

Academic Senate CSU (ASCUSU)

*401 Golden Shore, Suite 139
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210*

www.calstate.edu/acadsen

Christine M. Miller, Chair

Tel 916-704-5812

Fax 562-951-4911

E-mail: cmiller@calstate.edu

Minutes

January 26-27, 2017

Office of the Chancellor

Thursday, January 26 2017 - 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium

Senate Social – Academic Preparation & Education Programs Committee

5:15 p.m. to 6:45 p.m., Munitz Lobby

Friday, January 27, 2017 - 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium

Call to order

With a quorum being present, the meeting was called to order.

Roll call

Senators Present: Bakersfield (Frye (Absent), Murphy); Channel Islands (Aloisio, Yudelson); Chico (Schulte, Selvester); Dominguez Hills (Esposito, Norman); East Bay (Fleming (Absent), Gubernat); Fresno (Benavides, Schlievert); Fullerton (Bruschke, Hoven Stohs, Meyer); Humboldt (Creadon, Malloy(SUB)); Long Beach (Hood, Klink (Absent), Soni); Los Angeles (Baaske, Riggio (SUB)); Maritime (Browne, Trevisan); Monterey Bay (Davis, Nishita); Northridge (Chong, Schutte, Swenson); Pomona (Speak, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Groen(SUB), Ullman); San Diego (Butler-Byrd, Eadie, Ornatowski); San Francisco (Collins, Yee-Melichar, Vacant); San Jose (Lee, Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Foroohar, LoCasio); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Reeder); Stanislaus (Filling, Strahm); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack); Office of the Chancellor (Van Cleve).

Guests: Loren Blanchard, CSU Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs; Kathleen Chavira, Associate Vice Chancellor, Advocacy and State Relations; Harold Goldwhite, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA); Andrew Merrifield, CFA Liaison; Dia Poole, Alumni Council Liaison; Michael Ratcliff, CSSA Liaison; Framroze Virjee, Executive Vice Chancellor General Counsel; Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor.

Approval of agenda

Senator Soni moved that Agenda Item 10.8 become a new 10.4. The vote was called. The motion carried. The vote was called to accept the reordering. The motion carried. Senator Yee-Melichar moved to insert “Summer” in item 10.1. The motion carried. The Agenda was Approved as Amended.

Approval of November 3-4, 2016 minutes

The Minutes were Approved as Amended.

Announcements

Senator Swartz welcomed Senator Gubernat back. Senator Yee-Melichar announced that the Gerontology Conference will occur at SF State University and Senator Mark Leno will be honored for his work. Dr. Goldwhite announced that students at CSU Bakersfield has endowed an institute which supports student athletes. At-Large Senator Baaske announced that he will be in charge of collecting and issuing receipts for those senators interested in making augmented contributions to the Reed Scholarship. Chair Miller announced a call for volunteers to server on a senate committee. Senators Esposito, Schlievert, and Speak volunteered.

Presentations/Introductions

Senator Baasky presented Senator Reggio as the replacement for Senator Bodinger-De Uriarte from CSU Los Angeles. Ms. Tracy introduced new ASCSU Office Staff member Michelle. Senator Ullman introduced Senator Groen as the substitute for Senator Steffel from CSU San Bernardino. Vice Chair Nelson, on behalf of Senator Creadon, introduced Senator Malloy as the replacement for Senator Eschker from Humboldt State University.

Trustee Nominee Process (Time Certain: 9:00 a.m. Thursday)

Trustee Nominee Committee Chair Soni reported that the committee met and all members were present. The committee reviewed applications materials, all were complete, Dropbox was used, and all did due diligence in assessment to ensure that qualified pool moved forward. There were three applicants. The nominees to be sent forward – in no order – are as follows:

1. Susan Holl (SAC)
2. Romey Sabalius (SJ State)
3. Steven Filling (Stanislaus)

Trustee Nominee Committee Chair Soni also reported that an anonymous letter was received concerning a nominee and will not be included in the materials to be evaluated by the committee. Lastly, Senator Soni reported that he will be collecting question from senators to be asked of the candidates. The list will be narrowed to approximately six questions. The committee also discussed the format of the process for the March plenary (i.e., Each candidate will make a two minute statement, questions will be asked, and each candidate will make a closing statement, the vote will occur, and the names of two candidates will be sent forward.). It is important to pay attention to fairness and equity. There was discussion as to whether or not follow-up questions would be allowed. The committee decided in the spirit of equity, follow-up questions will not be allowed. If senators find irregularities, then please inform the committee and Chair Miller to ensure consistency in practice.

