EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RESOLUTIONS
ACADEMIC SENATE CSU PLENARY – MAY 19-20, 2016
(Extracted and edited from a report by Catherine Nelson, Sonoma State University ASCSU Senator)

The Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) met at the Chancellor’s Office in Long Beach May 19-20, 2016 and approved the following resolutions. All can be accessed at the ASCSU website.

Resolution Regarding Evaluation of Online Teaching
AS-3250-16/FGA (Rev) – Approved Without Dissent
This resolution recommends that the ASCSU, in conjunction with the Chancellor’s Office Department of Academic Technology Services review the 2012 ASCSU and 2014 California State Student Association (CSSA) reports on the use of online teaching, with respect to testing efficacy and cost effectiveness, and recommend to campuses that they: a) develop a campus-wide database of students and faculty involved in online courses, for comparison with the general population of students, faculty and courses; b) include both demographic and non-demographic information (e.g. hours worked, commute time, faculty rank, course section enrollment at census and online format) in those data; and c) in conjunction with the Chancellor’s Office Department of Academic Technology Services aggregate such information across the 23 campuses to provide system-wide data to drive decisions concerning online teaching.

The resolution recommends that campuses use the data to assess the desirability of establishing student qualifications for taking fully online courses, and potential limits on the number of fully online courses a student may take. The resolution also recommends that campuses use the data to assess the desirability of establishing protocols for offering face-to-face or hybrid equivalent classes for each fully online course offered, and placing size limits on fully on-line courses to match the size of the corresponding face-to-face class.

In Support of Increased Funding For the Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA) Program
AS-3251-16/FA (Rev) – Approved Unanimously
This resolution urges the Chancellor’s Office to increase funding for the RSCA program to a level commensurate with the original intent behind the program, the recognized value of faculty and student research as a significant factor in the quality of education, the amount of external funding faculty research brings to the CSU and the fact that lecturers, as well as tenure-track faculty, are now eligible to receive RSCA funding.

Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2016-17 Meetings
AS-3252-16/EX – Approved Unanimously
This resolution is self-explanatory.
Call for a Center for Advancement of Instruction in Mathematics

*AS 3253-16/APEP – Approved Unanimously*

This resolution encourages the CSU to establish a center to support mathematics instruction, analogous to the CSU Center for the Advancement for Reading (CAR). The resolution recommends that the center’s responsibilities include: a) development of a fourth year high-school mathematics course analogous to the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC); b) professional development for, and evaluation of, the fourth-year mathematics course; c) professional development in mathematics/quantitative reasoning instruction; and d) policy alignment in matters affecting mathematics curriculum and instruction.

Regarding Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-08 “Basic Subject Courses and the Grade of C-”

*AS-3254-16/AA – Approved Without Dissent*

Executive Order (EO) 1100 “General Education Breadth Requirements” set the parameters for General Education requirements in the CSU. In Section 2.2.2, the EO sets a minimum grade of “C” for satisfactory completion of the “Golden Four” basic subject General Education (GE) courses, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning and written and oral communication. The “C” requirement was included at the ASCSU’s request made in AS-3020-11/APEP/AA (Rev) Grade Minima for CSU General Education Courses in the “Golden Four.” In April 2016, the division of Academic and Student Affairs, after consultation with the CSU General Counsel, issued Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-08 “Basic Subject Courses and the Grade of C-.” The memo asserts that the literal intention of Section 2.2.2 cannot be evenly enforced, especially in the area of transfer, because of equity issues arising from the different grading modes (+/- vs. no +/-) used by CSU campuses and other universities where students may take courses they wish to transfer to the CSU. The resolution expresses grave concern that the memo was issued without consultation with, or formal notification to, the ASCSU. It also expresses grave concern that a CSU General Counsel’s legal interpretation obviated the need for faculty consultation in a policy area that has a direct bearing on curricular concerns. The resolution also calls for a summer 2016 working group to consider alternative viable solutions to that proposed in ASA-2016-08.

Commendation in Honor of Trustee Lou Monville

*AS-3255-16/FGA – Approved by Acclamation*

This resolution is a commendation for Lou Monville, outgoing Chair of the CSU Board of Trustees. He is leaving the Board after ten years of service.

