Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Minutes  
September 4-5, 2014  
Office of the Chancellor

Plenary - Thursday, September 4, 2014 – 8:00 a.m. to noon, Dumke Auditorium

New Senator Orientation – 1:00 to 3:00
New Senators/Standing Committees – 1:00 to 5:00
Senate Social – Executive Committee Hosting
5:15 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. Munitz Lobby

Plenary - Friday, September 5, 2014 – 8 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., Dumke Auditorium

1. Call to order: 8:04 a.m.

2. Roll call Senators Present: Bakersfield (Frye, Murphy); Channel Islands (Aloisio, Yudelson); Chico (Kaiser, Schulte); Dominguez Hills (Norman); East Bay (Fleming, Gubernat); Fresno (Benavides, Kensinger); Fullerton (Guerin, Jarvis, Walker); Humboldt (Creadon, Eschker); Long Beach (Hood, Klink, Soni); Los Angeles (Baaske, Bodinger-deUriarte); Maritime (Browne, Chisholm); Monterey Bay (Davis, Nishita); Northridge (Chong, Frehlich, Schutte); Pomona (Neto, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Steffel, Ullman); San Diego (Eadie, Ornatowski, Wheeler); San Francisco (Collins, Yee-Melichar); San Jose (Lessow-Hurley, Sabalia, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Foroohar, Widmann); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Roberts); Stanislaus (Eudey, Filling); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Paternack); Office of the Chancellor (Smith)

Guests: William Blischke (CSU-ERFA); Eric Forbes (CO); Rommel Hidalgo (CSU Fullerton); Christine Mallon (CO); Andy Merrifield (CFA); Sara Sanders (CSSA); Steven Stepanek (Faculty Trustee); Sharon Tanabe (Storbeck/Pimentel & Associates); Sheila Thomas (CO); Ron Vogel (CO); Chancellor Timothy P. White

3. Approval of Agenda: Approved as revised.


5. Announcements
   
   • Senator Yee-Melichar announced the first CSU Palliative Care Symposium to be held on the San Marcos campus October 7-8.
   
   • Senator Benavides announced that 89 Fresno State athletes had achieved GPAs of 3.0 or better.
   
   • Senator Brodowsky announced that CSU San Marcos had been named one of the top 100 colleges to work for in the USA by the Chronicle.
   
   • Senator Lessow-Hurley announced that on October 20, Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor will be speaking at San Jose State where this year’s choice of a freshman book is Sotomayor’s autobiography My Beloved World.
6. Presentations/Introductions

- Senator Kaiser introduced Senator Shulte from Chico.
- Senator Aloisio introduced Senator Yudelson from Channel Islands.

7. Reports

7.1. Chair - Chair Filling referred to his written report, which had been circulated via email and can be found at [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/documents/September-2014-Chairs-Rept.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/documents/September-2014-Chairs-Rept.pdf)

The report includes priorities for the 2014-15 academic year, as described during the August retreat by both ASCSU standing committee chairs and Chancellor's Office personnel.

7.2. Standing committees

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

The committee spent the majority of its meeting setting the agenda for the entire year. Members reviewed the results of a survey, distributed by Chair Eadie, designed to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats facing the CSU as a system in order to propose issues and projects for the year. Four broad areas were identified for further development:

a. The Access to Excellence strategic plan, which the Chancellor has indicated is in need of updating;

b. Assessment, for which there is some expertise on the committee;

c. Ethnic Studies, in response to the task force report that is due to be issued this fall;

d. Intermediate Algebra, which comes to the committee from ongoing discussions within the General Education Advisory Committee about the STATWAY pilot.

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

The committee welcomed three new members. Together with its CO liaisons, the committee plans to refine this year’s agenda, in particular to develop collaborative relationships with education councils and education schools, targeting priorities and staying abreast of those initiatives that have particular relevance to the committee’s charges such as accountability, the Common Core, Smarter Balance, and remediation. The committee is also interested in exploring issues of access for at-risk and marginalized populations.

As Early Start statistics become available, the committee will endeavor to get the latest information out. This past summer, there seemed to be some confusion about students responding to email communication about Early Start. (A question from the floor was about how to distinguish the results of Early Start completion between those programs that were 3-unit face-to-face vs. 1-unit online programs. The Chair agreed that the committee would continue to follow up on these issues.)

Numbers of students taking the EAP were only slightly down from previous years; the numbers still suggest significant need for remediation in both English and math. SAT and ACT revised scores will continue to serve as markers of readiness.

