

Academic Senate CSU

Plenary Minutes

Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium
November 4-5, 2010

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 10:03 a.m.

Roll Call

Senators Present: (Bakersfield) Michael Ault, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) James Meriwether, William (Billy) Wagner; (Chico) Kathy Kaiser, James Postma; (Dominguez Hills) Kate Fawver, Patricia Kalayjian; (East Bay) Susan Gubernat, Jeff Seitz (substitute); (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral; (Fullerton), Reyes Fidalgo, Diana Guerin, Barry Pasternack; (Humboldt) Bernadette Cheyne, Marshelle Thobaben; (Long Beach) Margaret Costa, Eileen Klink, Praveen Soni; (Los Angeles) Kevin Baaske, Robert Land; (Maritime) Steven Browne, Tony Snell; (Monterey Bay) Karen Davis, J. Ken Nishita; (Northridge) Sandra Chong, Jennifer Matos, Steven Stepanek; (Pomona) Saeed Monemi, Jared Stallones; (Sacramento) Robert (Bob) Buckley, Thomas Krabacher, Christine Miller; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, Jodie Ullman (for C. E. Tapie Rohm); (San Diego) Edward Aguado, Carole Kennedy, Cezar Ornatowski; (San Francisco) Andrea Renwanz Boyle, Martin Linder, Darlene Yee-Melichar; (San Jose) Judith Lessow-Hurley, Romey Sabalius, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Manzar Foroohar, James LoCascio; (San Marcos) Glen Brodowsky, John (Dick) Montanari; (Sonoma) Catherine Nelson, Brian Wilson; (Stanislaus) Steven Filling, Paul O'Brien; (CSU Retired Faculty) Harold Goldwhite; (Chancellor's Office) Ephraim Smith

Approval of Agenda

Agenda approved as amended.

Approval of September 15-16, 2010 Minutes

Minutes approved as submitted.

Announcements

Senator Kaiser was congratulated on her re-election to the school board.

Senator Van Selst was wished a happy birthday.

Presentations/Introductions

Dr. Jodie Ullman (San Bernardino) and Dr. Jeffrey Seitz (East Bay) were introduced as substitutes for their respective campuses. Dr. Steven Browne (CSU Maritime) was congratulated on his recent election.

Chair's Report

Chair Postma referenced his written report. The CSU budget is improved from previous years, but the state budget is still of concern for future years. The ASCSU budget is unchanged; he is hoping to speak with EVC Smith regarding the ASCSU budget.

The Graduation Initiative project is ongoing, and a new website showing campus plans is anticipated. Attention is shifting to the goal of closing the achievement gap. The Early Start Implementation Task Force has met once. Logistical and curricular issues are being worked out. Please encourage appropriate faculty involvement in developing curriculum at your local campuses.

Chair Postma has spent a great deal of time dealing with SB 1440 (transfer degrees). The Community College and CSU academic senates are trying to work together to develop a statewide centralized approach to make the logistics manageable. There is progress already. At the C-ID website, www.c-id.net, proposed templates for five standardized transfer degrees (math, criminal justice, sociology, communications studies, geology, psychology) are now ready for faculty feedback. CSU faculty involvement in reviewing and commenting on the proposed degrees is essential. Faculty can comment on any of the templates, not only that for their own discipline.

Chair Postma is seeking nominations for faculty with articulation experience to serve on the FDRG (faculty disciplinary review groups) who can work collegially with the community college faculty; all senators are considered volunteers. Chair Postma encourages a centralized approach to curriculum development, rather than having local campuses or other groups advocating for local plans. He described a recent conference held by the Central Valley Higher Education Consortium, where interest was strong in developing STEM transfer degrees (although only a handful of faculty were in attendance).

Q: What is the timeline for the specific disciplines to work on the degrees?

A: Disciplines are being prioritized based on those believed to be closest to agreement through LDTP. He believes that by next spring there will be 15 disciplines in process.

Q: Did you explain the role of faculty in developing curriculum at the Central Valley Higher Education Consortium?

A: Yes, both Jane Patton (Community College Academic Senate) and I spoke clearly to the faculty role.

Q: Has Executive Committee met with Chair Carter since our last plenary?

A: A commitment for such a meeting has been made, and hopefully I will meet with Chair Carter next week.

Academic Senate CSU

Reports of Standing Committees

Academic Affairs

Chair Boyle reported that the committee is sponsoring or co-sponsoring four resolutions. She noted the committee discussed the need for support of library and library services and extended education issues (e.g., transfer of extended education course credit into degree programs) and anticipates future resolutions on these topics.

