Minutes: ASCSU Planning Retreat
Office of the Chancellor of the CSU, Long Beach
ASCSU Extended Executive Committee
Thursday August 7, 2014
3-5 PM

Present: Julie Chisholm, Bill Eadie, Denise Fleming, Steven Filling, Manzar Foroohar, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Tom Krabacher, Chris Miller, Praveen Soni, Steven Stepanek, Jay Swartz

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM.

Chair Filling announced that the single order of business was to hear from each of the standing committee chairs what their priorities are for the 2014-15 academic year, after having reviewed their predecessors’ annual reports from 2013-14. They reported out in the following order:

Tom Krabacher, Chair, Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)

Krabacher began by noting that the committee’s regular annual activities are closely tied to the legislative calendar, which operates on a two-year cycle. After the session wrap up in August, the first year involves fact-finding and sprucing up 2nd year bills. During the 2nd year everyone in the legislature goes into campaign mode. Until November 4, all members of the Assembly and a good portion of the Senate will be campaigning, so no two-year bills will be returning in January. With that in mind, FGA should focus on the 2nd year of the legislature’s calendar. Thus a two-year timeline should include the following:

1) As recommended by last year’s FGA Chair Soni: The committee will continue to work to build stronger relationships at the LAO through keeping up the regular teleconferences with the LAO’s Judy Heiman. These were characterized as both frank and informative conversations. Building better relationships with the Department of Finance will also be on the agenda, though that that can be trickier: that group has proven in the past to be more
defensive or confrontational, and they often serve as the Governor’s messengers. In general, FGA will work on building stronger communication with both offices.

2) Ties into Senate leadership: good for the ASCSU’s image if our senate would get out thank-you notes to the 86 legislators supporting the efforts of the “Stand Up for the CSU” campaign. While for a Democrat in a “Blue” district, such support might go without saying, it can pose a bigger political risk for a Republican. Krabacher will have a conference call with FGA members before the September plenary to see if they are willing to draft such letters.

3) It is important to encourage involvement in local political campaigning, to ensure that higher ed is one of the issues on the table. The committee will make available a list of candidates running in the districts where CSU campuses are located. Other efforts to heighten visibility could include letters to the editor and op-ed pieces. In the past, there has been some concern about rating individual legislators: What are the implications of supporting a candidate who doesn’t win? What will be then characterize the ASCSU’s relationship with the successful candidate in the future? Krabacher also referred to the “two-edged sword” whereby the ASCSU’s engagement with legislators could encourage them to further intervene in academic affairs. The strategy is thus not to endorse or support a given candidate but rather to ask about where his or her support is for higher ed. Is higher ed even on a candidate’s agenda? Approaching candidates during the campaign can get them thinking early about higher ed issues. The committee will develop templates for ideas and talking points to use when approaching candidates. The committee will also focus on the Senate side, since most are not up for re-election in the fall, by following Senate bills not passed this year to see if they will be brought back.

4) Krabacher said that he also plans to further improve communication with CFA, ERFA, and CSSA, all of whom are engaged with the legislature.

5) Krabacher ended by presenting copies of the legislative timeline with related ASCSU actions.

Questions and comments for Krabacher included: Will FGA be looking at the LAO report on educational facilities and monitor such entities as the Campaign for College Opportunity? Krabacher said that the committee can do so, as well as forward legislation as it develops to the relevant standing committees—FGA thus serving as a clearinghouse. It was also suggested that fees within the CSU be on the FGA’s agenda this year.

Manzar Foroohar, Chair, Faculty Affairs (FA)

Foroohar said that the committee will continue to focus on three major issues from last year: faculty hiring, research funding, and academic freedom. FA will follow up with the Chancellor’s Office on the results of the past year’s recruitment and hiring of new tenure-
track faculty: 700 searches were proposed; how many actual faculty have been hired throughout the system? What are the trends in hiring and what are the multi-year plans for such?

Last year’s committee was able to advocate successfully for the restoration of RSCA funding, but the 2.4 M was less than asked for; further funding of research at the system level will be advocated for. FA will need to show how 2.4M falls far short of the actual need.