Reports

Chair

Chair Miller reported that it has been her privilege to represent the Academic Senate of the California State University between our last plenary meeting and the present one. She offered the following listing of her activities followed by summary and commentary on key issues that arose during that time:

Meetings and Activities

November, post-plenary

- Graduation Initiative 2025 Advisory Committee conference call
- Wang Awards Selection Committee (virtual)
- California State Student Association Executive Director in Long Beach
- November Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- Joint ASCSU/CFA Intellectual Property faculty group (virtual)
- San Jose State University Campus Senate and Executive Committee
- Association of Governing Boards survey interview (virtual)
- Academic Council in San Francisco

December

- Council of Campus Chairs meeting in Long Beach
- ASCSU interim virtual meeting
- Interim “agenda setting” meeting with Chancellor and cabinet in Long Beach
- San Diego State University Campus Senate and Executive Committee
- Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates meeting in Sacramento
- Intersegmental Coordinating Committee meeting in Sacramento
- Nichole Murillo, CSU Governmental Relations Office in Sacramento

January, pre-plenary

- Tenure Density Task Force (virtual)
- Kevin Powers, Senate Higher Education Committee Staff in Sacramento
- Christian Osmena, Department of Finance in Sacramento
- Alumni Council (virtual)
- CSU Governmental Relations Office Welcome Reception in Sacramento

Upcoming

- Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee in Long Beach

Academic Senate CSU

- California State Student Association in San Luis Obispo
- Honorary Degree Recommending Committee in Long Beach
- Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- Intersegmental Senate Chairs (virtual)
- Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates in Sacramento
- Academic Conference in San Diego
- San Luis Obispo Senate and Executive Committee
- Interim “agenda setting” meeting with Chancellor White and cabinet
- CSU Fullerton Senate meeting
- Tenure Density Task Force meeting in Long Beach
- Academic Council in Long Beach
- Campus Senate Chair’s Council meeting in Long Beach
- ASCSU virtual interim

Key Issues

General Education

Chair Miller also discussed how her last report referenced Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-19: *General Education Requirements Survey*, which resulted in each campus sending to the Chancellor’s Office an accounting of the requirements of its GE program. In the meantime, the Senate passed AS-3271-16/AA (Rev), “Establishment of an Academic Senate CSI (ASCSU) Task Force to Study General Education.” The response by the Chancellor’s Office was positive. At this January meeting, the Executive Committee will be considering a document that articulates how that resolution will be operationalized, and a call for membership will follow. Ideally, the Task Force will begin its work this Spring and complete the charge next year.

Task Forces

Quantitative Reasoning: As she mentioned in her last report, follow-up on the recommendations of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) continues. The Executive Committee as well as the Chairs (or Vice Chairs) of the Academic Affairs, Academic Preparation and Education Policies, and Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee will meet with AVCs Mallon and Van Cleve on January 25, 2017 to continue discussions, and more information will be provided in committee meetings and at the plenary.

Tenure Density: The first meeting of the Task Force on Tenure Density took place on September 19, 2016. A second “virtual” meeting took place January 12, 2017, and the final in-person meeting is slated for February 22, 2017. The Task Force is charged with making its recommendations to the Chancellor by March 1, 2017.

Academic Freedom: Three faculty representatives from ASCSU and three from CFA met to discuss the draft academic freedom policy developed by the Chancellor’s Office. That meeting produced

agreement on an approach resulting in a resolution from the Faculty Affairs committee that comes back to the Senate this week for a second reading. Senators will also have the opportunity to query both EVC Blanchard and EVC Virgee at the same about academic freedom issues on Thursday morning.

Intellectual Property: The intellectual property draft has not progressed as far: it was forwarded to the presidents for their review at the beginning of December, and Chair Miller was told at the time that it would be transmitted to the Senate for our review shortly thereafter . . . about 6 weeks ago. Chair Miller had made repeated inquiries, and consistently the response is that it will be forwarded soon.