Academic Preparation and Education Programs

Chair Van Selst stated that the committee has learned much about teacher credentialing in California and recent legislation pertaining to it. The committee has worked on six resolutions that will come forward at the plenary.

Faculty Affairs

Chair Cheyne reported that the committee met with Craig Smith (topic: Ceballos v. Garcetti); Gail Brooks, Margie Merryfield, and John Travis (topic: bargaining); Beth Ambos (topic: joint task force on technology transfer). The committee has five items for consideration on the agenda. Senator Kaiser requested the committee seek information on the progress of the CSU in addressing the backlog of grievances.

Chair Cheyne mentioned that the "Red Balloon" initiative has been brought to the attention of the committee members and requested information from Executive Committee. Chair Postma noted that this is not a CSU initiative, and more research is being conducted. Senator O'Brien noted that this initiative was also mentioned at the Academic Affairs Committee as a topic of study. Senators from several campuses noted that their campuses are participating in the "Red Balloon" initiative. Chair Postma stated that he would seek additional information and report back to senators as soon as possible.

Fiscal and Governmental Affairs

Chair Yee-Melichar reported on committee consultation with George Diehr (CalPERS Board: SB 871 Pension Reform Bill); David Hood (topic: BOT Committee on Finance report); Chair Postma and Senator Krabacher (topic: ASCSU budget); John Travis (topic: election results, bargaining, Red Balloon, Early Start); and Karen Zamarripa (topic: impact of election results for CSU). The committee has worked on nine resolutions.

Other Reports

David Hood - Budget Specialist

Professor Hood reviewed the agenda items on next week's BOT agenda. The BOT recommends using the term "tuition" instead of "fees." The support budget of 2010-2011 includes \$106 million federal stimulus money, which is one-time money. He is concerned that the CSU is admitting students based on funding that will not be available next year. A mid-year tuition increase of 5% is on the agenda next week. He reviewed

the support budget for 2011-12. The restoration of the \$106 million is on the proposal. A 10% tuition increase for 2011-12 is also on the BOT agenda.

Senator Thobaben expressed concern about the hardships of increasing student fees on families and the amount of debt students are accumulating. Senator LoCascio suggested that the CSU should be recognized as the leader for its low fees.

Harold Goldwhite - Faculty Trustee Nominating Committee

The members of the committee are Senators Goldwhite (chair), Kaiser, Nelson, O'Brien, and Tarjan. In addition, members from campuses include Jonathan Shapiro (Cal Poly San Luis Obispo) and Stacy Gleixner (San Jose State University). He noted that the committee will discuss the standing of FERP candidates for the Faculty Trustee position. The ASCSU's procedure states that the ASCSU shall resolve questions as to definitions and eligibility, so when candidates are brought forward to the Academic Senate in March, senators will decide questions of eligibility. Senator Goldwhite reviewed the timeline. The Faculty Trustee plays a critical role in teaching the BOT about faculty views, opinions, and positions. Senators are encouraged to seek for and urge colleagues to apply so that a strong pool is available.

John Tarjan - General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC)

Senator Tarjan reviewed issues considered at a recent GEAC meeting. There is a potential move to further align area breadth and IGETC. Statway, an alternate pathway to prepare students for general education math, was described. The goal of Statway is to improve transfer of students to CSU from community college. A Statway pilot project involving multiple CSU campuses and community colleges is proposed; a task force is first reviewing the curriculum for appropriateness. Statway might be a better option for students in majors in the liberal arts. Three senators expressed concern about the Statway approach. The Compass Project, which has the goal of getting students more involved in the curriculum, will have a conference in January. GEAC is also examining aspects of the international baccalaureate, which is supplanting the advanced placement program.

Tom Krabacher - Legislative Analyst

New legislators meet in Sacramento on December 6th for orientation. They return in January and must introduce ideas for new legislation by mid-February. This is the time to propose ideas for new bills, and senators are encouraged to bring their suggestions to Chair Postma.

Kathy Kaiser - CAP Advisory

Lorie Roth was honored at the last meeting on her retirement. EVC Smith and Chancellor Reed spoke at the meeting. Several grants and grant proposals seeking to improve educational experiences of underserved populations at all levels were described. She described the challenge of keeping high quality principals, who are poached once they show promise, in our schools. Senator Kaiser encouraged senators

Academic Senate CSU

to look at the Ed Source website (<http://www.edsource.org>) for information about Governor-elect Brown's election platform on education issues.

Steven Stepanek - Admissions Advisory Committee

The committee has not met.

Ephraim Smith - Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

On the Graduation Initiative, we have visited four campuses; by March, we will have visited all 23 campuses.