The Role of Faculty and Campus Academic Senates in Recommending Campus Strategic Plans

*AS-3256-16/ASCSU – Approved Without Dissent*

This resolution is in response to concern about shared governance practices at CSU Stanislaus regarding the creation/revision of a campus strategic plan. It calls upon all CSU campus administrations to honor and reaffirm the authority of faculty in the creation, revision or affirmation of strategic plans in keeping with the principles and practices of shared governance, in particular those codified in campus policies. It also urges CSU Presidents and Presidents’ Offices to advocate for and follow the policies and procedures that promote and ensure shared governance.
Additional Commendations
Commendations were offered for several Senators ending their service on the ASCSU, including Bill Eadie (San Diego), Diana Guerin (Fullerton), Loretta Kensinger (Fresno), Deborah Roberts (Sonoma State) and Francelina A. Neto (Pomona). A commendation was also offered for outgoing Chair of the ASCSU Steven Filling (Stanislaus).

The full text of ASCSU resolutions is available at: http://calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/
RESOLUTION REGARDING EVALUATION OF ONLINE TEACHING

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU), in conjunction with Chancellor's Office department of Academic Technology Services review the 2012 Statewide Academic Senate and 2014 California State Student Association (CSSA) reports on the use of online teaching, with respect to testing efficacy and cost effectiveness, and recommend to campuses they:

a) develop a campus wide database of students and faculty involved in online courses, for comparison with the general population of students, faculty and courses;

b) include both demographic and non-demographic information (e.g. hours worked, commute time, faculty rank, course section enrollment at census, and online format) in those data; and

c) in conjunction with the Chancellor's Office department of Academic Technology Services, aggregate such information across the 23 campuses so as to provide system-wide data to drive decisions concerning online teaching at the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU, in conjunction with Chancellor’s Office department of Academic Technology Services, make these data available, with respect to students, and recommend to campuses they use these data to assess the desirability of establishing: a) student qualifications for taking fully online courses; and b) potential limits on the number of fully online courses a student may take; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU, in conjunction with Chancellor’s Office department of Academic Technology Services, make these data available, with respect to online courses, and recommend to campuses they use these data to assess the desirability of: a) establishing protocols for offering face-to-face or hybrid equivalent classes for each fully online course offered; and b) placing size limits on fully on-line courses to match the size of the corresponding face-to-face class; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU Chancellor's Cabinet, CSU Campus Presidents, CSU Campus Chief Information Officers, CSU Campus Senate Executive Committees, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California State Student Association (CSSA), California Faculty Association (CFA), Chairs of the California State Senate and Assembly Fiscal Affairs Committees.
RATIONALE: Enrollment growth funds requested by the Board of Trustees from the State, when given, historically are enough to cover only inflationary costs. The 3+3% yearly enrollment growth of the CSU is, therefore, not typically covered. Additionally, despite record hiring (to replace attrition plus enrollment growth), less than 60% of the faculty positions required to be filled is funded. Finally folding in the effects of capital budgeting now having to come from funds previously allocated exclusively to operating budgets and it is evident there is a perfect storm in higher education financing.

Traditional responses to funding shortfalls (e.g. increases in student fees, Student/Faculty Ratios, philanthropy, impaction and percentage of part time employees; or alternatively, decreases in real faculty wages, library acquisitions, or athletic programs) do not work in the long run. Student fees have outpaced inflation 3:1 in the past 20 years while percentage of administrative hires have outpaced faculty hires 4:1 in the same period. Student/Faculty Ratio (SFR) has grown 30% on most campuses, to accommodate increased administrative growth, while tenure density and real faculty salaries have dropped 20%. Philanthropy averages only 14% of campus funds. Further, impaction yields little benefit as increased enrollment demand and rate of acceptance more than eliminates the effect. Moreover, tenure density, faculty salaries, library acquisitions and athletic programs have an absolute zero point, precluding reductions in budgets these as long term solutions. Compound this by the continuing support of Student University Grants (SUG) and one can see why stakeholders are looking toward the use of online technology in teaching as a panacea.

Moreover, there are multiple groups embracing this technology and, therefore, contributing to this trend, each of which has their own vested interest in increasing use of online teaching: 1) the state legislature and Governor who want us to do more with less; 2) the Chancellor’s Office (CO) and Board of Trustees who want to be more efficient, especially in increasing graduation rates; 3) the faculty, who over time and through attrition, want to embrace change; and 4) our students are now fully evolved as digital natives.

That said, taken slowly, well evaluated and controlled disruptive innovations, such as online pedagogy in higher education, can have many beneficial effects. However, when artificially accelerated, it can have unintended consequences, such as the issue of support (e.g. Los Angeles Unified School District’s multimillion lawsuit against Apple) or the effects unlimited scaling (e.g. the debacle that was the San José State experiment with Massive Online Open Courses [MOOC]), or the seemingly endless iterations of attempts to integrate diverse organizational structure (e.g. the Western Governor’s Virtual University, qua California Virtual University, qua Cal State Online).