AB 2548 had proposed a study to ensure that the CSU continues to admit the top 1/3 of those graduating; the Department of Finance has opposed the bill because of its costs.
Among other matters: Bev Young provided the committee with excellent updates on teacher credentialing. Later in the plenary a resolution commending a Bechtel science education grant will be brought forward by the committee. Re. the graduation initiative: each campus will work on 10-year targets, which will be disaggregated (categories such as rates for Native American; African-Americans; Latinos/Latinas. A question from the floor was about the need to include gender in the mix as well.)

A report by Nathan Evans on the number of eligible students denied admission to the CSU is also of concern to and possible action by the committee.

**Faculty Affairs (FA) – Manzar Foroohar, Chair**

There is work before the committee that carries over from last year. Four main priorities for the coming year are a revised policy on academic freedom; issues of intellectual property (particularly with relevance to online instruction); ensuring enough tenure-track positions to meet student needs; and bolstering the RSCA program system-wide. The committee is currently drafting a resolution on sexual violence on campuses (with co-sponsorship from other committees) and a resolution on political attacks on campuses; the latter resolution is related to concerns about academic freedom. The committee met for an extended conversation with General Counsel Fram Virjee to discuss the committee’s concern that CSU’s 1971 academic freedom policy is outdated and doesn’t meet current challenges. The committee will continue to pursue the possibility of revision of this policy and will report to the senate on progress made in that area. The committee also met briefly with the new Chancellor for Human Resources, Lori Lamb. Margie Merryfield, Senior Director, Academic Human Resources, reported on the recruitment of new tenure-track faculty in the system. There were about 700 tenure-track searches and there is a hope that 600 have been successful. More data will be available in October. Currently there are 400 new positions posted, with more to come. Entry salaries have gone up slightly, including in the Humanities, where the figure had been $60,000; $65,000 is now the system average. The costs of a start-up package have increased from $25,000 to $40,000, including release time. The committee also met with CFA liaison Andy Merrifield, whose report was recapped earlier during the plenary.

**Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) – Thomas Krabacher, Chair**

New members were introduced to the committee, as was the new CO liaison Kara Perkins. The committee heard reports from Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, Andy Merrifield, and the Executive Committee liaison Chris Miller. The committee’s events are tied to the legislative calendar, whose cycle ended in August/September with the ending of the two-year session. Any bills passed by then would have been sent forward to the Governor; the legislature adjourns and legislators return to their home districts where they will be campaigning for the November election. The committee did a wrap-up disposition of bills, following through on what happened; many did not make it through.

Bills of interest to this body include: SB 850 (Block), which is awaiting action by the Governor; AB 2324, the faculty trustee bill whose fate seemed at one point to be tied to that of AB 2721, which would have added a staff trustee. However, there is no linkage between them, per a follow-up by Andy Martinez. At this point the Governor's staff sees no problem with his signing it, but they cannot predict his response. The committee will bring forward a resolution later in the plenary opposing AB 46 (Pan).
Looking ahead, the committee intends to ensure that higher education is kept on the legislators’ radar and is working with ERFA to do so.

A presentation by Nathan Evans on the number of denied eligible students is an issue that was raised earlier in August and is of concern both to APEP and FGA. The committee will have more campus-specific data on this issue and may then go forward with a joint action in November.

Finally, the bill allowing underage students to taste wine in wine-making classes—otherwise known as “sip and spit”—was also signed into law.

7.3. Other committees and committee liaisons

**Ethnic Studies Task Force – Senator Kensinger**

The task force continues its work from the spring, including assembling the data from a survey conducted this summer. The subcommittee’s next meeting is on September 19, and they have asked for a fall extension to complete their work.

**General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) - Senator Van Selst, Chair**

Senator Van Selst referred senators to the written report he distributed yesterday, with an update. The following are items reviewed from that report:

- Four-year degrees to be granted by community colleges: These will need a GE component with work that meets CSU GE and/or IGETC content. A question to pursue is what kind of input will CSU faculty have as these degrees are being designed, particularly in terms of GE?
- Programmatic reviews of GE: Are tied to WASC evaluation. GE is defined as a program and should be evaluated as such, though this doesn’t always happen.
- Competency-based assessment: This remains of interest, with inputs received from WICHE, ICAS, the Compass project, and internal pilot studies.
- A review of EO 1065 revisions (in progress)

Other issues included dissemination of Compass project results; “thematic” GE; GE waivers; the current status of exemption requests; and an AP capstone course as potentially fulfilling the critical thinking requirement.