The SB 1440 Implementation Group had its first meeting last Tuesday. The curriculum issue was delegated to the CCC and CSU Academic Senates; they will report back to the Group. The community colleges have some issues to work out regarding statewide development of degrees versus local campuses. The issue of how students currently at the community colleges (transition issues) will be treated has been raised. Small community colleges may have problems offering all courses. Also, residency requirements for community colleges who issue the transfer degree must be determined.

Regarding Early Start, we are awaiting preliminary reports from campuses, which are due on November 19th.

Enrollment targets have varied from 310,000 to 339,000 FTES, due to budget developments at the state legislature. If CSU does not generate 339,000 FTES, then money will be removed from the CSU budget.

Q: What is the total CSU FTES, including nonresident students?

A: Our number of nonresident students is quite low; it is approximately 3.5% to 4%.

Q: Are we better off not meeting our target of 339,000 FTES, given the budget uncertainty in the coming years?

A: If there is a budget cut in the future, are we better off having cuts on a base of 339,000 FTES or 310,000 FTES? Assuming that future cuts would be spread across all state agencies, he believes CSU is in a better position with possible cuts on the higher base. We take in very few freshmen in the spring, so our main commitment is to transfer students completing their last two years.

Q: Campuses that cut enrollments as directed this year are now having a difficult time recovering enrollments. Are there any strategies to assist programs that have been adversely affected by the cuts?

A: Enrollments in teacher education programs have been light over the past few years, and provosts have been asked to be careful of those programs in spring admissions. Small graduate programs need special attention. We also have to be careful of our relations with community colleges, whose transfer students were impacted by the lowering of our targets.

Q: Can you tell us anything about the "Red Balloon" project?

A: I first became aware of it last summer. It is a project of AASCU. Now that I have received emails and looked at the article by George Mehaffy, I will give him a call to find more out about it. I will let you know what I find out.

Q: On our campus, last summer was self-support. It is possible to go back and make summer 2010 state-support? What about next summer; will it be self- or state-support.

A: Last summer, all campuses except San Diego were on self-support. Certain year-round or other special programs were state-support. No, we will not go back and change summer 2010 to YRO. This is not a campus decision, and for summer 2010 it is looking like we will be back to YRO (given the current budget situation). A lot can happen between now and the approval of the next budget.

Q: Can you tell us about the campus visits regarding the graduation initiative? Are there faculty on the visiting team?

A: No, there are no faculty on the visiting team, but we do meet with various groups on campus that include faculty. Our goals are to see how well the campus is doing in improving graduation rates, and what programs have been initiated. We will share this information once we have completed the visits.

Q: The pipelines into our programs are affected when freshmen are not admitted in fall and transfers are not admitted in the spring. The recent changes in enrollment patterns influence the courses programs are able to offer.

A: The enrollment challenge began in spring of 2010 when admissions were closed. This fall's class might have been a little low on freshmen, but our balance is probably okay at this time. As a way of achieving the target and allowing more access to students, we are hoping campuses will allow students to take more units per student. This will allow students to graduate faster. Some campuses set unit loads for fall of 13 or 14 units.

Eric Forbes - Director, Enrollment Management Services

On the Early Start Implementation, we are waiting for the plans from the 23 campuses, which are due on November 19th. The plans will be reviewed, and the Implementation Committee will reconvene. The goal is to determine a process for the program to start in fall 2012. This has drawn attention to the entire area of college readiness, and we need to develop a coherent policy on this matter. Early Start is the last resort for students who do qualify through other processes. We had an excellent meeting with the English Council, and we are thankful that they will join the implementation group.

Q: What arrangements have been made for students participating in Early Start in terms of financial aid?

A: Pell grants will be available, but students must meet the criteria to qualify for their disbursement. For example, students must have completed 25 units by the end of the

Academic Senate CSU

year. Cal Grants are not available. The group is sensitive to the issue of cost for students, whether the program is self- or state-support.

Q: Our campus is planning to use ERWC courses as part of our Early Start Program. Is this allowed?

A: That has not been determined. There may need to be some standardization on the use of ERWC, because it is now offered at various levels in high school (9th through 12th). If properly developed and positioned in the senior year, then it ought to work.

Q: After campuses submit their plans, will the plans be made available on a website?

A: That is not determined yet, but there should be a way to communicate the plans.

Q: Can an online resource be developed to help students to know if they meet the standards?

A: Yes. Early Start is helping high schools communicate with students about the importance of meeting the standards.

With respect to SB 1440, the faculty from both segments are beginning to define the transfer degrees in terms of a statewide approach. It is in the interest of all of us, particularly students, to provide such a solution. Yesterday, he received a letter from Michelle Pilates asking for faculty to review the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) for several programs. We need to get the message out to all the discipline faculty to take a look at the C-ID website.