Academic Conference

Registration has closed, and the participant list is exciting: many members of the Board of Trustees, students, presidents, vice presidents, Chancellor's Office personnel and senators have made the commitment to gather in San Diego to strategize with nationally-recognized speakers on ways to close the achievement gap. The conference promises to be enlightening event.

Legislative Advocacy

Given the rather dramatic changes in legislative leadership and staff support, it's critical that ASCSU engage in effective and sustained legislative advocacy. Such a goal is consistent with November's unanimous ASCSU agreement to promote the Board of Trustees' support budget. Beyond that though, Chair Miller noted with pride that the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs committee has prioritized in-district advocacy in order to forge connections with legislators and their staffs, and she similarly is committed to developing productive relationships with policy makers. Together we all can advance the dreams of hundreds of thousands of students in the State of California who rely on us to help them succeed. What an honor. The following concerns and questions were raised.

1. Senator Chong explained the Curriculum Advising, Program Planning (CAPP) committee. See Senator Chong for details of committee duties and efforts. In short, senators are requested to read grant proposals and offer feedback. The committee is intersegmental and one more member is needed.
2. Chair Miller made call for volunteers to serve on committees with appointments to be made by ExCom. Chair Miller also explained the nature of conversations on the potential Quantitative Reasoning Shared Governance Communication Group.
3. Immediate Past Chair Filling thanked Chair Miller for her efforts to ensure the effectiveness of shared governance in the formation of the Center for Math Instruction.
4. It is important to consider how the senate can help to ensure best practices as we move forward.
5. What is the motive behind the resistance to having a steering committee?

Standing committees

Academic Affairs (AA)

Central in AA Chair Ullman's agenda was the "Commendation of the CSU Institute of Teaching and Learning (ITL) Summer Institute 2016" coming to plenary in Second Reading and potential resolutions on "Support for Graduate Education in the California State University (CSU)" and "Tenure Density." A resolution in support for the Doctorate of Nursing Practitioner would also be discussed in preparation for the March plenary. AA would also meet with AVC Mallon and AVC Thomas. Pending Title V changes were discussed with AVC Mallon and the committee continued discussions of C/C- in the Golden Four.

Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)

Central in APEP Vice Chair Barsky's agenda, on behalf of Chair Fleming, was the resolution on "A Call for Increased Funding to the California State University (CSU)" brought to the floor by Chair Fleming during the previous plenary. APEP met with CO Liaisons AVC Forbes and AVC Sullivan. CSU mentor is ending and APEP discussed the new format of Calstateapply available June 1, 2017. This program will allow the integration of undergrad, graduate, and international student application processes, and an enhanced interface. Student materials will be available to all campuses to which students apply. Vice Chair Barsky further reported that APEP heard from James Minor about course redesign efforts. APEP also discussed reviews of CCC course, the baccalaureate as a requirement for a teacher credential and the relevance of this to the teacher shortage in the State of California. Lastly, Vice Chair Barsky reported that APEP would be hosting the ASCSU social. The following concerns and question were raised:

1. To what extent might running a class from 7am.-10p.m. be useful to ensuring student success?
2. Did anyone ask the LAO if their offices were used until 10p.m.
3. The New York Times had an article on why men do not take women's job. It is important to think about the adjectives used so that we can attract more men into the teaching fields.
4. It is important to push back on this inconsistent discussion of effectiveness versus efficiency. We are here to help people learn, as we are hoping that they are the future leaders of the State of California. If students work a full day, then trying to get the same amount of learning out of the student is difficult.
5. Senator Holl thanked APEP for their work.

Faculty Affairs (FA)

Central in FA Chair Norman's agenda were two resolutions to be brought to plenary in Second Reading: Academic Freedom Policy and Lactation Resource Policy and Practices in the State of California (CSU). Revisions would be reflective of feedback received by the body. FA would also discuss the preparation of three new resolutions to be brought to plenary in First Reading: "Shared Governance and Security of Employment for Contingent Faculty, Librarians, Coaches, and Counselors," "Political Organizations Attacks on Students

and Faculty,” and “Supporting DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals).” Lastly, FA met with CO Liaison Kennedy and CFA Liaison Merrifield. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Chair Miller requested information on search committee vacancies.
2. Dr. Raman informed FA of a pilot program on mentoring scenarios to help guide them through the successful completion of grant writing. The goal of this is to support faculty going after national grants.

Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)

Central in FGA Chair Soni’s agenda was FGA’s resolutions on the proposed 2017-18 tuition increase and the one brought to floor by APEP Chair Fleming, and resolution on Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students. FGA also met with AVC Storm regarding the governor’s preliminary 2017-18 CSU budget and Christian Osmena, Department of Finance. The 2017-18 budget was also discussed. The budget is \$169 million short the Board of Trustees’ (BoT) request. Getting these additional funds is unlikely. With the new government in Washington, there may be federal programs that are at risk. Chair Soni further reported that the propose student fee increase was also discussed and many legislators feel that fee increases should be tied to graduation rates. FGA also discussed how to better interact with the Department of Finance. The committee also debriefed on local advocacy efforts. Senator Soni ask for recognition of Senator Swartz to get local advocacy efforts going. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Is it possible to disaggregate the working students from the non-work students in discussions of the four year graduate rates?
2. The in-district advocacy meetings have been very successful. It is important to pay attention to what legislators think. They do not know the tenure track density issues.
3. It is important to factor in discussion of graduation rates the reality that 23% of our students suffer from depression.
4. It is important to factor in the necessary professional preparation of students in high unit arts majors.
5. It is important to lead with what legislators like as strategies for moving forward on what we want to see accomplished.
6. Is it possible to address the study on hunger and homelessness with legislators? Faculty are donating to organizations that assist struggling students.
7. It is important to have a realistic picture of who our students are.
8. Homelessness and hunger was the main conversation with Senator Connie Leyva.
9. It is important to tap into the expertise of the CSU faculty to educate legislators. This expertise could provide data for advocating for higher budgets.

Steven Stepanek – CSU Faculty Trustee

CSU Faculty Trustee reported that his report on the November 15-16, 2016 Board of Trustees meeting is a separate attachment to this report in case senators would like to read it. He

Academic Senate CSU

also summarized many his activities since the November 2016 ASCSU Plenary. On November 9th and 10th, Faculty Trustee Stepanek made trustee campus visits to CSU Monterey Bay and CSU East Bay. Both visits were very informative. Because these visits occurred just after the presidential election results were announced, both visits took on a special tone both with the groups he met with on the campuses and his participation in a town hall style open meeting of Monterey Bay students with campus president Ochoa. As usual for each campus visit, Faculty Trustee Stepanek requested to meet with the campus president, their cabinet, faculty leadership and student leadership besides receiving informative tours of the campus facilities and innovative instruction projects.

Faculty Trustee Stepanek also reported that On November 17th, immediately after the Board of Trustees meeting, he had the opportunity to travel to San Diego State University for a trustee visit. One of the highlights of that visit was the early Thanksgiving dinner with campus president Hirshman and the Guardian Scholars, a remarkable group of SDSU students who have gone through foster care, been wards of the state or been homeless. On December 1st, Faculty Trustee Stepanek attended the December meeting of the CSU Campus Senate Chairs which occurred in Long Beach at the Chancellor's Office. Major topics during this meeting included the proposed CSU budget for 2017-2018, the possible tuition increase and the Graduation Initiative 2025 project. December 10th was winter commencement day at CSU San Bernardino where he attended both the morning and the afternoon events. Graduation commencements are always very joyful occasions for everyone involved; they are celebrations of student accomplishment and family pride in that accomplishment.