Unfortunately, according to Foroohar, the committee has been unable to make the progress it had hoped for on drafting a new system-wide policy on academic freedom. This is due in part to the need to work with the CO’s office of General Counsel, which has been in transition and unable to collaborate. Last year, the new General Counsel was able to schedule only a ½ hour meeting with FA. Within the last week, there has been a commitment from that office to pursue this issue; the General Counsel is now scheduled to meet with FA in September. Foroohar has sent him a draft policy generated by FA last year and also the UC policy and guidelines for protecting faculty work and academic freedom in the face of requests for information based on the California Public Records and federal Freedom of Information acts for his review and comment. Meanwhile, FA continues to advocate for a special committee devoted to developing an academic freedom policy for the entire CSU and studying the situation on CSU campuses related to academic freedom. The current policy dates back to 1971 and comprises a single paragraph.

Other issues: Another ongoing issue for the committee to take up again is the role of lecturers in shared governance; the results of recent arbitration have begun to create major confusion on campuses about how exactly to incorporate lecturers into campus policies on shared governance. Foroohar plans a discussion with CFA on this matter in the hope of making recommendations. The committee continues to review new campus-based faculty awards to determine if they should be added to the Outstanding Faculty website. Intellectual property remains a concern for FA and is particularly important for online courses. As an example, last year Dominguez Hills nursing faculty’s syllabi were made available to another institution. There may be possible collaboration with other committees, such as AA, on issues such as campus climate, Title 5, Cal State Online, the Ethnic Studies task force. On the matter of academic freedom, there may also be some collaboration with FGA regarding governmental interference, as Foroohar noted a trend at local levels among city councils (Los Angeles, for example) who are weighing in on matters of academic freedom.

Denise Fleming, Chair, Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)

Fleming characterized this coming year as a re-building year for the committee since there have been many membership changes that have resulted in the loss of quite a few senior members with long-term experience on APEP. She welcomes the new Vice Chair, Senator Barsky’s, role, particularly given his expertise in mathematics.
Procedurally, Fleming says her plan is to develop a robust portfolio not only to increase productivity but also to take a more pro-active approach in APEP’s areas of concentration. A signal concern of APEP is the sheer number of CO liaisons attached to the committee, many more than other committees have. Thus, during plenary sessions, most of Wednesday meetings can wind up being devoted to briefings from as many as 3-6 CO liaisons, cutting down on the time the committee has had available for their own work. At the same time, both CO liaisons and committee members have been expressing the need for more up-to-date information. Fleming identified a need for increased contact in between meetings in order to get to the plenary with a better sense of what needs to be worked on. Fleming would also like the committee to build or enhance current relationships with colleges and schools of education, especially given APEP’s charge to interact with other segments. She would like to see the committee get out more in front so that members will be less hesitant in drafting resolutions.

Fleming defined the following as hot-button issues for APEP: Common Core and Smarter Balance, the latter when it is a mediating tool for assessment by which higher ed and K-12 would come to standardize college readiness expectations. The committee needs to fully understand and have input here. Early Start: While in the past there have been many resolutions requesting data, to date there have been reports from only three campuses from which no cross-system conclusions about the effectiveness of Early Start might be drawn, grounded in good data. Should the Chancellor’s Office be asked for a reporting template? A task force could be devoted to Early Start issues alone. Academic preparation: So far, there has not much discussion of diversity and marginalized groups, and APEP should explore this; of personal interest to Fleming herself are English learners, foster youth, and veterans. Accreditation: there may be some wisdom in taking a look at the issue of national accreditation—a dicey conversation there that needs framing. The committee might also want to address the changing nature of CTC (teacher credentialing) accreditation. (Bev Young is on the national commission and can be a good resource). In light of a great deal of politicized misinformation about Common Core, should the CSU use its language in defining readiness goals? Other areas of concern for the committee include: the Admission Advisory Board; the CID numbering project; ASSIST; BOARS.

Suggested items to add to the committee’s agenda (via WICHE): credit for prior learning, experiential learning, and common courses (on a national basis) for transfer.

**Bill Eadie, Chair, Academic Affairs (AA)**

Eadie discussed his goal of changing the committee’s interaction with the Chancellor’s Office so that the committee would not find itself in a reactive mode so frequently. He emphasized continuing to improve communication between the CO and the committee as issues such as the graduate degree policy arise, with an eye toward the effects policies have on the campuses.
Eadie maintained that the role of individual campuses/universities should remain primary; that’s where the good work is going on. He would like to find ways through the committee’s partnering with the CO to encourage the development of academic quality through the campuses, pilot projects, grants, reporting out, then letting them proceed. How could we be a voice in setting the agenda? What would help campuses the most? What could the staff work on and help with attracting funding?