In terms of articulation, we are going to need to determine what the similar degree programs at the CSU are for the various TMCs. Community colleges are concerned about how impaction criteria will impact transfer degrees.

The Academic Senate of the CCC will be considering a resolution stating that students will be required to have a "C" or better in the basic subjects of the transfer degree. There are 14 campuses in the CSU that require a "C" or better in these areas for native students.

Issues that need to be addressed: (1) the absence of American ideals general education course from transfer degrees. CSU needs reassurance that this course becomes part of the general education preparation; (2) acknowledgement that these are transfer degrees, not terminal degrees. Substitutions/waivers for core requirements sometimes occur in times of budget constraints. However, core requirements in transfer degrees must be taught, or the degree should not be conferred.

Q: What are some of the models that are being examined that might address the tremendous amount of variability among the 23 CSU campuses?

A: The TCM consist of core requirements, electives, and general education. We need to define the common degrees and put them on a database for students to use. Faculty need to decide this. Chair Postma noted that he believes it makes great

sense for common transfer degrees, and he hopes that CSU degree standardization will not be necessary. In looking at the TCM, he thinks faculty need to determine how well these will fit with existing campus degrees.

Q: What is the timeline for implementation, and how many degrees will there be?

A: Starts in fall 2011, but it is not clear if that means that community colleges start conferring the degree, or that students can start the degree program? We received some support for the latter, that students can start the programs. The community colleges need to figure out how to keep track of how many students are in the degree pipeline beginning in fall 2011. The number of degrees depends on how well the C-ID/TCM process works.

Q: Chair Postma, does SB 1440 have implications for CSU programs that are accredited?

A: It has that potential, but so far external accreditation is being taken into account as the transfer degrees are being developed. The rub will be in high-unit majors or those with a structured, sequential curriculum pattern.

With respect to enrollment management, we are seeking 339,000 FTES for the year. We are now in growth mode for spring; this should result in a robust number of students resulting from the continuation rates between spring and fall. We do not know where we are for fall, or what will become of summer. We are now 25,000 applications behind where we were last year. Those campuses that are impacted are going to have to close November 30th or reconsider what impaction means.

Q: Early Start FTES do not go to the campus where student start their remediation if it is not their destination campus. Are they invisible students?

A: They are not matriculated students. This will give us a program where we can share information across campuses, and possibly lead to cross-campus enrollments for students.

Q: For campuses that are not making their targets because they curtailed enrollments as directed. Will there be any grace for campuses who followed the directions, but now cannot meet targets?

A: The whole system is experiencing that problem. All penalties have been lifted; if campuses go way beyond, they may not receive the marginal resources.

Q: Enrollment cuts have created deficits that will go forward over the next few years, such as in teacher credential programs.

A: Correct. Graduate deans recommended that programs should be held harmless in cycles such as this.

Q: How will admitting so many transfer students in spring 2011 impact fall 2011 admissions?

Academic Senate CSU

A: If we meet our target of 339,000 FTES, transfer students will play a role. However, the real growth will be continuing students finding seats in expanded course sections and increasing their unit loads. One implication for fall 2011 is that a robust spring 2011 will give us a robust continuation rate; applications for freshmen are down at this time. Each campus will need to look at its impact plan. New legislation requires public disclosure if impact plans are changed, however.

Neil Sanchez - CSSA Liaison

Chair Postma complimented Neil on how efficiently CSSA meetings are run.

Neil Sanchez reported that CSU and UC student groups registered over 40,000 new voters for the recent election. Cal Poly SLO exceeded its goal by 142% (each campus was assigned a goal of registering 10% of its campus population). At recent meetings, two resolutions were passed by CSSA: (1) shared governance on auxiliary boards; (2) student participation in systemwide searches. We approved our 2015 sustainability plan last month. Two new resolutions under consideration are (1) support for LGBT students on campus, and (2) encouraging campuses to standardize student response ("clicker") systems to reduce costs for students.

Ongoing efforts include the "Made in the CSU" campaign, evaluating voter education portion of the voter project, supporting the affordable learning solutions campaign by raising awareness. Upcoming meetings include the newly formed fundraising committee, Lobby Corps clinic, and a shared governance summit. At the January meeting, we expect introduction of a resolution on the transfer to electronic teaching evaluations.

Q: Could you describe the shared governance resolution recently passed by CSSA?

A: One of the main issues relates to appointments to foundation boards; the view is that ASI presidents should be included.

Q: Has CSSA taken a position on the fee increases on the BOT agenda?

A: Our meeting is this weekend, and it will come up during University Affairs Committee.