Evaluated in its present state, it is evident that much of the impetus for accelerating online instruction is not based on pedagogical efficacy, but financial expediency. As evidence of this trend, most stakeholders have come to believe
online classes are cheaper, more scalable, and not significantly different in outcomes from face-to-face classes. None of that follows from the technology. Therefore we, as faculty, need to be vigilant in monitoring this trend.

As evidence of this need, we continue to see the California Legislature enacting and/or introducing bills regarding technology (without a corresponding evaluation component) including, but not limited to, increasing student success rates in general, and bottleneck courses in particular, encouraging public-private technology partnerships, mandating electronic texts and using Cal State Online to among other things, equivocate online class credit between CSU campuses.

To date, however, despite considered online education white papers written by the ASCSU and the CSSA, in 2012 and 2014 respectively, no policies have been enacted by the CO, nor resolutions been passed by the ASCSU, nor any recommendations made regarding avenues for translating any of those reports’ recommended best practices, into policies. That we have recently hired a new Chief Information Officer (CIO) in the Chancellor’s Office, reformulating the duties and descriptions of that office and reorganizing its relationship with campus CIOs, this resolution is a timely attempt to address these cost and efficacy issues in advocating that the use of online teaching deserves such attention and evaluation.

Approved Without Dissent – May 19-20, 2016
IN SUPPORT OF INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND 
CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA) PROGRAM

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) urge the 
Chancellor’s Office to increase funding for the Research, Scholarship, and 
Creative Activities (RSCA) program to a level commensurate with the intent 
behind the program, the recognized value of faculty and student research as a 
significant factor in the quality of education, the amount of external funding 
faculty research brings to the CSU, and the fact that lecturers, as well as tenure­ 
track faculty, are now eligible to receive RSCA funding; and be it further 

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to CSU Board of Trustees, CSU 
Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU 
Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California Faculty Association 
(CFA), and California State University Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association 
(CSU ERFA).

RATIONALE: The RSCA program was initiated in response to a 1987 draft 
report issued by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher 
Education. The Commission recognized that faculty research results in better 
teaching by faculty and better learning by students. The report, titled “The Master 
Plan Renewed,” recommended: “Research, scholarship and creativity in support 
of the undergraduate and graduate instructional mission is authorized in The 
California State University, and shall be supported by the State” 
(http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/masterplan/MPComm1987.pdf). This statement was 
subsequently repeated in the California Education Code 66010.4, which reads:

(b) .... Research, scholarship, and creative activity in support of its 
undergraduate and graduate instructional mission is authorized in the 
California State University and shall be supported by the state.

Recommendation number 2 of the report estimated the cost of the RSCA program 
to be $14.5 million, based on the assumption that only full-time faculty are 
eligible for the funds. In 1988-89, the CSU requested only $7.5 million (it is not 
known today how that number was arrived at) to create the RSCA program, but 
was allocated $2.5 million, and this level remained unchanged until 2009-10, 
when funding was suspended. In 2010-11, funds were allocated again, while 
between 2011 and 2014 the program was again suspended. Funds were restored 
in 2014-15 ($2.4 million), based on carry over from Academic Affairs 2013-14 
general funds matched 1:1 by the Chancellor. In 2015-16, funding for the RSCA 
program was reinstated in the amount of $2.5 million.
In his response to the ASCSU resolution AS-3173-14/FA (Rev) “Eligibility Status for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Awards”, Associate Vice Chancellor Ron Vogel stated:

“We join the ASCSU in recognizing the importance of research, scholarly, and creative activity for the faculty and students in the CSU. The value of these activities spread far beyond our institutions and positively impacts the state, region, nation, and international communities. As noted in the resolution, the distribution of the funds for this program is based on FTEF, which includes lecturers.”

In response to ASCSU resolution AS-3247-16/FA “Restoring Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) Funds as a Line Item in the CSU Operations Budget,” approved in January 2016, RSCA funds were again made a line item in the CSU operating budget.

The original estimates of needed RSCA funding were based upon headcount, while at present the RSCA allocation to the campuses is based upon Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) and includes lecturers. While this makes it difficult to arrive at a precise estimate of the funding level adequate to meet today’s needs based on the original assumptions, it should be clear that $2.5 million is not adequate. Currently, nearly 25,000 faculty are eligible to receive RSCA funds (the 1987-88 estimate of $14.5 million assumed 14,084 eligible full-time faculty).