7.4. Faculty Trustee report

Faculty Trustee Steven Stepanek referred to his written report of summer activities, sent to the senators via email on August 29. Among his upcoming responsibilities he noted his attendance at the October 15 meeting on the Graduate Initiative, the upcoming September Board of Trustees meeting, and visits to Maritime, Chico, and Humboldt in a northern swing among campuses.

In answer to a question about dormitory construction on the SLO campus, Stepanek confirmed that the campus did receive approval at the last BOT meeting; he noted that there was quite a bit of controversy over the project since it was close to a neighborhood elementary school. While many raised their objections during the public comment portion of the Board meeting, there were no representatives from the school district commenting. The campus has agreed to work closely with the city to ameliorate some of the potential problems, including traffic problems that the project may cause.
7.5. **CSU Chancellor Timothy P. White**

Chair Filling introduced Chancellor White with a word of appreciation for the Chancellor's stated intention to address the ASCSU plenary during every session. The Chancellor hoped that the senators have experienced successful launches of the new academic year on the semester campuses and will do so in the near future on the quarter campuses. He said that he hoped never to forget to thank the senators for their leadership, above and beyond.

The Chancellor noted that the search committee for the position of Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs has now been populated and that Chair Filling and Senator Foroohar (SLO) have been appointed as the ASCSU representatives on the committee. He noted that there would be an opportunity later in the plenary to visit with Sharon Tanabe of Storbeck/Pimentel & Associates, who are conducting the search, to provide feedback on the kinds of experiences and attributes senators believe will be necessary in this important position. The Chancellor added that there will be an online link for individuals to send him their comments directly. The position's title and responsibility have been changed, after much consultation, to include oversight over student affairs; the organizational chart will now also include an additional Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, akin to Ron Vogel’s position in Academic Affairs.

Trustee Monville's student success fee task force has been convened in response to members of the Board of Trustees who wanted a deeper understanding of fees beyond what is charged for tuition at the CSU. It will be wise to focus on student success for now, but they are cognizant of concerns advanced by ASCSU resolutions and by the legislature. Three open forums will be held on campuses and feedback will be solicited from student and faculty leadership. The process will be reviewed at the September Board of Trustees meeting with reports to follow at the November and January meetings of the BOT, with opportunity for public comment.

The Chancellor entertained the following questions from individual senators:

**Q.** Have heard that campuses with 8,000 or fewer FTEs will not be penalized if they have gone over their enrollment targets. Will the Chancellor confirm this and put it in writing? (Nelson)

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Thanks for help with the faculty trustee legislation. Where does it stand currently? Can the Chancellor and BOT Chair put in a good word for it? (Guerin)

**A.** The Governor has been focused on hundreds of bills and on raising money for his water bond measure on the November ballot and raising money for his rainy-day fund. But yes, it makes sense to have coverage as the bill provides.

**Q.** What is the CSU doing as a system to help campuses address the issue of sexual assault? (Kaiser)

**A.** Will have a briefing on this for the next ASCSU plenary. The CSU is the first system in the country to seek a Title IX coordinator as a resource—not as a “gotcha” but for the right reason: providing a safe learning environment for all students.

**Q.** On the issue of money being devoted to athletic programs in the CSU; at San Jose State, for example, millions of dollars of student fees, without consultation, are subsidizing athletics. With student demographics changing, there may be less interest and less need to attract...
students via sports programs to campuses that are already impacted, so should there be a re-evaluation of how these monies are being spent? (Sabalius)

A. It is important to have a healthy debate on the issue. That said, the Chancellor noted that he is “very supportive” of intercollegiate athletics and believes that athletics can develop a work ethic, encourage team work, and provide opportunities for other students—for musicians in a pep squad, for business majors to do internships, for students in allied health fields to be involved in occupational therapy. College sports attract community and alumni support and provide visibility for individual campuses. The Board of Trustees will hear a report that the graduation rates of Division I athletes are in fact higher than those of the student body.

Q. On the senator’s campus (Channel Islands), Academic Affairs is getting less than 50% of the budget; is that so on other campuses? Why have non-instructional costs gone up so dramatically? Can the Chancellor’s Office do something to redirect funding? (Aloisio)

A. Will look at it to see what is going on.

Q. As an engineering faculty member, am concerned that, instead of enabling the change to Title 5 allowing for 132 units, the modifications we’re being asked to make to get our programs to 120 units are requiring the cutting of important GE requirements. The mandate to get to 120 may be shortsighted in developing the strongest programs and preparing students for the work force. (Holl)

A. Understood. The exceptions have not yet crossed his desk, and the Chancellor is expecting to review them in October. The data is still being put together. He will look at the exception requests personally and will continue to discuss the process with senate leadership.