Lastly, Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported that after the fall finals and winter commencements, campus activities took their normal pause for the winter break, providing an opportunity to slow the pace and reflect on the events of 2016. The formal agenda for the January 31st-February 1st meeting of the Board of Trustees has been released (<http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/>). As one might expect, a major topic for discussion will be an update on the California state budget proposal for 2017-2018, its impact on the CSU, and the possibility of a tuition increase of no more that \$270 per year for full-time undergraduate students. A vote on any possible tuition increase will not occur until the March meeting of the Board of Trustees. In case you have not seen it, the Chancellor's Office has a web site up regarding the proposed tuition increase (<https://www2.calstate.edu/attend/paying-for-college/tuition-adjustments/>). There will undoubtable also be discussion of the potential impact the new federal administration may have on California, the CSU, and the people of California. On Wednesday,

January 25th, Faculty Trustee Stepanek will be attending the CSU Meta-Major meeting occurring in San Francisco. Central in this discussion was exploratory pathways. He will return to Long Beach that evening and will be available to answer questions you may have during the ASCSU Plenary on Thursday and Friday. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important for the BoT to consider the long-term sustainability of our institution. Have there been any conversations on where the money is going? The DOW is near 20,000. There could be a bigger piece of the pie if we advocated for revision of Prop 13, oil severance taxes, etc. Why isn't our BoT talking about the money out there and the ways we need to get it, rather than allowing our institution to become beholden to private interests?
2. It is important to consider the tightrope that we have to walk as a state agency. It will be very interesting to hear the conversation that take place at the ASCSU. The middleclass grants are at stake and this may be more important than the student fee increase. The absence of this grant will hurt a specific part of the student population.
3. Why haven't the trustees made statements about severance taxes? It is important to recognize the constraints of discussions; however, it is also important to acknowledge that this discussion is being had by trustees.
4. Individuals have been raising the issue but it is not a statement from the BoT.
5. When we engage in these meta-major conversations, will we allow students to change their minds? Some students want out of this structure and we should help them.
6. As our students become more non-traditional, why can't we allow our students to create non-traditional lines of education? If we really want our students to graduate, then maybe we should try asking them what they want and how we can help them to get there.
7. Why are students not able to appeal their non-resident termination? As new information becomes available, why should students not be able to appeal?
8. Students often ask for more classes that they need to graduate and more classes at night that they need to graduate. We need to find ways to balance the two. Independent majors would not be feasible.

Other committees and committee liaisons

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC)

GEAC Vice Chair, Mark Van Selst, on behalf of Chair Creadon, reported that GEAC engaged in a discussion of the C/C- issues, as the C- memo is still in effect, so the grade of C- does count for the Golden Four GE. This conflicts with the ASCSU Resolution (AS-3269-16/AA/APEP (Rev)) and the prior agreement discussed with the CSU CO that a course should count if it counted at the university where the course was taken. The committee also discussed the Online Oral Communication Pilots. Central in this discussion was the action to allow the pilot to continue. Assessment data on student learning will be requested, as this may prove informative as the May 2017 deadline approaches. Otherwise, the same set of original pilots would extend to 2017-18 with the expectation that learning outcomes data would be reported online vs. in-person. Vice Chair Van Selst also reported that GEAC discussed the Math 110 C-ID Descriptor. The following three questions, representing queries of the STATWAY pilots, were discussed:

1. What is the SLO assessment data and how does it compare to the skills and practices spelled out in the foundational expectations in the QRTF report.
2. How is the appropriateness of course selection addressed for different student audiences (i.e., feedback on how STEM/ Health Science/ Business)?
3. Is it possible to hold off on any new STATWAY/CAPP/ proficiency-attainment pilot participation heretofore until the Math 110 issue is resolved and in the larger context of QRTF action?

CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL)

Senator Yee-Melichar reported that the committee met Monday, January 23, 2017. Senators Schulte and Yee Melichar were in attendance. Director McGruder gave an informative report that contained both quantitative and qualitative data. SJSU was commended for their hard work and collaboration on the symposium. Director McGruder spoke about the faculty collaborative and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) activities pursued by the CO. Senator Yee-Melichar also expressed disappointment on the lack of funding for the 2017 ITL Summer Institute and discussed the role of ITL in the CSU Quantitative Reasoning. The next committee meeting will occur on March 14, 2017. Campus concerns about amending RTP to include recognition of the scholarship of teaching and learning will be a central focus of discussion.