Q: Has CSSA taken a position on a proposed licensing project where students in classes could gain access to an electronic version of the text at the cost of 35% of the cost of the book; however, all students in the course would be required to pay the fee?

A: No.

Q: At SJSU for the coming academic year, we have new admissions criteria: students living further away than 30 miles are required to live in student housing. The students on campus condemned this policy. Has CSSA taken a position on this?

A: It came up after the last meeting had adjourned. The general reaction is in opposition to something like this. We expect to discuss it at the upcoming meeting.

Q: Can you expand on your comments about online teaching evaluations?

A: This is partly a sustainability effort, but also relates to integrating them with online portals to make them easier to complete. We expect a report this month or in January.

Q: Is the "Made in the CSU" an advocacy campaign aimed at state relations?

A: It is to promote public awareness and support for the CSU. We may at some point ask ASCSU for your support, once the plan is completed.

Q: Is there a systemwide policy on student housing?

A: Chair Postma stated that the student housing requirement previously mentioned as taking place at SJSU is permitted.

Q: Are there any other campuses that have instituted a student housing requirement such as that of SJSU?

A: Senators reported that such practices exist at CSULB, SDSU, Maritime, and CSUMB.

Gerard Hanley - Senior Director, Academic Technology Services

Gerard reported that about four years ago, the CSU provided grants to campuses in the Transforming Course Design project. Many campuses received grants. About two years ago, we started doing greater coordination, but then central support for these projects was discontinued due to budget constraints. Some campuses continued on with their efforts.

Q: How many courses were redesigned?

A: This was done at your campuses. Work was done on developmental math, general chemistry, US history, and economics. There is a teaching commons website that includes information about these projects. We do not know how many faculty incorporated this work into their courses. We do not want to homogenize the curriculum; faculty need to make decisions about what might help their students.

The Learning Management Systems (LMS): There are two LMS used in the CSU now: Moodle and Blackboard. The LMS Futures Workgroup is working on a strategy for learning management systems. We work collaboratively across campuses on Moodle through a standards and practices group. SFSU is the leading user of Moodle. We are trying to leverage each other's expertise to move the Moodle process forward in a cost-effective manner. The BlackBoard (Bb) campuses are coordinated by Larry Gilbert. Campuses have different implementations or versions of Bb. Bb has bought out two web conferencing tools companies (called Blackboard Collaborate). Two campuses (CSULB and SJSU) are using Desire to Learn. ATAC and the Academic Technology Steering Committee are committees involved in LMS with ASCSU members. The Chancellor's Office will not impose a particular LMS; this decision belongs to faculty on campuses. When campuses choose to collaborate, that is the best time to create cost

Academic Senate CSU

savings and a better solution. SJSU is a good model to follow in campus consultation on LMS.

Q: Publishers are very interested in pushing services linked to their textbooks, including testing. How are campuses responding?

A: Currently, the publishing business is realizing that books are not going to give them the profits seen in the past. They want to become knowledge systems. Campuses should be extremely cautious about how directly integrated publishers are in your technology platforms. There needs to be a buffer between the publishers and your systems. Digital distribution of content can be cheaper for students, and we are doing pilot studies on five campuses now where students pay a fee equal to 35% of the cost of the text. This is driven by faculty. How we progress into use of digital content and integration of it needs to be studied. We have faculty member at San Bernardino doing research on this. We can develop new types of business relationships around this.

Q: Are you in charge of email? There is a rumor that the CSU is going to require campuses to archive seven years of their email.

A: No, I am not in charge of email. There is a CSU security policy. EVC Smith said he would check on this.

Q: How much does the system pay for Blackboard each year?

A: For all the campus contracts, \$2 million; CSU gets a 5% discount by pooling all campus contracts. There are a number of costs: license cost, hosting, staffing cost for customization/support, etc. Our analysis showed that for small campuses, running Blackboard costs \$25 to \$35 per FTES, and Moodle costs about \$5. The cost differential between Blackboard and Moodle is less on large campuses. Although there is variability across campuses, BlackBoard has generally not been responsive to working out problems experienced on the campuses. Dr. Hanley will send a link to a report on this.

Q: What is the support available for Moodle?

A: Many campuses like Northridge, Sonoma, and Monterey Bay use Moodle rooms (a vendor that provides Moodle services), which costs campuses extra. A test environment is currently being funded by the CSU for some campuses; campuses set up an MOU with Dr. Hanley. This is to support experimentation on the campuses. The CSU pays for some services that all campuses can access (example: Turn-it-in, Respondus). We try to figure out how to leverage our size to negotiate lower costs with the vendors.

Q: Does the centralization of systems fit into the CSU Synergy project?