Q. The Academic Affairs Committee is hearing about situations in which these exceptions are not being allowed off campus. Meanwhile, at San Jose, for example, classes are heavily overenrolled; students cannot be added to classes where capacity doesn’t exist. (Van Selst)

A. Some of these system policies, like penalties for exceeding targets mentioned earlier, were built during a different era and will implode under their own weight, working, as they may, at cross purposes. The Chancellor said they are making progress, if slowly, in redesigning the system going forward. He welcomes faculty voices and senate representation in future decision-making.

Q. On the San Marcos campus, 62% of the students are female. Why this gender imbalance? College-age males are at risk. (Brodowsky)

A. This is a question of enrollment management. There is a need for campus-based, regional outreach. There are not only gender issues but also those involving race and ethnicity; Latino and African-Americans males are at greatest risk. Churches, community organizations need to continue to play a role.

Q. In the face of predictions about long-term drought in California, how will campus be directed to be more intelligent in water use, to be sustainable? There is lots of water waste on campuses. (Yudelson)

A. Each campus has targets for greenhouse gas emission, solid waste, water consumption as well as overall energy usages. Some campuses are making progress, but water usage has gone up. There is a need to try to get rid of lush vegetation. And there are costs associated with
retrofitting and such. The Chancellor’s Office could get a summary of efforts and bring that back to the senate. The CSU has an ally in Trustee Becky Eisen; see the BOT’s sustainability report.

**Q.** To return to engineering and the 120/180-unit cap: Pomona engineering graduates are making a significant contribution to the workforce in California. We want to keep a good program but cannot achieve such within these strictures. We believe in GE, but fear that with the re-visioning of curriculum during semester conversion, there will not be much GE left. Consider this as an issue that may never reach your desk. (Neto)

**A.** No response.

**Q.** What about Access to Excellence? What does the Chancellor mean when he says it is time to “dust off” the Access to Excellence strategic plan? (Miller)

**A.** Haven’t even taken a serious look at it. There are many other things that need attention, and when we do take a look at it, it will be a “community event.”

### 7.6. Andy Merrifield, CFA Liaison Report

Merrifield decried the fact that while legislators originally supported the 273M increase to the CSU budget for this year, they folded like a “cheap tent” in response to the Governor’s opposition. The CFA maintains that such underfunding is not a good idea for California, the students, faculty, and other employees of the system. The CFA is not in agreement with the amount proposed or the priorities of this budget.

**Legislation:** CFA had worked cooperatively with the CSU to get legislation passed on the issue of supplanting, but no clear definition of the term emerged; auditors could not determine the extent to which CFA and CSU management disagreed. Both sides compromised on a bill but at the last minute the CSU “moved the goal post” and no bill was passed. CFA maintains that their version is what is needed and will bring it back in the next legislative session. Another piece of legislation requiring greater online transparency, as authored by Pan, is now on the Governor’s desk; CFA would like to see transparency in success rates in online courses. In many cases, though, CFA finds itself in agreement with the ASCSU in that legislation may not always be the ideal way to get things done. Meanwhile, CFA is looking forward to the next session and soliciting information, from all members of Unit 3, for ideas for legislation and would like to hear from the ASCSU as to what the senate might think could be beneficial to quality education and to faculty. An example might be a bill protecting Ethnic Studies programs. Currently, the CFA has a rich political program and is working on electing people this November who support public higher education.

**Bargaining:** An update on contract negotiations: the original agreement expired June 30, and it was the intent of the CFA to complete bargaining before that. The bargaining is now extended 65 into a new contract year. This is an improvement on past negotiations, which had gone on over 27 months in the past. There are “huge” sections that now have been mutually agreed upon. The ASCSU may have particular interests in the following tentative agreements:

- Evaluation of online courses would mirror the processes of face-to-face evaluations closely to protect the faculty, with the same criteria to be used. There would be no “stealth observation,” (that is when a faculty member would not know he/she was being observed). Also, irrelevant data, such as keystroke counts, or the speed at which an online faculty member returns students’ queries, cannot be used in evaluation;
Recognition of the work of non tenure-track faculty on committees: no more freebies;
Coaches on nine-month contracts should not be expected to work all year, for example, say on recruiting, in a month when they are not being paid to work;
Full-time lecturers with a 15-unit time base will not have to teach a 16th unit for free.
FERP remains status quo, continuing as a five-year program.
Intellectual property: a moving target, not unique to the CSU. The definition is being expanded to provide additional clarity and to afford faculty protection from 3rd parties. The term “extraordinary support” had been used to define the faculty member’s and the institution’s mutual ownership. Now, the faculty member must know in advance exactly what the institution is providing. A written contract in advance will spell out who owns what.

