Members Present:
Praveen Soni, Chair (Long Beach); Jim LoCascio Vice Chair (San Luis Obispo); Otto Benavides, (Fresno); Kate Fawver (Dominguez Hills); Eileen Klink (Long Beach); Thomas Krabacher (Sacramento); Martin Linder (San Francisco); and Cezar Ornatowski (San Diego), Ron Vogel (AVP, Chancellor’s Office)

Regrets: Jay Swartz (Pomona), Steven Browne (Maritime).

1. Welcome and Call to Order: Praveen Soni, Chair 10:08AM.

2. Agenda Approval: The agenda was approved.

3. Approval of Minutes: Approval of the March minutes will discussed at the May meeting.

4. Chair’s Report: Praveen Soni:
   - San Jose State University representatives will address the ASCSU to describe their relationship with Udacity.
   - The April 9th Lobby Day was a success and resulted in amendments to bills that are of particular interest to the CSU.
   - George Ashkar, Robert Turnage and Karen YZ will meet us in May.

5. Other Reports:
   - Eileen Klink reported on the Chancellor's Doctoral Incentive Program. She reported that there are 73 applicants being evaluated. This program is funded with lottery money and that there is a proposal to increase the maximum forgivable loan amount from $30,000 to $45,000.

6. Executive Committee Liaison; Steve Filling:
   - Steve Filling will email his report to FGA.
7. **Second Reading Resolutions:**

a. Refining resolution AB 386 California State University Online Accessibility; Marc Levine: “AB 386 provides matriculated CSU students system wide access to online courses provided by the twenty three campuses.” This resolution will need to be revised since amendments have been made to the bill, and the resolution will have a second reading at the May plenary. Also part of the memo (See below)

b. Refining resolution AB 387 California State University Online Accessibility; Marc Levine: “AB 387 establishes a uniform definition for online courses provided by the CSU, and develops an accountability system for measuring online coursework at the CSU.” This Bill has been amended to address our concerns and the resolution will need to be revised and will have a second reading at the May plenary. Also part of the memo (See below).

8. **Memo to the Executive Committee on Legislative Bills**

Since many of the legislative bills will have hearings next week in Sacramento and the ASCSU plenary is not until May, Diana Guerin, Chair of the ASCSU requested the FGA to provide recommended positions on the various bills by the end of the meeting today. The ASCSU Executive Committee would then vote on those positions on behalf of the ASCSU.

The FGA Committee, therefore, worked upon and amended a memo drafted by Chair Soni listing the bills and their descriptions, comments and recommended positions. The amended memo was unanimously approved by the FGA Committee and sent to the ASCSU Executive Committee.

The approved memo is appended below.

Relevant committee discussion only for some of the bills follows:

a. AB 895 Introduced by Assembly Member Rendon: FGA supports this bill now that it is expanded to 15 members and that the number of faculty was increased from 3 to 6, and are now appointed by the respective senates.

b. SB 440 Introduced by Senate Member Padilla. FGA opposes this bill. Tom pointed out that the bill may be amended and then it may not bode well for the CSU.

c. AB 1306 Introduced by Assembly Member Wilk. FGA opposes this bill.

d. SB 520 Introduced by Senator Steinberg: “Student instruction: California Online Student Access Platform.” After a spirited discussion, the majority of members opposed the bill unless amended while three members voted not to oppose the bill. A major point was the difference between ‘online course provider’ and ‘online course technology provider.’ The committee was clear that the ‘course provider’ should be the CSU and the ‘technology provider’ should be determined by who can do the best job. That was included as an amendment in the memo. Kate had
concerns with the term ‘bottleneck’ courses. Kate as well as Jim LoCascio questioned if such courses exist. In Kate’s view it was not clear if bottleneck class are defined by 1) wait lists 2) high failure rates 3) enrollments limited by available ‘wet lab’ seats. It was noted that wait lists are not a good indicator because students could be wait listed in multiple sections of the same class. High failure rates are not necessarily a problem with the course, course mode or course instructor but may be a result of poor student preparation. Kate enquired if the Chancellor’s office supported this bill. Ron Vogel indicated that the CO’s office was concerned at the lack of progress made by students towards graduation because they cannot get necessary classes. They will attempt to identify if there are bottleneck classes. Jim LoCascio indicated that he has asked the Academic Affairs office at Cal Poly SLO if they had identified bottleneck classes. The AA office had not been able to identify such classes. Marty wondered about the monetary value of online classes to private providers. In the memo an amendment is sought on this issue as well.