The improvement in the fiscal situation in the state makes this an appropriate time for an increase in the RSCA funding level. The current resolution therefore urges that RSCA funding be increased (if not at once then by calculated steps over a period of time) to a level commensurate with the intent behind the program, the recognized value of faculty and student research as a significant factor in the quality of student education, the amount of external funding (currently estimated at $0.6 billion) that faculty research brings to the CSU, and the fact that lecturers (who currently constitute more than 50% of all faculty on CSU campuses) as well as tenure-track faculty are now eligible to receive RSCA funding.

Approved Unanimously – May 19-20, 2016
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following schedule for 2016-2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 14-16</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2-4</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 25-27</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15-17</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17-19</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13-15</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13</td>
<td>Interim Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-3</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>Interim Committees</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 2016-2017, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Remaining meetings</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 23-25</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19-20</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20-21</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15-16</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017 Tentative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 31 - February 1</th>
<th>Headquarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 21-22</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23-24</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18-19</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19-20</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7-8</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Typically, 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 Unanimously – May 19-20, 2016
CALL FOR A CENTER FOR ADVANCEMENT OF INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) encourage the establishment of a center to support mathematics instruction, analogous to the CSU Center for the Advancement of Reading (CAR); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the center have among its responsibilities:
   a. Development of a fourth-year high school mathematics course, analogous to the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC);
   b. Professional development for, and evaluation of, the fourth-year mathematics course;
   c. Professional development in effective mathematics/quantitative reasoning instruction; and
   d. Policy alignment in matters affecting mathematics curriculum and instruction

; 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 Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, CSU Math Council, CSU Deans of Colleges of Education, and the CSU Quantitative Reasoning Task Force.

RATIONALE: Currently, 27% of incoming CSU students arrive unprepared to succeed in college-level mathematics. In March 2016, the ASCSU passed AS-3244-16/APEP (Rev), “Support for Requiring a Fourth Year of Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning for Admission to the California State University”. Like the Center for the Advancement of Reading (CAR), this proposed center will provide leadership, support, training, and curricular resources in mathematics instruction for CSU faculty and California’s K-12 teachers.
REGARDING CODED MEMORANDUM ASA-2016-08 “BASIC SUBJECT COURSES AND THE GRADE OF C-”

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) affirm the role of faculty in shared governance with respect to policies on academic and professional matters affecting the CSU, as embodied in the California Higher Education Employee Relations Act (HEERA) of 1978 and the Board of Trustees’ CSU Statement on Collegiality (https://www.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/files/documents/Collegiality_Statement_CSU.pdf); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU express grave concern that Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-08 “Basic Subject Courses and the Grade of C-” was issued without consultation with, or formal notification to, the ASCSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU express grave concern that a CSU General Counsel’s legal interpretation obviated the need for faculty consultation in a policy area that has a direct bearing on curricular concerns; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that the Chancellor’s Office convene a working group, including representatives from, the Division of Academic and Student Affairs, and the ASCSU, during summer 2016 to explore alternative viable solutions to that proposed in ASA-2016-08. These solutions to safeguard academic quality should be implemented in time for spring 2017 admission decisions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Chancellor, CSU Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs, CSU General Counsel and CSU Campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: In March 2011 the ASCSU passed AS-3020-11/APEP/AA (Rev) “Grade Minima for CSU General Education Courses in the ‘Golden Four’. ” The resolution supported a minimum grade of C (2.0) in the Golden Four CSU General Education areas (Written Communication/English Comprehension, Mathematical Concepts/Quantitative Reasoning, Oral Communication and Critical Thinking) for both native and transfer students. At the time many, but not all, campuses of the CSU required a minimum grade of “C” (2.0) or better (as opposed to a “C-“ (1.7) or no minimum grade) standard in the Golden Four as a campus requirement for native students. Transfer students were required to have a “C” (2.0) or better in the Golden Four. In February 2015, after extensive consultation with the ASCSU, the Chancellor issued Executive Order (EO) 1100 “General Education Breadth Requirements,” an update to the previous Executive
Order 1065. EO 1100 Section 2.2.2 incorporated the C grade or better in the Golden Four for both native and transfer students.

In April 2016, the division of Academic and Student Affairs issued Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-08: “Basic Subject Courses and the Grade of C-“. The memo asserts that “students performing at the low end of the scale at any CSU or external campuses that do not award C- might likely receive C grades. The consequence is that the literal intention of section of 2.2.2 of Executive Order 1100 cannot be evenly enforced”.