There are four issues that remain divisive in current bargaining: salary, workload, recognition of faculty in extended education as members of the faculty, and a guaranteed assumption that long-term lecturers who are qualified for an advertised t/t position should have the right to be interviewed during a search process in their departments.

**Salary:** The big issues related to salary are problems not only of resources but also of process: wage stagnation; the absence of COLAs, no step increases (CSU and UC are the only public employees who have not been paid SSIs); inversion and compression. There are real issues of equity. Lecturers have been misclassified: the “L” category should not pertain to those with advanced degrees; those with terminal degrees in their fields should be in “B” and not in “A.”

There is no disagreement between CFA and management that these are problems to be addressed, but the issue is how many resources can be allocated to solving them, and how. Individual campuses differ in how unevenly resources have been distributed; some campuses have consistently low-balled faculty. Forty percent of the faculty are now below the SSI maximum, and on some campuses that figure can be as high as 63%. CFA wants SSIs guaranteed in all three years of the contract. Equity 3 in the old contract is not being paid. (Individual campuses are claiming that they do not have the money or are waiting for the new contract or claim that the Chancellor’s Office has directed them not to pay Equity 3. CFA says none of these excuses are to be believed.)

**Workload:** has grown but is not being adequately compensated for. And extra duties involving internships, thesis units, independent study work are not being resourced, as is service especially where there are not enough permanent faculty. Service requirements have grown particularly onerous for small departments. Another area of service involves those faculty who are most involved with first-generation, under-represented minority students. When faculty members are engaged with these students, their success rates climb dramatically; however, these faculty do a disproportionate share of the work, for which they are not compensated. RSCA funds need to grow annually and should not be taken away at campuses where Chancellor’s Office money is forthcoming and should emanate from a pool controlled not by management but through faculty governance processes.

The bargaining team hopes to resolve these issues at the sessions on September 18 and 19.
Q&A with Merrifield:

Senators thanked CFA for instituting unconscious bias workshops on campuses, which are also open to campus administrators; asked if CFA could get the legislature involved in protecting and enhancing Ethnic Studies programs, Merrifield answered he was wary of such legislative involvement. Merrifield fielded questions about how to interpret the CSU’s bargaining memo, where the numbers don’t take into account the lack of SSI increases as well as the references to prior years’ salary increases which have not materialized. Other questions involved how difficult it is to address equity (and attendant morale issues) on campuses when t/t promotion itself is honored only at the minimum 7.5%. It was also mentioned that lecturers are mired in rank, under the current policy. Merrifield added that without SSIs that is also true, and there is a gender gap in pay between women and men as well. All other public workers in CA have been getting SSIs. Another questions was whether the new contract takes up issues of risk management— independent lab work, field trips, anything that could potentially shift liability to faculty members themselves. Merrifield’s answer is that there is an article on safety. In the past no record of management response was kept; now it must be tracked in writing.

7.7. Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support

Forbes reported on a set of projects being referred to as “E-Advisor,” a name borrowed from Arizona universities where there has been significant development in this arena. There was a 1.5M set-aside stimulus package for such tools; during the recession work on them had atrophied.

When campuses were asked what kinds of activities would be most helpful to develop, the degree audit tool was chief among them; eleven of the campuses hadn’t been using it at all, but progress is now being made. Three campuses plan to role out “Smart Planner,” by spring and two others next year; it is a tool with Peoplesoft that will enable students to set long-term goals in their course-planning and can be particularly useful to department chairs in predicting how many course sections will be needed over time.

Early warning systems were also of concern; there are about a dozen out there from various vendors with different intervention strategies. Campuses need to inventory such tools and consider consolidating them across campuses. A “predictive analytics” tool takes all course enrollment data into account to determine if road maps that the faculty invent actually match the success rates of their students. Three campuses initially used the tool; now six are working with the vendor. According to Forbes, because transfer in the CSU is different from anywhere in the country, unfortunately, such prediction has been difficult. Classroom performance data could indicate long-term success; a marginal score could present an opportunity to intervene through advisement, matching a student up with a different degree, keeping him or her from probation or opting out.