A: Email and virtual labs fit in. We try to figure out when it is useful to do things centrally versus distributed across campuses, e.g., storage. The locus of control of technology management is changing; it is moving out of the institution and into

students. The challenge is to ensure that students can access the campus resources (inter-operability).

Q: What is the Chancellor's Office connection, if any, to the McGraw-Hill Summit?

A: A division of McGraw-Hill is Aleks, a product used by many of our campuses in their developmental math programs. CSU negotiated a deal for Aleks to be available to students through the web for \$35. Some years ago, CSU held summits for Aleks users. The Summit is a sales pitch for their products and services. Dr. Hanley plans to attend the Summit. He has not given McGraw-Hill any faculty email addresses.

Q: What are companies doing to insure LMS security, especially with hand-held systems, and on using streaming video, personalization of LMS, etc.?

A: At SDSU, students can get CSU library services on their mobile device. This requires writing an application for each application. Directors of academic technology had a retreat a few months ago and had mobile as an issue that they are working on. Centrally, we are testing MERLOT in the Cloud to compare costs. We need to make sure that using the Cloud is cost-effective.

Q: What has been done to protect faculty materials on LMS? What happened to Course Hero?

A: I am not sure what happened on Course Hero. Counsel is watching those issues. On the security of content on LMS, what is difficult is transferring the content from one system to another. Blackboard and other LMS offer the support, but it is now essential for us to figure out how to manage our own content. In LMS, content is relatively secure. The systems can be abused, however. The more secure something becomes, however, the less usable it becomes.

Q: Have you been working with the Red Balloon project?

A: No. There are a number of initiatives in process, including the Gates Foundation Next Generation Learning Challenge Grants with four tracks (blended learning, deeper learning, learning analytics, open courseware) through Educause. I have created a on [open forum](http://Voices.merlot.org) (Voices.merlot.org) for those who would like to share ideas on these grants.

Q: Is your office involved with the Skylight project (for scheduling and room assignments) at Washington State University?

A: No. Desdemona Cardoza is working on how we can look at degree audits, program planning, and scheduling in a coordinated way so as to find out what courses students need in order to graduate.

John Travis - CFA

John Travis introduced members of the Bargaining Team accompanying him: Elizabeth Hoffman (CSULB), Terry Yamada (CSULB), Kevin Wehr (Sac State), and Hank Reichman (CSUEB).

Academic Senate CSU

CFA endorsed Jerry Brown in the recent election, and they believe that CFA will be able to present issues of concern to him. CFA also supported Gavin Newsom, who in his campaign said that one of the most important roles of the Lieutenant Governor is the position on the CSU BOT/UC Board of Regents; he stated that he will take those roles seriously. CFA also endorsed Senator Torlakson for Superintendent of Public Instruction and Kamala Harris for Attorney General supported. All of these candidates were successful.

CFA also supported two propositions (24 and 25). Prop 24 would have brought \$1.5 to 2 billion into the general fund; however it failed. Prop 25, requiring a majority vote on the state budget, allows the Legislature to pass the budget with simple majority vote. This is a first step to make the budgetary process in California more rational.

With respect to bargaining, we have not been surprised by what is happening at the table. We expected the CO to propose take-backs, and that is what we've gotten. We have had several sessions already. The process is that each side opens a new article, and presents the changes desired. CFA started with Article 38 (Layoff), because CFA discovered problems in the layoff process last year. The Chancellor's Office (CO) responded that Article 38 was tied up with Article 12 (Appointment) and Article 15 (Evaluations). CO proposed changes that showed an interest in transferring the decision making process from faculty to management (President). The CO proposals strip lecturers of much of their limited protections and reduced the faculty voice in determining teaching schedule. This is the beginning of the process, and Travis expects it will take a while; the current contract is still in effect until we have a new contract or reach impasse. Go to www.calfac.org for weekly updates.

Changes proposed at the upcoming BOT meeting include an increase in student fees. CFA opposes student fee increases. If successful this time (5% fee increase immediately and 10% next year), this would be a 242% increase in student fees since 2002. Similarly, the BOT will vote to call student fees "tuition" instead of fees. This is a departure from the Master Plan for Higher Education. Also, CFA believes this change will make it more difficult to track where these resources are being spent. The rules regarding fee increases require greater accountability.

Terry Yamada reported on the Red Balloon project kick-off at Fresno last Friday. Yamada encourages senators to look at the George Mehaffy's Powerpoint presentation on Fresno's website. There are over 100 campuses involved across the country, including many CSU campuses. There is support from foundations, such as Educause and Bill/Melinda Gates Foundation. Yamada described the themes of the initiative as moving instruction to online format and reducing faculty governance. She is studying faculty involvement in the decision-making process at the CSU campuses.