9. Adjourn 12:35 pm

Meeting minutes submitted by Jim G. LoCascio, FGA Vice Chair.

Appended below: Memo to Diana Guerin, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU.

Dated: April 19, 2013

Diana Guerin, Chair

Academic Senate

California State University

Subject: Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) Committee recommendations on legislative bills

Dear Diana,

After careful consideration, stated below are the FGA Committee recommendations to the various legislative bills affecting the California State University. The FGA Committee recognizes the fluidity of the legislative process and suggests that you and the Executive Committee modify the actions based upon changing conditions as they occur.

Sincerely,

Praveen Soni, Chair
Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) Committee

1. AB 386, as amended (Levine): Public postsecondary education: Cross-enrollment: Online education at the California State University.

   Action: Support

   Bill Description: 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 campus of the California State University 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 campus of the California State University on a space-available basis.

   The bill would require the trustees, 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, by the beginning of the 2015-2016 academic year to find and enroll in courses that will earn them credit toward graduation, general education, and major requirements.

   Comments: The FGA Committee now recommends supporting the bill, which is to ensure that students have timely access to the courses needed to achieve their academic goals, thereby improve graduation rates, and reducing time to degree, and the language in the original version calling for establishment of a common course numbering system has now been removed.

2. AB 387, as amended (Levine): Public postsecondary education: California State University: Online education.

   Action: Support

   Bill Description: This bill would express the intent of the Legislature that the California State University have a uniform definition of online education for the purposes of measuring its effectiveness. The bill would require the trustees to establish a series of uniform definitions for online education 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.

   This bill would require the Trustees of the California State University 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.

*Comments*: The FGA Committee now recommends supporting the bill, since there is a need for regular, periodic assessment of online programs, and language in the original version requiring the establishment of a common course numbering system and that new programs offer a minimum of 10% of new courses online has now been removed. The bill would also help those students to whom life happened, finally complete their degree.

3. AB 895, as amended (Rendon): Postsecondary education: Online Education Task Force.

**Action**: Support

*Bill Description*: This bill would establish the California Postsecondary Online Education Task Force, to consist of 15 members to be appointed on or before March 31, 2014. This bill would require the task force to evaluate and collect data on the current status of postsecondary online education in both public and private institutions, as specified, examine online education programs in other states, and analyze methods to implement online education programs in California postsecondary institutions. This bill would require the task force to submit a report on or before an unspecified date to the Legislature with recommendations of innovative online education methods.

*Comments*: A task force to study online education so as to recommend methods to implement online education programs is welcome.


**Action**: Oppose

*Bill Description*: This bill would establish The New University of California as a 4th segment of public postsecondary education in the state. The bill would establish an 11-member Board of Trustees of The New University of California as the governing body of the university, and specify the membership and appointing authority for the board of trustees. The bill would specify the mission and goal of the university. The bill would provide for the appointment of a Chancellor of The New University of California as the chief executive officer of the university.

The New University of California shall provide no instruction, but shall issue college credit and baccalaureate and associate degrees to any person capable of passing examinations. The New University of California is authorized to contract with qualified entities for the formulation of peer-reviewed course
examinations the passage of which would demonstrate that the student has the knowledge and skill necessary to receive college credit for that course.

Comments: Education and learning is a more complex process than just passing an exam. Students need the assistance of faculty members to facilitate and enrich their learning. Students need to learn to analyze, discuss and debate, research, experiment, communicate, work in teams, and carry out projects, all as a part of enrolling in a course whether online or face to face. Those skills are neither taught, nor fully measured by tests.

Here is a quote from a Los Angeles Times editorial on April 12, 2013 opposing the bill. “Without faculty to insist on standards, there would no doubt be continual pressure to loosen standards for the exams to raise the number of students taking and passing them. The degrees would probably have little value in gaining entry to graduate schools or employment.”


Action: Oppose

Bill Description: The bill would require community college districts to create an associate degree for transfer in every major offered by that district that has an approved transfer model curriculum before the commencement of the 2014-15 academic year, thereby imposing a state-mandated local program. The bill would require California State University campuses to accept transfer model curriculum-aligned associate degrees for transfer in each of the California State University degree options, as defined, within a major field.