These tools are being implemented with the goal of raising the graduation rate from 54% to 60%. The 60% refers to freshmen with a date of 2025 to achieve it.

Senators raised the following questions:

Q. What determined which campuses were able to roll out e-advising? (Kaiser)
A. The choice was based on readiness of a particular campus. Over the summer consultants had gone from campus to campus and found that among impediments were understaffing; some campuses are still dependent upon a paper culture.
Q. With the 120-unit degree limit, there have been some campuses that have instituted certain machinations to get there. San Jose, for example, has an integrated program of GE in place of talking to an advisor. That a student may be ready to step into Calculus can be unreasonable; more paths need to be shown to students. There needs to be more flexibility for advising. (Van Selst)

A. This is a good issue and will take it back to the person responsible. We’re experiencing more pressure, and now that has been followed by pressure to complete a four-year degree.

Q. At Fullerton it would improve the degree audit for a student to get the catalog year when she comes to Fullerton and not the year she began in community college. The degree audit seems to point in the wrong direction. Has the degree audit tightened? Has there been a law affecting it? (Guerin)

A. The rule is that a student can come in with the catalog year but can graduate with a different year. Will check and respond.

Q. What is our four-year graduation rate? Can it be determined for those who do not need remediation? (Soni)

A. It is very low, will verify. Unfortunately, federal and state interests are in four-year rates and the CSU needs also to report that as an accountability measure. It will be important to continue to have dialogue about this since the four-year rate does not match our version of success. Faculty can help with such dialogue.

Q. We are getting more qualified students the more impacted campuses are. But if students cannot get the classes they need, the graduation rate could decline. (Van Selst)

A. E-advisement tools could be incredibly helpful here; they can help with future planning, determining what the pressure points are. These tools exist for people to help students; we hope to see an increase in the number of professional advisors.

Q. The current six-year graduation rate at the CSU reflects our student body: they have families and jobs and are going to school part-time. It doesn’t make sense to judge their completion rates by the same data. Impaction sends them into majors they wouldn’t have chosen, into degrees for which they are not motivated. The Master Plan has not been funded. (Bodinger-deUriarte)

A. We have to look at the freshman cohort in terms of national standards.

Q. The Early Warning system is new to our campus so we’d appreciate help from others who are using it. Many faculty are worried about the identification processes, the fact that students would ultimately be identified as “problem students” and that this could be prejudicial. It could harm relationships and a student’s own sense of success. Are there such problems? (Creadon)

A. This is always concern when an advisor isn’t working face to face with a student; it will be important for the individual advisor to identify the positive. It’s similar to situations of probation and disqualification. We hope that these tools can prevent such experiences before they happen through timely intervention.
Q. In FGA we have talked about impaction, trying to keep applicants in the CSU, finding ways to suggest a sister campus instead for students to enroll in, even for a term, where there is capacity elsewhere. (Eschker)

A. Most are applying to multiple campuses. There is currently a primitive redirection tool we hope to make grow and mature. Because of impaction, there are still 20,000 eligible who are not admissible. We need to address this best by graduating them well, with 120 units, and without a lot of withdrawals and repeats.

Q. Our current course-repeat policy encourages students to fail rather than receive a C. See Executive Order 1037, endorsed by this body; the impact of 1037 needs to be addressed. What are we enforcing? How would an auditor respond? Are campuses varying in their processes? (Walker)

A. It has also troubled me that remediation is not completed before students take other coursework. It seems contradictory: why take a history class if you are still remedial?

Q. These tools are exciting; the goals of graduation are disappointing. What we’ve been talking about on our campus (Sonoma) is that students are not taking advantage of the advising being offered. How to get them to do this? (Roberts)

A. In the tools there are “hounding” activities, such as “You need to see your advisor” appearing on a mobile device. We want to see these tools restricting registration into the next term; the courage of enforcement is needed. In terms of the graduation rate: there are outside forces at work that are challenging us: financial aid, the use of state dollars, accountability issues.

7.8. Sara Sanders, CSSA Liaison Report

The CSSA is currently working on moving the Student Involvement Representation fee forward. The students are also concerned this year with how to improve EOP; Veterans Affairs will also be a major focus at their upcoming meeting on Saturday. Four students have lobbied in Washington, DC on Senate bill 967 (sexual assault on college campuses). CSSA has issued a press release in support of the related legislation that is now on the Governor’s desk. The student organization sees this issue as a good opportunity for partnership between the CSSA and ASCSU. They are calling on the Governor to approve the additional 50M funding for infrastructure needs in the system, particularly as these have affected old buildings and laboratories. Of current concern, given the election year, is how to get students to register and to the polls, and they are looking for suggestions on how to do so. There is now a memo of understanding among the CSU, UC, and CCC students planning to work together for public higher education in the state; it will involve monthly meetings and updates among the segments. CSSA is also interested in getting more campus voting partnerships and mentorships; it will be important this year to make connections with ASI campus presidents in these ventures. Sanders ended her report by saying she was happy to be included in the plenary as liaison to the ASCSU. Individual senators suggested strategies to get more campus involvement in the November election.