Academic Conference

Academic Conference Committee Chair, Senator Soni, reported that the committee had met over lunch and planning is coming along. San Diego State University and their new Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Platinum Certified Student Union Building would be showcased during the conference. Committee Chair Soni also reported that SDSU students would offer tours, followed by a dinner, and welcome speeches from Chancellor White, President Lopez of the California State Student Association (CSSA), and representative of the BoT. The Friday keynote would be given by Diane Ravitch and breakout sessions would follow. Tia Brown McNaire would follow with another keynote, and breakout sessions would follow. The goal of these breakout sessions was to enable conversations across ranks and disciplines. 175 attendees are expected. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Is it possible that senators can rent a bus to travel to and from campus?
2. Thursday night, the conference will be in the Student Union in Montezuma Hall. The Double Tree is immediately across from the trolley stop. This will take you to campus. On Friday, the events will be at the Alumni Center. The trolley is close to the center and there will be plenty of parking.
3. Senator Brodowsky, offered faculty senators to his home for a reception on Thursday night. It may be important to the make a list of those who would be driving to assist with moving with people to and fro.

Discussion Items

Dia Poole – CSU Alumni Council Liaison Report (Time Approximate: Thursday, 10:00 a.m.)

CSU Alumni Council Liaison Poole reported that the Alumni Council had been telling legacy family stories to highlight the impact of the CSU on California families. The new goals of the council would be to discuss ways to further identify legacy families and create a tool kit for how to recognize the families during graduation ceremonies and encourage their participation in CSU advocacy with legacy family lapel pins, etc. Liaison Poole also reported that the CSSA had taken an interest in this project and Chair Miller had been contacted regarding participation as well. The council would also be examining the Graduation Initiative 2025 and how alumni might serve as a resource to enable success. 3.3 million alumni could be engaged to work with students and provide momentum for closing the achievement gaps. Specific actions that alumni can take will also be explored (i.e., career preparation, emergency grant funding, etc.). Liaison Poole further reported that the Alumni Council members would review individual campus plans, which could be found on the Chancellor's website. Potential collaborations would be discussed during the March meeting. With respect to CSU advocacy, the gap in proposed funding has been examined. Advocacy to assist in the augmentation of the budget would be engaged by the council, as they are interested in BoT discussion of tuition adjustment. Lastly, Liaison Poole reported that Sac State places 64 Capital Fellows in legislative offices and 54 will be based in Sacramento and 10 in courts throughout the state. This is a great way to bring the next generation into leadership and faculty play an important role in ensure a robust candidate pool by recommendation. Mid-career and post graduate are also eligible for the Capital Fellows program. The deadline is February 13, 2017. The Alumni would also participate in Super Sunday in both Northern and Southern California. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important to remember that "Bar Crawl" has a very specific meaning and it is necessary to pay attention to the implications that intoxication can have.
2. Is it possible to create a CSU Emeriti passport?
3. A speaker bureau would be very useful for the faculty. This would enable students to talk with alumni as peers. This would also show students that there is opportunity after the CSU.
4. Super Sunday is outreach at Christian churches; however, there are other religions. It is important to consider Super Fridays and other day when other religious communities can be reached to encourage their attendance in the CSU.

Academic Senate CSU

5. As a first-generation college graduate, it is important to expand our understanding of who our students are, especially those that are second, third, and fourth generation students. They can be great resources.

Andrew Merrifield - CFA Liaison Report (Time Approximate: Thursday 10:30 a.m.)

California Faculty Association (CFA) Liaison Merrifield, on behalf of President Jen Eagan, reported that the governor's budget is insufficient and the CFA would be working to increase the state allocation. The governor seems to put money in a rainy day fund, rather than funding higher education. This action could lead to the killing of the middle class scholarship, as well as fee hikes. Liaison Merrifield also reported that the report "Equity Interrupted" had been published and it is intended to convey the relevance of the shortfall in the CSU budget. The report has graphics that are reflective of CSU needs. The report has also been discussed with the CO. As students get darker, it seems the funding for the CSU gets lighter. The faculty union believes that it is unethical to ignore this issue and it will continue to be examined. The CFA will continue an internal fight against bias and racism. Faculty are offered workshops on unconscious bias and the need for equity in the CSU and State of California. Liaison Merrifield further reported that, on the subject of bargaining, the calendar has been changed as a result of the current contract and could begin any time after July 1, 2017. The goal will be to come up with a bargained salary and the CFA and CO can lobby collectively on funding needs thereafter. The CFA will continue collecting information on bargaining concerns and new ideas on the CFA website. The CFA will continue presentations on campuses this spring. Lastly, Liaison Merrifield reported that there were several bills that the CFA has examined and would continue monitoring. They are as follows:

