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It has been my privilege to represent the Academic Senate of the California State University between our last plenary meeting and the present. I offer the following listing of my activities followed by summary and commentary on key issues that arose during that time.

Meetings and Activities

May, post-plenary
- Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- Interviews of ASCSU Staff candidates in Long Beach
- Women in Higher Education in Sacramento
- Executive Committee (virtual)

June
- Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates in Sacramento
- Invited testimony, Senate Select Committee on Student Success in Sacramento
- Joint meeting (CSU, CCC, CAP) on statistics pathways in Sacramento
- Executive Committee retreat in Sacramento
- California State Student Association meeting in Monterey Bay
- General Education Task Force meeting in Hayward
- Intersegmental Coordinating Committee in Sacramento
- Systemwide Budget Advocacy Committee in Long Beach

July
- Executive Committee retreat in Long Beach
- Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- Discussion of EO 1100 revisions in Long Beach
Upcoming

- Meeting with CSSA liaison in Sacramento
- Leadership retreat (ASCSU, CSSA, CO, BoT) in Long Beach
- Discussion of EO 1100 revisions (virtual)
- General Education Task Force in Long Beach
- General Education Advisory Committee in Long Beach
- ASCSU Plenary in Long Beach

Key Issues

Senate Functioning

Appointments
In June, the Executive Committee made appointments to ASCSU Standing Committees and to systemwide committees. A couple of weeks later, Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) Committee Chair Yee Melichar informed me that she would not be able to accept the appointment after all, owing to campus responsibilities. The Executive Committee then shifted Senator Filling from his appointment as Legislative Specialist to FGA Chair. He and Vice Chair Stohs will share the Legislative Specialist duties. My thanks to Senator Yee Melichar for her conscientiousness, and to Senators Filling and Stohs for their willingness to serve.

Trustee Nominees
Yes, when the FGA Chair decision was made, the Executive Committee was mindful of the fact that Senator Filling is still an active nominee for the position of Faculty Trustee. As I indicated at the end of May, Governor Brown’s office informed me that Senator Sabalius (the second trustee nominee forwarded for the governor’s consideration) is not a citizen, and thus is not eligible for appointment. The Executive Committee declined to take any action on behalf of the Senate, and Senator Sabalius began pursuing citizenship through an expedited process. He has made significant progress on that front, and may, indeed, be granted citizenship before our September plenary. If so, Governor Brown will be invited once again to make an appointment from the two eligible nominees. When he makes his appointment, the Executive Committee will, of course, “backfill” the standing and systemwide committee commitments of the senator chosen. In the meantime, Trustee Stepanek will continue in the position until an appointment is made.
Staff
Happily, we have a permanent, full-time addition to the ASCSU staff! Some of you may already have interacted with Ms. Reem Osman, since one of her first tasks with us has been to make hotel arrangements for those senators requesting it. Please help me welcome Reem when you meet her in person or correspond with her!

Budget

Final budget numbers are still being reconciled, but it appears we did not stay within our budget with respect to at least two areas: travel, and “sunshine” (e.g., socials). The Executive Committee requested a budget increase for the upcoming AY, but we have not yet been told the fate of our budget. We ask your forbearance in two ways.

First, Reem is doing an outstanding job of securing hotel rooms at a $120 rate. In some cases, she is able to book that rate at properties which are not your top preferences. If possible, please indulge these bookings, and take the lower rate. Think about it: most senators will need accommodations for at least two nights. There are 53 senators. If rooms are booked at the $175 Chancellor’s Office rate (the maximum allowed for reimbursement) versus the $120 state rate, the difference is roughly $6,000 per plenary, times 5 plenaries. Please understand, this is a minimum cost differential, since many senators stay more than two nights. Clearly, it won’t be possible for all 53 senators to get the $120 rate, but when you can, please take it!

Second, for a while now, you have been asked to contribute $35 toward “sunshine” (socials, flowers, gift cards for those who perform services for ASCSU, etc.). This past year, we were significantly “in the hole” with this dimension of our budget. The main impact on this line item has been coffee service. The Executive Committee has decided to increase the contribution of senators to $40, but even this increase will not bring us from the “red” to the “black”. Thus, we will revisit the decision about coffee service during the course of the year to determine if it is sustainable.

Leadership Retreat
On August 28, the Executive Committee, the ASCSU Committee Chairs, CSSA leadership, Board of Trustees leadership, and Chancellor’s Office leadership will meet to discuss each stakeholders’ priorities for the coming year. In addition, the group will discuss shared governance: what has worked, what needs improvement, and how to proceed in an environment of an accelerated pace in shared governance. More
information regarding the ASCSU Committee Chairs’ priorities as well as the outcomes of the meeting will be shared later.

**General Education**

*General Education Task Force*

GE Task Force Co-Chair Ullman and I have convened the Task Force three times. I am grateful to her for drafting this portion of the report. With the use of background materials from LEAP, DQP, and WASC, in our first meeting we worked in a combination of small and large groups to discuss the skills, abilities, and dispositions that we feel are critical for our 21st century CSU graduates. What seemed to emerge more strongly than perhaps LEAP, DQP or WASC was a desire for our graduates to be globally aware. Our first two meetings were purposely focused at high level goals and aspirations. Throughout we have been clear that our focus is on what is best for our students.