Q: Will CFA solicit the support of Governor in getting a fair and decent contract for CSU faculty?

A: We have not talked about this yet. However, we will talk with him about funding for higher education. His comments about funding have been guarded, so far.

Q: What is the separation between the mission of the academic senates versus CFA?

A: The CFA view of HEERA is that there are areas of overlap (e.g., workload implications of curriculum).

Q: The current governor has politicized the appointment of the faculty trustee. Will CFA help encourage this appointment?

A: CFA made inquiries upon first learning about this. After those conversations, CFA did not believe there was much it could do to help the situation. CFA will help out in any way possible at the Academic Senate's request.

Q: Will there be an equity program for associate professors in the next contract?

A: There will be \$1.2 million distributed this year; this was left over from the equity program for assistants.

Q: What kind of take-backs is the CO after?

A: Some examples cited by Dr. Travis include: In Article 12, job security for lecturers (entitlements, preference for work); In Article 15, student evaluations in at least two courses per year (change default to all courses); Exceptions to order of lay off. Most take-backs give the administration more authority.

Q: What is CFA's position on changing the terminology from "fee" to "tuition?"

A: Fees can be traced because they are for specific purposes that must be separately accounted; changing the term to "tuition" reduces the ability to hold administration accountable for use of fees.

Q: What can academic senates do to collaborate with CFA on issues?

A: We encourage our chapters to try to build a close relationship with academic senates. We have different responsibilities, but similar concerns.

Q: Is CO proposing any changes to FERP?

A: Article 29 has been given to CFA by CO. CO is not proposing changes in the length of the program, but it has proposed changes to assignment of work. CFA attempted to get an extension on FERP, but CSU refused. CFA has not had an opportunity to question CO about why it wants to make the changes proposed.

F. King Alexander - President, CSU Long Beach

The national dialogue has shifted from arbitrary rankings to the production of degrees as the way to assess the productivity of universities. Higher education is an international industry. He showed slides depicting how efficient the CSU is compared to California community colleges, our CPEC peer comparison institutions, UC, public research universities, and private research universities. Slides included per FTE data on tuition, student aid appropriations from state and local sources, total revenues, expenditures,

Academic Senate CSU

public service expenditures, net scholarships and fellowships, E & G expenditures, total operating expenditures, source of expenditures paid by students, cost of degree/FTE (CSU=\$48,000; Community colleges=\$64,000; CPEC peers=\$65,000; UC=\$96,000), cost of each degree per various campuses in California colleges and universities, percentage of Pell-eligible (low income) students, average mid-career earnings of graduates (CSU=\$82,300; UC=\$96,700), and debt that students have when they graduate.

We (CSU) collect the least and spend the least per student, even though we have a high percentage of low income students. We are seeking federal funding to help teach the high-cost students. CSU is second in terms of affordability in the US (behind Florida). President Alexander maintains that California should shift its funding to the most efficient system. We produce high numbers of graduates. President Alexander will make these slides available to senators.

Q: A common metric for higher education reported in newspapers in graduation rates. The implied graduation rate seems to be 100%. What should the goal be, given that 100% might indicate a lack of standards? How do we communicate an appropriate metric?

A: Harvard has a 91% graduation rate; given its expense and selectivity, one wonders why Harvard does not graduate 100%. At CSULB, we have a “common good” page on the VSA. The rate is not as important as the number. We report on our page who the students are, financial aid status, and numbers graduating. An institution can make its graduation rate jump tremendously by changing the population it is serving. Now, all public institutions will be required to have the commons good page.

Q: Will the privates be required to have a common goods page?

A: No. In fact, the privates are largely responsible for the public concern about the cost of higher education. Institutions that do not teach significant percentages of students who are eligible for Pell grants should not receive public funding, in his opinion.

Q: How can CSU be proud of how few dollars it spends on our students' education? I would want to send my kids to USC, where more money is spent per student. You get what you pay for. Framing our accountability in terms of degree production concerns me.

A: He contends that federal and state funding is perversely rewarding inefficiency. CSU should receive more funding because we are more efficient. The productivity of the CSU is being recognized at the federal level, particularly given who we are serving. We can demonstrate that we are doing a better job, not driving students into debt, and have comparable outcomes when you look at graduates' salaries.

Q: In New York state schools, the chancellor wants each campus to set its own fees. This seems to be happening in the CSU. Should we go in that direction?

A: The SUNY system is very different; it does not receive state funding. This is a terrible direction and trend. The four leading institutions dropped SUNY from their

name. There is not a strong public higher education in the northeast, and we should not be following that model. The students in New York, through their fees, are subsidizing other public services (like roads).