Comments: The bill essentially nullifies the progress made on SB 1440 so far and requires the CSU to accept all Transfer AA degrees from the CCC in all options without any input, thereby surrendering curricular authority and jeopardizing educational quality.

The real obstacles to effective SB 1440 transfer are not curricular issues. The CCC system needs an efficient degree-audit and an e-transcript system to allow tracking and transfer to occur efficiently. The CSU needs resources to do the TMC-to-BA (and BS) matchups that will allow the maximum value of a T-AA degree to be realized. Resources are needed to complete the TMC development process, to complete the C-ID course review process and to create a system-to-system database of matchups to make use of the T-AA degrees, and extend these course articulations to non-SB 1440 transfer students.
6. SB 520, as amended (Steinberg). Student instruction: California Online Student Access Platform.

**Action:** Oppose unless amended

**Bill Description:** This bill would establish the California Online Student Access Platform under the administration of the President of the University of California, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, jointly, with the academic senates of the respective segments. The bill would require the platform, among other things, to provide an efficient statewide mechanism for online course providers to offer transferable courses for credit and to create a pool of these online courses.

The bill would require the President of the University of California, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, jointly, with the academic senates of the respective segments, to develop a list of the 50 most impacted lower division courses, as defined, at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges that are deemed necessary for program completion, or deemed satisfactory for meeting general education requirements in areas defined as high-demand transferable lower division courses under the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and, for each of those 50 courses, to promote the availability of multiple high-quality online course options, as specified.

The bill would require that matriculated students of campuses of the University of California, California State University, or California Community Colleges, and California high school pupils, who complete online courses developed through the platform and achieve a passing score on corresponding course examinations, be awarded full academic credit for an equivalent course at the University of California, the California State University, or the California Community College, as applicable.

The bill would provide that funding for the implementation of this provision would be provided in the annual Budget Act.

**Comments:** The bill has been amended and significantly improved allowing for the courses to be led by the faculty and providing a central role for the three Academic Senates of California higher education. The bill also provides for funding for this provision and is not an unfunded mandate.

Instead of focusing on motivated and mature learners who would seem to benefit
from online classes, the bill continues to target lower division and IGETC courses for online delivery, the very environments that research tells us that students who are at risk have the most difficulty learning online, and need more interactivity and learning communities in a face to face environment to be successful. The Fall 2014 deadline does not afford sufficient time for experimentation and evaluation.

An issue that seems to hinge on language, but could be substantive is the usage of ‘online course providers’ at one point in the bill, which would include both technology and academic course content, and ‘online course technology providers,’ which would restrict their role to technology and not academic course content. The ASCSU would like to see consistency in the use of the term ‘online course technology providers’ throughout the bill such that the partnership is between the faculty and online course technology providers, so that the faculty are the leaders and are responsible for the academic course content.

Another problem with the proposed bill is that it does not allow the system to develop online courses for this purpose on their own without partnering with private online course technology providers. In many cases the CSU has demonstrated the ability to do this with considerable efficiency.

The CSU currently offers 84 online and hybrid programs and 13,000 online courses developed thoughtfully by the faculty to ensure quality, reviewed and approved by campus curriculum processes, to provide access and offered to students most likely to benefit from online courses. The CSU continues to increase the numbers of such offerings while maintaining quality. The $10m in the budget will assist in this endeavor.

7. SB 547 (Block). Public postsecondary education: Online courses.

Action: Support

Bill Description: This bill would require the academic senates of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges to jointly develop and identify online courses that would be made available to students of each of the 3 segments for enrollment by the fall of 2014. The bill would require the online courses to be in areas defined as high demand transferable lower division courses under the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and to be deemed to meet the lower division transfer and degree requirements for the 3 segments. The bill would require the board of governors to create an Internet portal through the California Virtual Campus that facilitates enrollment in the online courses. The bill would require funding for implementation of the bill to be provided for in the annual Budget Act.

The bill also requires the development of a process for determining and identifying which students are most likely to succeed in the online courses and target enrollment efforts toward those students, as well as inform students of the technical requirements to
be satisfied in order to successfully participate in and complete the online courses.

Comments: A collaborative effort between the three segments of California Higher Education to improve student access and success is laudable and deserves support. In addition, the bill provides funding for the effort and is not an unfunded mandate. The only element of concern is the short timeline.