In our third meeting at CSU East Bay, we began transitioning from a 30,000 foot perspective to an examination of the CSU as a whole and of the campuses. Still working at a high level, we discussed materials articulating what employers seek in college graduates. Very broadly, employers want to hire graduates with a high degree of competence in many of our GE areas.

In this third meeting, we also began to look at the important ways the campuses express their uniqueness in meeting GE goals and outcomes. We did this by looking at a range of campus general education learning outcomes (GELOs) as well as full university aims, often called “institutional learning outcomes” (ILOS). ILOS are goals and outcomes for students that encompass curricular and co-curricular goals. GE outcomes are specific outcomes for the GE programs. We had a valuable discussion about these campus goals and outcomes. One interesting and perhaps provocative future discussion point surrounded how we frame and focus GE. Currently, we have EO 1100 which is fairly “course based,” although the CSU has adopted LEAP. We will continue to discuss a different approach, an outcomes-based approach to GE. Some of the campuses which recently converted to semesters have taken this approach. As we looked at different web sites for GELOs and ILOs we also probed the notion of who the audience is for these outcomes. We questioned which information is best for students, and which may be best for community members and other stakeholders. Further work likely will be focused here.
We decided that we want time to think carefully about our GE programs and would prefer a longer timeline with a more thoughtful end product than a quicker look and simple review of our existing GE. Therefore, it is likely that the Task Force will continue its work through AY 17-18. We would also like to invite someone from AAC&U to discuss current trends and issues with us. Any change to GE will cause ripples throughout the CSU and the CCC, so we have committed to wide consultation with internal and external stakeholders as we move through the process.

Executive Order (EO) 1100 Revision Feedback
The Executive Committee met with AVC Mallon to discuss pending changes to Executive Order (EO) 1100. We were told that a new version of the EO would be published by August 14, 2017. Prior to that, campus representatives as well as ASCSU would be queried regarding the changes. The Executive Committee met with AVCs Mallon and Van Cleve to share feedback on the most current version of the EO. In addition, we shared our feedback with the current and former Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Academic Affairs Committee and the General Education Advisory Committee, Senators Ullman, Schleivert, Creadon, Van Selst, and Baaske. Along with me, they are slated to meet (virtually) with AVCs Mallon and Van Cleve next week. Following on discussions with ASCSU committees and GEAC last year, these meetings are consistent with the memo in March from EVC Blanchard which stipulates that senators will be involved this summer in providing feedback on revisions to EO 1100 prior to its release, scheduled before campuses return for fall semester/quarter operation. This timing gives campuses the maximum amount of time to make any changes necessary to their GE programs prior to Fall 2018.

Quantitative Reasoning, Statistics Pathways, and Intermediate Algebra

As I reported in May, the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) recommendations continue along their implementation path. Presumably, the outcome of the decisions regarding co-leadership of the Center for the Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning will be announced soon so that the work of the Center can proceed and become visible.

There has also been quite a bit of interest in Intermediate Algebra and statistics pathways. In my last report, I indicated that there would be a joint meeting including representatives from the CSU and CCC Chancellor’s Office, the CSU and CCC Academic Senates, and the California Acceleration Project (CAP). At the conclusion of
that meeting, I sent an update which included a joint statement agreed to by all parties. The joint statement allowed the “pause” button to be pushed until fall semester on discussions about statistics pathways and transfer model curricula. In the fall, faculty in some disciplines will continue their dialogue regarding the role of intermediate algebra and success in upper division course work. As you may recall, CAP was quite active in challenging CSU requirements in intermediate algebra versus statistics pathways. The joint statement was an attempt to maintain the primacy of CSU faculty in establishing CSU degree requirements, and to retain a disciplinary focus. More work will be done on both of these fronts in the coming weeks.

**Tenure Density**

In my May Chair’s Report, here is what I said on this topic: “The Tenure Density Task Force report was due March 1. The Task Force determined that it needed more time to do justice to the issue, but it has not met since March 24 to complete the work, nor has an updated draft been circulated to its members for review.” As far as I know, there is nothing new to report.

**Intellectual Property**

In accordance with AS-3296-17/FA, the Executive Committee forwarded to both the Chancellor’s Office and to the California Faculty Association the responses to the draft intellectual property policy that were received by the June 16, 2017 deadline. Neither entity has acknowledged receipt of the materials. Since the document generated is seventy-four pages in length, only the two-page summary is appended to the email accompanying this Chair’s Report.

**Academic Preparation**

As you may recall, EVC Blanchard released Coded Memorandum ASA-2017-14 (“Consultation on Proposed Changes in Academic Preparation Requirements”) on May 16. Feedback on the draft EO had to be submitted by June 16. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Executive Committee provided commentary on the draft EO and the timeline, and that response was forwarded to ASCSU on June 16, 2017.

**Graduation Initiative**

The Chancellor’s Office is convening “workgroups” to consider issues surrounding six “pillars” of the Graduation Initiative. ASCSU was asked to nominate members to serve on each. The Executive Committee selected the following senators in the six areas:
EVC Blanchard has indicated that these senators have been selected to serve on the respective workgroups, and that the first two groups to be convened will be Academic Preparation followed by Enrollment Management. Beyond the assurance that the senators above will serve, membership on each workgroup has not been announced. Only the Academic Preparation workgroup members have been notified. Membership/affiliation is as follows:

![Table](#)

I will, of course, keep you updated as the summer progresses regarding these and other matters of interest to ASCSU. Thank you for the opportunity to do so.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Miller