1. AB 21: This supports DACA Students with housing support and legal services, as well as health care.
2. Fee moratorium. No fee increase until 2021 and the CFA continues to be guide that the education should be free.
3. ACR 73 legislation: This will enable the creation of 75% tenure and tenure track/25% lecturer faculty in the CSU.
4. Tuition Free University Resolution may be going before the legislature. This will establish a working group on how to make university education free.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. San Jose recently made the news in housing affordability. It is important to pay attention to housing insecurity among tenured and new tenure-track faculty. What will the CFA do to address this issue and advocate for folks who live in high cost of living areas?
2. It is important to push for reasonable wages and this concern should be sent to the bargaining team.
3. Lecturer range elevation is being supported in a way that enables some lecturers to receive an increase in pay.
4. This is the result of an agreement reached before binding arbitration and allows for lecturers that have not been reached for a number of year to receive additional needed pay. Information can be found on the CFA website.

5. It is important to remember the fiscal consequences of increasing tenure density. Lecturers play a very important role in the university system. It is important to distinguish between the function of lecturers and tenure-track faculty. There needs to be a rationale for the contributions that faculty make that is not often associated with their salary (i.e., students mentoring). This is an added value that faculty make that is seldom counted. These should be advocated.
6. We need multiple arguments in order for there to be a holistic understanding of the contributions that faculty make.
7. It is important to remember workload and the important work that the CFA has been done to ensure that attention is given to the unpaid work that faculty often do (i.e., advising graduate students, mentoring, etc.)
8. CFA Liaison Merrifield can be contacted at amerrifield@calfac.org.

Loren Blanchard – CSU Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs & Framroze Virjee – Executive Vice Chancellor General Counsel (Time Certain: Thursday 11:00 a.m.)

CSU Executive Vice Chancellors (EVC) Blanchard and Virjee met with the ASCSU to discuss Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property. EVC Blanchard reminded the ASCSU of the value of these discussions at a time when our student will be completing their programs and beginning professional lives. He also reported that once the draft Academic Freedom Policy is received from committee, it will go to collective bargaining. EVC Virjee discussed the importance of understanding collective bargaining under California's Higher Education Employee Relations Acts (HEERA) and the values that it holds for the ASCSU. The values of Academic Freedom in the CSU preceded HEERA and it is not intended to restrict academic and professional practices in the CSU; however, with respect to collective bargaining, the CSU has an obligation to meet and confer on terms and conditional of employment. It is unlawful to speak with any group on a matter related to the terms and conditions of employment. While no definition of consultation is given, it is important to consider whether Academic Freedom is covered by conditions of employment. Therefore, the CSU has an obligation to meet with the CFA on changes in policy. The following possibilities were suggested:

1. CFA waive their right to Academic Freedom as a collective bargaining point.
2. The ASCSU, CFA, and CSU have a tripartite discussion.
3. Consultation could occur first with the ASCSU and negotiations later occur with the CFA.

EVCs Blanchard and Virjee also reported that feedback was given on what the ASCSU would like to see in a CSU policy on Academic Freedom. The feedback from the ASCSU is appreciated, as well as the ASCSU consultation with the CFA. In order to negotiate with the CFA on Academic Freedom, the CFA needs to agree to negotiation. An Intellectual Property policy is also under discussion. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important to look to the University of Chicago on policy on Academic Freedom and Free Speech for a way to create language the assert our desire to recruit the best faculty and that we fully embrace Academic Freedom.
2. One of the problems that we have had in the past when talking about Academic Freedom is that faculty are talking about principle and administration is talking

about legal bargaining concerns. This causes two different conversations to occur and bypass one another. The ASCSU has never asked the administration to negotiate the principles of Academic Freedom or Free Speech. All that has been asked these past five years is to develop a definition that you have in mind about Academic Freedom. All major universities have a major statement about Academic Freedom. Is it possible to have a definition of Academic Freedom that we can show to the world with pride? In a resolution produced last year, the ASCSU presented faculty understandings of the principle of Academic Freedom and it was met with a barrier. A statement would enable us to respond to the new challenges that faculty face with technology, Free Speech, and violations of Academic Freedom. We hope that we can reach an agreement.