During a discussion, ideas for possible issues for AA to focus on this year emerged: the assault on General Education; competency-based assessment; the implications of articulation for Course Match (with, possibly, a task force devoted to that issue).

In a general discussion following the chairs’ reports, concerns about how the ASCSU can enhance communication with local campuses this year, beyond the newsletter, arose. This is essential in terms of the evolving role of system-wide initiatives as well as legislative engagement and intrusion. There is a need to bring up with the senate chairs what the role of the ASCSU is in shared governance, how the ASCSU functions and can strengthen the bonds among campuses, acting, ultimately, in their best interests.

At the end of the meeting, a written description of the Legislative Analyst’s role, with changes, was distributed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 PM, followed at 6—8 PM by a dinner for the Extended Executive Committee at George’s restaurant in Long Beach.
ASCSU Extended Executive Committee  
Friday, August 8, 2014  
8:30—11:30

Present: Julie Chisholm, Bill Eadie, Denise Fleming, Steven Filling, Manzar Foroohar, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Chris Miller, Praveen Soni, Steven Stepanek, Jay Swartz (for Tom Krabacher, FGA)

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 AM.

Committee members discussed and drafted the following priorities to be shared with CO liaisons Friday afternoon, with CSSA, and with the ASCSU at the September plenary:

**ASCSU Committee Priorities for 2014-15**

**Executive Committee (EX)**

- Develop and promote meaningful measures ("metrics") that effectively and accurately reflect CSU efforts to provide a quality education, including those used to report on Access to Excellence outcomes
- Establish a framework for effective and impactful communication with stakeholders, both external and internal to the CSU
- Improve our understanding of the budgetary implications of decisions and recommendations, both for the ASCSU and the system as a whole
- Organize, co-host, and evaluate the effectiveness of the Academic Conference
- Coordinate the efforts of this year’s Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS)

**Academic Affairs (AA)**

To collaborate with the Chancellor’s Office to improve academic quality and to consider alternate paths to degrees at the California State University by:

- Examining the viability of competency based assessment;
- Developing effective policies designed to facilitate cross campus enrollment, including CourseMatch;
- Exploring the viability of various means of assessing the General Education requirement in critical thinking; and
• Discussing the role of Community Colleges in contributing to majors within the CSU.

Academic Preparation and Educational Programs (APEP)

• Strengthen/build collaborative relationships with internal and external constituencies with common interests, e.g., colleges and schools of education, other segments (UC, CC), pre-K-12, math and English councils, CO staff, other ASCSU committees, etc.

• Monitor and appropriately act upon relevant internal and external initiatives & legislation with implications for APEP’s charge, e.g., teacher preparation, accountability measures, Common Core, Smarter Balance, college readiness, remediation, etc.

• Foster access and success for historically marginalized and/or at-risk populations

Faculty Affairs (FA)

• Work toward drafting a comprehensive system-wide policy on Academic Freedom

• Revisit CSU policy on intellectual property issues especially in relationship to online delivery

• Advocate for the expansion of tenure-track positions to meet the growing need for access to a quality education and insuring shared governance

• Advocate for increased system-wide support for faculty research and creative activities

Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)

• Monitor proposed legislation of interest regularly throughout the year and recommend positions when appropriate

• Encourage local campus engagement in legislative matters to include an active interface with higher education issues during the campaign season

• Build and strengthen ties with the LAO, the state Department of Finance and other segments of interest including CSSA, statewide academic senates of the UC and CCC, ERFA and CFA

• Understand and monitor the CSU budget with respect to sources and uses of funds
12—1 PM

Working lunch with CO liaisons for a structured discussion on performance metrics as developed for communication with different audiences. The group was divided into four tables, each with its own note-taker. The four groups were tasked with defining appropriate metrics for the following stakeholder groups, to be summarized for and to promote further discussion during September's standing committee meetings and plenary:

- Legislators and Policy-makers
- Regulators (such as WASC, the Dept. of Education, etc.)
- Internal CSU Management, including the Board of Trustees
- The Public