Sharon Tanabe, representing the firm engaged in the current search for the next Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs, met with the ASCSU in order to hear from the senators directly what qualities and “skill sets” the faculty believe are most important in evaluating candidates for the position. A description of the position had been distributed earlier to the senators. She announced that the first meetings of the search committee in October would culminate in arriving at 6-8 names followed by interviews of those persons in November. Ultimately the names of three persons, equally able to serve, would be forwarded by the search committee to the Chancellor, who will make the final decision in consultation with members of the Board of Trustees.

Senators were also told that they could send their input confidentially to jdarin@calstate.ed. Tanabe described her view of the position as one that, in addition to the significant internal responsibilities, provides for the opportunity to have a national, as well as state voice, in public higher education policy development. She invited senators to weigh in on what they believed was most important to consider in the selection of the next Executive Vice Chancellor. The following themes emerged from the senators’ conversation with Tanabe:

- The importance of this role as being second in command to the Chancellor—analogous to the relationship of a campus provost to a campus president;
- The need for the EVC to be actively engaged with the faculty, in particular the senate, and to promote communication between the ASCSU and the Chancellor’s Office;
- A perspective on his/her role arising from the EVC’s having come through the ranks as a faculty member; the person should be an advocate for faculty;
- A strategic thinker is a must: someone who is aware of national trends, understands and can work within a structure of shared governance, and in general, has a “big picture” view, who understands the role of technology as well as the faculty’s purview over curriculum;
- The next EVC should be not merely looking for this kind of academic position but someone who desires, in particular, to work for the CSU; someone who understands the diversity of faculty and of students in this institution, its mission as a teaching institution;
- Experience in a represented system that has collective bargaining is essential; that also includes an understanding of the roles of contingent faculty;
- Someone who, while working at “30,000 feet” can also express and represent what is happening on the ground for students and faculty, aware of the diversity of our student population, so many of whom are first-generation and are struggling financially. In this regard, a leader with real credentials in such an environment, not merely interest in it;
- A details-oriented administrator;
- A transparent communicator, conveying informative data when setting policy that evolves into practice; not an “after the fact” communicator but someone dedicated to process, who is committed to a culture of evidence;
- A leader who can advocate for the CSU to the legislature, and in that regard, sees the ASCSU as a primary resource of advocacy.

Concerns expressed by senators were that there were so few faculty on the search committee; that the position description had not been made available for comment before the process began;
that the description did not include a statement strongly encouraging women and minorities to apply; and that perhaps the best faculty can hope for, given that the choice remains with the Board of Trustees, is not someone who is necessarily “faculty-friendly” but fair and even-handed.

Tanabe concluded the conversation by mentioning that, as a product of the CSU herself, she understood the senators’ concerns and appreciated them. She characterized the position as an “octopus” of a job, fundamentally grounded in student success. She encouraged senators to send her names of potential candidates.

7.10. William Blischke, CSU ERFA Liaison Report

Blischke reported that this is his fifth year in the liaison position. New senators who may not know about ERFA, need to: since 1985 the organization has comprised 3,000 members. He reviewed the organization’s activities, in particular, lobbying for the CSU, which, for retired faculty is a “selfless” endeavor; ERFA works with RPEA, the retired public employees’ association in Sacramento. There is a current search for someone to take on the Executive Director position of ERFA, and all who are eligible are encouraged to apply. He encouraged senators to take a look at ERFA’s online publication, *The Reporter*, which provides a link to the ASCSU’s *Faculty to Faculty* newsletter. In closing, he added that ERFA was the largest emeriti faculty group on the planet.

7.11. Ephraim Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

EVC Smith reported on the following:

**The Graduation Initiative:** The system expects to come in above the target rate of 54%, not only an improvement for the CSU but a rate far above the national rate for comprehensive universities, which is 46% (six-year rate); the new goal is 60% by 2025, and the October 15 conference will be devoted to discussing how to make this possible. Meanwhile, unfortunately, the achievement gap has not been closed.

