved Unanimously – May 16, 2014
RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION FOR JAMES TILL, INTERIM ASSISTANT VICE CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH INITIATIVES AND PARTNERSHIPS

WHEREAS, James Till has served the California State University (CSU) campuses and Chancellor’s Office for many years; and

WHEREAS, James Till has always maintained a faculty perspective in all of his administrative appointments; and

WHEREAS, James Till’s work with and reports to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate of the CSU demonstrate his dedication to collegial and collaborative relations with faculty, and serves as a model of shared governance; and

WHEREAS, James Till worked closely with Faculty Affairs to draft AS-3156-13/FA (Rev) Reinstatement of Faculty Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Fund that was subsequently approved by the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU), which led to the Chancellor’s reinstatement of a $2.4 million RSCA pool; and

WHEREAS, James Till has unsuccessfully tried to retire two different times, always to be recalled by the Office of the Chancellor to solve one of their myriad of impossible tasks; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU lend its moral support to James Till’s third and, we hope, final attempt to escape from the malevolent clutches of the Office of the Chancellor, although we will miss his work in the CSU; be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU wish James Till a long, successful and productive retirement.

Approved By Acclamation – May 16, 2014
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) urge the Board of Trustees (BOT) to request annual reports assessing progress toward achieving each of the eight goals/commitments delineated in the *Access to Excellence*\(^1\) strategic plan for the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that the annual reports utilize an appropriate and limited number of performance quality indicators for each of the eight strategic plan goals/commitments, drawing from among the indicators adopted by the BOT in the Accountability Plan\(^2\) and metrics\(^3\) in Appendix 2; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that faculty be involved in identifying the performance quality indicators for each of the eight strategic plans goals/commitments; be it finally

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, campus presidents, and campus senate chairs.

**RATIONALE:** In 2008, the BOT adopted a ten-year strategic plan, *Access to Excellence.* The plan was developed with broad consultation, as recognized by the ASCSU\(^4,5,6\), and it set forth eight broad strategic goals/commitments that would be the basis for setting priorities and measuring success over the next decade: (1) reduce existing achievement gaps; (2) plan for faculty turnover and invest in faculty excellence; (3) plan for staff and administrative succession and professional growth; (4) improve accountability for learning results; (5) expand student outreach; (6) enhance student opportunities for “active learning;” (7) enhance opportunities for global awareness; and (8) act on CSU’s responsibility to meet post-baccalaureate needs, including those of working professionals.

The BOT also adopted an Accountability Plan\(^2\) to assess progress toward these goals, including a menu of measurable indicators\(^4\). To date, evidence of progress toward the eight goals using the possible indicators recommended by the BOT has yet to be compiled.

The ASCSU shares the BOT’s commitment to accountability and empirical evidence\(^7,8,9\). Chancellor White also recognized the need to expand data-based decision-making in his inaugural State of the CSU address\(^10\).

Given that the half-way point of the strategic plan has passed, an annual assessment of progress toward achieving the goals established by the Board—
using the metrics adopted by the Board—will provide evidence of whether or not the BOT’s strategic goals are on track to be achieved. If the trajectory is not in line with attainment of goals, then additional interventions can be identified and implemented.

The Accountability Plan appropriately calls for a limited number of indicators. The ASCSU requests that faculty be involved in identifying an appropriate number of indicators that can be used to assess system-wide progress to achieving the goals of the Access to Excellence plan.

Given that this process requires consultation and coordination across 23 diverse campuses, the ASCSU recommends that the specific indicators for each of the eight goals be reported to the BOT in January 2015 and that institution- and system-level progress data be reported in May 2015, May 2016, May 2017, and May 2018.

1 Access to Excellence Strategic Plan – Full Report
http://www.calstate.edu/accessexcellence/introduction.shtml

2 Access to Excellence Accountability Plan
http://www.calstate.edu/accessexcellence/accountability/

3 Appendix 2: Metrics for System- and Institution-Level Indicators
http://www.calstate.edu/accessexcellence/accountability/metrics.shtml

4 Acknowledgement of Faculty Involvement in the Access to Excellence Accountability Plan

5 Response to Access to Excellence

6 Response to Access to Excellence Draft

7 “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

8 Implementation of Access to Excellence CSU Strategic Plan Commitment 2: Plan for Faculty Turnover and Invest in Faculty Excellence

10 State of The CSU Address [http://www.calstate.edu/stateofcsu/address.shtml]

Approved Unanimously – May 16, 2014