Friday, 1-2:30 PM
A Discussion of the CSU Chancellor's Office and ASCSU Priorities

Guests Present: Chancellor Timothy White (by phone); Executive Vice Chancellor Ephraim Smith; Associate Vice Chancellor Ron Vogel; Assistant Vice Chancellors Eric Forbes, Gerard Hanley, Chris Mallon, Beverly Young; Senior Director Ken O'Donnell, CSSA Executive Director Miles Nevin

Chair Filling invited those present to share and discuss their priorities for the academic year and beyond. The presentations were made in the following order:

Chancellor Timothy White

- Reverse the downward trend in tenure-track appointments
- Improve graduation rates in the next decade, stressing target mechanisms to get there (“more students to the degree, high quality, faster”)
- Foster the appropriate use of technology, not only to insure access but also to insure quality in the learning environment
- Better access to high-quality data; improvements in the infrastructure providing the data
- Improve communications, internally and externally; improve video presence, getting the right people together at lower costs
- Finalize the work on exceptions on 120/180 unit exceptions this fall
- Anticipate the findings of the Ethnic Studies task force, due this fall, and engage in discussion with senate and other academic leaders on the issues to be raised
• Look forward to the success of the Academic Conference, funding it reasonably

• Make progress in the area of financial aid

• Identify resources for academic facilities

• Dust off the system’s strategic plan to see if it still is providing the proper direction for the system and for campuses; modernize A2E since it may not prove to be the necessary guidepost for the future

• Find room in the budget this year to provide more system-wide funding for faculty research (RSCA)

Executive Vice Chancellor Ephraim Smith

• Student success: a six-year endeavor with Ed Trust with a goal of 54% (hoping to do even better in 2015 by coming in at 55.8%, a significant improvement). The national average of comprehensive universities is 46% so the CSU is ahead of other systems

• Campaign for College Opportunity: African-Americans graduate at a rate 1 of 5; the CSU has never been below 35%. We are at 45% among under-represented minorities vs. 46% for ALL students. “Boats are rising.” What new initiatives can be aimed at closing the gap? Pilots this summer will focus on the relationship between Early Start and freshman year.

• SB 1440: Associate degree for transfer: will wait until fall registration time before information is available. How many have come to the CSU? What does it mean for the state of California? The hope is that the TMCs will pay dividends, especially in insuring that no extraneous sophomore courses are taken toward a degree.

• Bottlenecks: through Course Match, offering more online courses. Though not required by SB 386, the deans in Extended Ed listed 700 such courses in summer session. By fall 2015 all online courses, that is, 3,000 courses are supposed to be available and the hope is that this might help sustain majors such as Geology and Modern Languages as well as help people graduate.

• 29,000 enrollees in Early Start this year vs. 22,000 last year. Will start tracking student success after completing Early Start.

• The 120/180-unit exception report is being finished for the Chancellor by Assistant Vice Chancellor Mallon.

• A website developed directing people in applying for the 50 million dollars set aside for the innovation grants, as well as conference calls planned for applicants’ information.
• Work to progress on Smarter Balance and related transition from EAP.

• SUGs limited at 15% vs. 33% (as is now the case).

• Attention to rankings in Teacher Education.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Chris Mallon

• All exceptions to the 120-180 unit limit will be given to the Chancellor by the end of September. Not very many programs in the CSU are over 120-180 units.

Senior Director Ken O’Donnell

• Further work on high-impact practices such as the Compass project

• GE transfer curriculum

• Improving transfer pathways for those who start out in career education

• STEM: Center for Community Engagement to evaluate benefits of service learning for STEM majors. Achievement gaps are severe and students “bleed out.” Explore how to help with degree production.

• VISTA volunteers (15) getting placed in STEM departments in colleges throughout system

• The Helmsley Charitable Trust’s grant focusing on intervention with summer students, the goal being to invest students in their own success to help with persistence and grad rates. Another RFP will be promoted in the fall.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Eric Forbes

• E-advisor Projects: how to get tools into the hands of those who can use them well: support tools, such as College Scheduler that can relieve students of self-inflicted bottlenecks, now at 21 campuses; easy to install and reports about it have been positive.