Minimum grade criteria are under the purview of faculty and under established practices of shared governance any such policy should be subject to prior consultation with the ASCSU before a final decision is reached. Prior consultation would have allowed full discussion of several important questions, assumptions and consequences raised by the memo, including the issue of Registrar’s processes that cannot distinguish between a C and a C-, the influence of the General Counsel over academic policy, the potential for the C- (1.7 GPA) to become a precedent for other minimum graduation requirements, and the lowering of graduation standards on some campuses. Consultation with the ASCSU may have generated other viable solutions to this problem.

Source Materials:

- AS-3020-11/APEP/AA (Rev) “Grade Minima for CSU General Education Courses in the ‘Golden Four’
- Executive Order 1100
  http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1100.pdf
- ASA-2016-08 “Basic Subjects and the Grade of C-“
  http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedMemos/ASA-2016-08.pdf

Approved Without Dissent – May 19–20, 2016
COMMENDATION IN HONOR OF TRUSTEE LOU MONVILLE

WHEREAS, Trustee Lou Monville is a gold-plated product of the California State University (CSU), having earned his B.A. in Communication at CSU San Bernardino while serving as the campus’ ASI president, and eventually serving for more than a decade – from 2006 to 2014 – as a member the CSU Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, Following his time as a member of the Board, Trustee Lou Monville has most recently gone on to serve, from 2014 to 2016, as Chair of the CSU Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, During his time on the CSU Board of Trustees as both member and Chair, Trustee Lou Monville has ably shouldered a wide range of responsibilities, including the roles of Board of Trustees Vice Chair, and Chair of the Board’s Collective Bargaining Committee, as well as those of a member of Committee on Educational Policy, Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Governmental Relations, to mention just a few; and

WHEREAS, Trustee Lou Monville has brought an extensive background in public service to his time on CSU Board of Trustees, having previously worked for two members of the California State Assembly and served on the California Community College Board of Governors; and

WHEREAS, Trustee Lou Monville has used this experience to act as a tireless advocate for CSU in the community, in the Capitol, in the media, and in public forums everywhere; and

WHEREAS, Trustee Lou Monville consistently praises his experience as a student and student leader at his beloved alma mater, CSU San Bernardino, and continues to remain actively engaged with the campus; and

WHEREAS, Lou Monville is dedicated and loving father, have once brought his new-born daughter to a Board dinner, thus providing her with an early introduction to the joys of higher education administration; be it therefore

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University bestow its thanks and gratitude upon Lou Monville for his exemplary service and contributions to the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate once again state that it is proud to claim Lou Monville as a CSU Alumnus and extend it’s very best wishes to him and his family, and wish him well as he pursues life’s next big adventure.

Approved by Acclamation – May 19-20, 2016
THE ROLE OF FACULTY AND CAMPUS ACADEMIC SENATES IN RECOMMENDING
CAMPUS STRATEGIC PLANS

RESOLVED: Academic Senate of the California State University call upon all CSU campus administrations to honor and reaffirm the authority of faculty in the creation, revision or affirmation of strategic plans in keeping with the principles and practices of shared governance, in particular those codified in campus policies; and be it further

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University urge CSU Presidents and the Presidents’ Offices to advocate for and follow policies and procedures that promote and ensure shared governance; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to CSU Chancellor, CSU Campus Presidents, CSU Provosts and VPs of Academic Affairs, CSU Campus Senate Chairs, CSU Board of Trustees.

RATIONALE: In the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) the California legislature has affirmed that “joint decisionmaking [sic] and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions.”  
Additionally, the AAUP’s 1966 “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” similarly defines shared governance as “joint action” taken between faculty, administration, and boards of governors. Finally, the California State University System’s 2007 “Distinctive Universities and Campuses: The Autonomy of Individual Institutions in a Multi-Institutional System” provides “universities and campus senates their role in shared governance whenever possible ...”

Given the reality that the primary mission of the CSU is the education of California’s students, it seems obvious that the faculty have a clear and compelling interest in strategic plans, which are, after all, the maps campuses use to accomplish their mission. It is clear to this body that the official voice of the

---

1 Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) 3561 (b): http://www.perb.ca.gov/laws/heera.aspx
CSU faculty is the faculty senates. Campus senates must have formal roles in campus strategic plans. Strategic plans should be formally presented to campus senates who are the official voice of faculty. It is our understanding that events on the Stanislaus campus have not conformed to the principles referenced above. These events act as an index of the need to monitor such strategic planning practices on campuses in order to follow such policies and advocate for them where they do not exist.

Approved Without Dissent – May 19-20, 2016