**Early Start:** The first “full” summer is being completed (given quarter campus schedules): 29,000 students were enrolled in Early Start; there are no system-wide data yet available but will be in future.

**SB 1440:** Smith referred to a recent report by Jim Postma; currently three are 32 TMCs (transfer model curricula) and he is waiting to see how many students who have completed a TMC will have enrolled in fall. This can be a tricky proposition due to the fact that students may be identifying themselves as such when their transcripts suggest otherwise. So far the numbers have been low and he hopes for a dramatic up-tick.

**Bottleneck Courses** and the $10M initiative: AB 386 takes effect in 2015; for now there is a website developed that listed 715 online courses available this summer. Listing of the courses was voluntary. For CourseMatch, he expects 3,000 courses next year, comprising roughly 3,250 sections; as of now, there are 36 from semester and 12 from quarter campuses. Last year 190 students participated, and the system ended with 163 cross-registered. Having met with the UC in May, Smith learned that the numbers were identical for their system, and theirs is a much greater articulation problem. A challenge CSU has to face is how to deal with upper-division transfer and upper-division articulation in future.
Summer E-Academies: 88 faculty from 19 campuses participated; seven of these groups will be continuing throughout the year in the areas of accounting, biology, chemistry, history, math, political science, physics; psychology, economics, engineering, and marketing will be added.

SB 1053: The website "Cool4Ed" (http://www.coolfored.org), broken out by discipline, has been established through the Steinberg bill and matching funds from Hewlett. It comprises currently listings of 3,400 free and open e-textbooks. Contact Gerard Hanley for more information.

Common Core: Last spring there was testing, sampling, and there is hope that it's on track to test for college readiness and that there will be improvements, with more students being involved; Bev Young is monitoring this closely.

Senators brought the following issues to the EVC’s attention:

- The lack of visibility and marketing of TMCs;
- The need for more guidance from the CSU on what math preparation should be among the high schools;
- The lack of data on the success rate of last year’s CourseMatch; the range of fees offered through extended education for online courses could create competition among campuses;
- The absence of a current infrastructure or planning for how the CSU will be involved in SB 850 implementation;
- Inaccurate links to open source materials;
- Variations among campuses as to what constitutes “passing” grades (C- vs. D);
- Need for further information about Early Start, including information on cohorts extending past the summer; need for data collection, and for templates to use for analyzing system-wide data for better reporting;
- The current state of Access to Excellence—does it make sense to go forward with initiatives without revisiting this strategic plan?

7.12. Sheila Thomas, State University Dean—Extended Education

Thomas reported that Cal State Online had now been brought under the aegis of Academic Affairs. Through consultation with campuses over the summer, it was decided to make the following changes which have resulted in CSO’s operation as a system of support services:

- Campuses now have a choice of LMS; they do not have to use Pearson;
- No restrictions on limiting courses to eight-week sessions;
- Fees: established as set tuition, $400-500 per unit; now campuses with all self-support programs have the flexibility to charge less; previously, the fees were higher than campuses would have liked;
- CSO welcomes both fully on-line and hybrid;
- Can make use of state support monies

This focus is now on shared services; campus coordinators have been identified and there will be monthly meetings with these liaisons.

Senators raised the following issues: difficulties with registration processes campus to campus through CourseMatch, processes which have yet to be worked out; concerns still existing about how fees are determined and ultimately distributed on campuses; competition among campuses for recognition of their courses’ availability—need for equal access through the portal.
8. **Election of the CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee**

Results of the Faculty Trustee Selection Committee election are as follows:

8.1. Election of Five Members:

- Senator Pasternack, Chair, ERFA
- Senator Baaske, Los Angeles
- Senator Chong, Northridge
- Senator Davis, Monterey Bay
- Senator Collins, San Francisco

8.2. Results of random drawing of two campuses to solicit for final two members:

- Pomona and Bakersfield

9. **Committee Recommendations**

**Action Items:**

Appreciation for the S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation’s Support of the California State University Efforts to Implement the California Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards (AS-3190-14/APEP). Approved by acclamation.

Opposition to AB 46 (Pan) California State University: Online Education (AS-3191-14/FGA). First Reading/Waiver. Approved.

**First-reading Items**

- Resolution on Improving Campus Response to Sexual Assault and Sexual Violence (AS-3192-14/FA)
- Protecting the Academic Freedom of California State University Faculty Facing Harassment from Outside Political Pressure Groups (AS-3193-14/FA)

10. **Adjournment** at 2:45 p.m.