• Degree Audit as a primary tool for advisement on all campuses. Eleven campuses are not set up yet; there have been consultants on campuses to help with doing so this summer. Two campuses are going to develop a planning tool to set up a path/roadmap for multiple terms going forward—beneficial particularly for department chairs in planning course sections.

• Early Warning Systems: used to contact students needing intervention. Hope to explore more of such tools, tailoring them to student needs.
• Predictive analytics: another important advisory tool to determine which courses are making a difference; if students succeed in such a course, what is their chance of earning a degree?

Forbes concluded by saying that there are more of such projects than there are resources to invest in them.

**Assistant Vice Chancellor Beverly Young**

• Educator Preparation and K-12: transition from STAR to CASP assessment (part of Smarter Balance) of student performance. Will make recommendations about scores that will define readiness in 11th grade. Note: the whole country is now using the CSU’s model. Will continue to work with the English and Math Councils and EPT/ELM committees.

• Common core and new science standards: not so controversial in CA, which has been ahead of most states in its standards-based

• Educator Prep: first 3 M of 15 M Bechtel Grant for improvement of Teacher Education. Is working with deans and faculty on RFPs to make awards to campuses. Hoping for funds to go out in January.

• National Accreditation for Teachers; currently 19 programs are nationally accredited. (Some campuses will not participate. There are districts and superintendents who don’t care about national accreditation so may not participate. More may be opting out in the future).

**Miles Nevin, Executive Director of CSSA**

(On behalf of student leaders unable to attend)

• Want to work with Academic Affairs on their success initiatives. (Students appreciated sitting in on the Ethnic Studies task force, e-advising)

• Increasingly interested in academic technology as demonstrated by the CSSA white paper on online education

• Plan to increase involvement in BOT meetings by having more students attend and speak to issues during public comment

• State advocacy: Voter registration effort this election year; advocate for “access” continuing to engage, as in the past with the 95 M ask; social media efforts to support increased funding for enrollment growth; “access” as a theme; attention to bills re. Cal Grants
• Federal advocacy: a new venture, 4th year in the program, providing students a leadership development experience, opportunities to lobby and to understand how policy-making works on a national level

• Internal affairs: moving toward a funding model change to stabilize the CSSA and insure its independence through a per-student fee with the expectation that strategic planning efforts would ensue

Assistant Vice Chancellor Gerry Hanley

Principal focus on outcomes:

• With affordable learning solutions: continue to reduce the cost of educational materials.

• Course Redesign with technology: a range of areas. “Quality assurance” that is, supporting faculty through professional development. Moving more toward hybrid learning as a methodology as well as how to deliver quality online. More emphasis on faculty development this summer, through the Quality Matters program, providing peer review of their own colleagues’ courses and exemplary practices.

• QOLT: now being used on 17 campuses. Unlike Quality Matters, is not concerned with course design and faculty skills; QOLT involves student feedback for an improvement cycle. Training sessions taking place in August with support for those faculty participating. Another round of opportunity will be available in the fall. Will discuss with ASCSU what the possibilities are for participating.

• Focus on supporting faculty through Course Redesign: Discipline-based pedagogical strategy leading to outcomes. What are the successful practices that are also discipline-based? Key element: peer-to-peer sharing within a discipline: high standards, quality, student success. Teaching e-portfolios are created to help faculty document their processes in developing new courses; syllabi, student responses, a “digital poster” representing the scholarship of teaching and learning for faculty to learn from one another.

In response to discussion questions, Hanley referred to the Senate bill’s requirement that by Fall 2015, all online courses (3,200) are expected to be available; however, some may not fit the bill’s definition. This spring CourseMatch will roll out via CMS with the same marketing website. He emphasized that the old Executive Order for cross-campus enrollment was well-written and applies here: one cannot be a first-semester student and must be full-time. At this point, there is also a one-course limit per term. Currently, 50 courses are available through CourseMatch. Over time, it is important, he said, to be conservative in the roll-out, ensuring that there are seats, procedures in place, and ways to monitor student success, and that it will be important to provide articulation across campuses for courses in CourseMatch. Data clean-up will need to occur before reporting on the current status of student success in CourseMatch.
ASCSU Priorities
See above. Presented by Senate Chair and Chairs of Standing Committees in printed handout and PowerPoint presentation.

The meeting was adjourned at 3 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gubernat, Secretary
ASCSU