Q: On the issue of quality, perhaps indicating that graduates' salaries relate to quality would be helpful.

A: Our graduates are doing very well in mid-career earnings compared to other institutions. This is a message that we need to communicate.

Q: Who are you working with in developing this presentation, and are there venues where you want to take the data?

A: "We" refers to the Undersecretary of Education in Washington. George Miller and his staff understood the issues, but new leadership will be coming in January. "We" is also the Chancellor and our legislative staff. We have just started this campaign. I shared the data with the CSU presidents about six weeks ago. We also presented the data to the Department of Finance in California. Getting the media to pick up on it is a difficult battle, especially at the national level. We will present it at the AASCU Conference shortly. We are just starting. The Chancellor asked me to present the data to you. There may not be new public money, but money can be re-directed. For-profits have 11% of students and get 30% of Pell grants; they have 43% of the defaults on loans (our student default rate is 2%). There are wiser ways to use public money. For-profits are getting public money and not producing graduates. They are sending their students into deep debt. Why do privates get more public funding per student than we do, such as Cal Grant A?

Q: Legislators believe that it costs less to send students to community college than the CSU. Have you done any comparisons controlling for the degree level?

A: CSU is only \$600 more than community colleges in terms of funding. Factoring in the graduation rates, the CSU is much more cost effective than both the community college and UC systems.

Q: Is there a way to incorporate other measures of quality (than salary of graduates)?

A: Our assessment on campuses can help us, but we have not done a good job at doing that. We cannot show what the difference between graduates of for-profits and CSU, and we need to do a better job. Graduating students is the strategic plan of CSULB. We have hundreds of strategies to help students graduate. For example, we personally call "near graduates" and encourage them to complete. We show them earning differences between graduates and drop outs. There are just too many to name.

Q: Why isn't the public more supportive of public higher education? Why aren't our alums more supportive? Should this information be given at graduation?

A: In Florida, there is a bifurcation in voters, with seniors wanting more spending on public health and jails. Hopefully, we will not find ourselves there. We are not the

Academic Senate CSU

cause of increasing costs of higher education at the national level, but we are lumped together with all the institutions.

Q: Is there an efficiency problem in CSU, or a marketing problem? Don't we need to do a better story telling our story?

A: We do need to tell our own story. Now that we have the data, we should put it on the table. We cannot sustain the level of productivity we have in the CSU when all the funding is going to the other less-productive institutions.

Committee Recommendations

AS-2974-10/AA (Rev) - Approved Unanimously

Support Services and Troops to College

AS-2975-10/FGA (Rev) - Withdrawn

Affordable Learning Solutions Initiative

AS-2976-10/FA (Rev) - Approved

Public Education Leadership and Political Neutrality

AS-2978-10/APEP/AA (Rev) - Approved Unanimously

Meeting General Education Requirements using College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Tests

AS-2981-10/FGA (Rev) - Tabled

Adequate Financial Support for the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU)

AS-2982-10/AA (Rev) - Approved Unanimously

Resolution on Returning Veterans

AS-2985-10/FGA/EX (Waiver) - Tabled

Commendation for Allison Jones Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Support

AS-2986-10/FA (Waiver) - Approved Unanimously

A Call for Governor Brown to Appoint a Faculty Trustee

AS-2987-10/EX (Waiver) - Approved by Acclamation

Resolution of Appreciation Upon the Retirement of Gunnar and Sue Serpa

AS-2988-10/APEP (Waiver) - Approved Unanimously

Public Sharing of Campuses' Early Start Program Plans

First Reading

AS-2979-10/APEP

Commending the California State University for Hosting a National Teacher Education Summit

AS-2980-10/APEP

Recognition and Commendation for Efforts That Have Increased Rates of Proficiency in Reading and Writing for Entering Freshmen

AS-2989-10/AA

Creation of a Task Force for Developing System Policies Regarding Online Degree Programs

AS-2990-10/FA

Implications of the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in Garcetti v. Ceballos

AS-2991-10/FA

Setting the Stage for Quality Education in the CSU

AS-2992-10/FA/FGA

Sale, Distribution, or Publishing of Class Materials for Commercial Use

AS-2993-10/FGA /APEP

Fiscal Concerns on Implementation of Early Start Programs

AS-2994-10/FGA /AA

Call for Intersegmental Collaboration on the Implementation of AB 1295 (Fuller) – Postsecondary Education Nursing Degree Programs

AS-2995-10/APEP

Assessment and Reporting of Results of Early Start Programs

AS-2997-10/Nelson

Resolution Regarding Consultation about the American Association of State Colleges and Universities' (AASCU) Red Balloon Project

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.