3. Not responding to the suggestions does not mean that they are not appreciated. They will be discussed with the executive team and taken into account in the process. While Academic Freedom as an inalienable right is respected, it is important to remain aware of the contexts that the policy and associated practices have to be negotiated as part of the collective bargaining process.
4. As academics, we need a different lens to view Academic Freedom. Discussing this issue through a legalistic framework sounds corporate. This is alarming. What is needed is a conversation at the table with different views and different roles on a topic as complicated as Academic Freedom.
5. It is important to remember that the focus on the process is necessary when negating the substance that needs to be discussed. The legislature has created a structure that limits the nature of our discussions. This is not meant to be nefarious. This does not mean that the Academic Senate cannot provide input. Feedback will all be taken into account. In a corporate negotiation, we get to talk to each other. This sounds like a one-way conversation.
6. It is important to remember that the policy draft you have before you had a real academic lens in the shaping of the policy.
7. Chair Miller suggested that the concerns generated by this conversation can be used to modify the rationale for the resolution to be discussed later.
8. It is important for new senators to know that the conversations had already begun prior to EVC Blanchard joining the CSU and these were taken into consideration.

EVC Blanchard also reported that the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) had not created recommendations that could be carried forward. In November, the report was circulated to different campuses and feedback is due on February 6, 2017. A few campus faculty have asked for more time to provide additional feedback. Campus communities were also asked to pay attention to equity and access and investigate strategies for how to not exacerbate the situation of underrepresented groups during implementation. Suggestions for operationalizing taskforce recommendations have been asked of the ASCSU. It is important to remember that the CO supports the efforts of the QRTF and will continue to seek advice as implementation advances. EVC Blanchard also reported that the Admissions Advisory Council, APEP, GEAC, Math Council, and future advisory committee for the proposed Center for Math Instruction, etc. will all be stakeholders in next steps. The senate chair and vice chair or designees will also be asked to participate in discussions. It is important to stress the relevance of the task force's work to ensure student success, as inaction impacts the lives of

thousands of students. We will have to move this work along as expeditiously as possible. SJSU, SFSU, Bakersfield, etc. have all been visited in order to understand the roles that faculty will play in student success plans. Lastly, EVC Blanchard acknowledged the work being done by the ASCSU. Much is being heard about the academic conference in San Diego and the conversations and recommendations will be well received. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important to review the Online Education Whitepaper in relation to the new June memo on Online Education. To what extent was the Whitepaper considered? It is important to review it before information is sent to campuses.
2. A leading administrator at SJSU has suggested that the Chancellor is in favor of three-unit courses being the norm in the CSU. There are many pedagogical reasons for questioning this practice. Is this an attempt to streamline our curricula?
3. This information has not been seen coming from the Chancellor. Discussion has been heard that three-unit courses are beneficial for meeting the 120-unit marker. Please allow time for the review of this concern.
4. During our November plenary AS 3020 and 69, several senators came up with a good way to deal with the C/C- issue. What is the best path forward? Has there been any new information provided?
5. Please allow this information to be reviewed and an answer will be given, if not before the end of the plenary today.
6. It is important to engage in conversations, rather than soliciting comments on the QRTF. It is important that conversations about the report occur in tandem with implementation. These conversations should also occur between faculty, rather than administrators. It also seems that the center was intended to be created as a one-stop shop. Is this goal being changed? If so, then why? If not, then why not?
7. Part of the thinking about the center is that it will start out in the CO and then move to a campus. This will enable the acquisition of funding for the center and offer an initial home for it. It is important to have the right voices around the table on the center and policy to effectively move forward.
8. Given the changing national political landscape, what should the faculty be afraid of and what can be worked around?
9. We have people that are ready to begin conversations with the changing political structure to ensure that the concerns for higher education in the State of California are addressed.
10. Why is it that the ASCSU is being excluded from the policy development table? Why do we not have the ability to participate in the development of the policy?
11. Two terms that were used – consultation and advisement – are intended to ensure that the ASCSU is able to offer feedback and we have the best thinking on how to move forward.
12. On the subjects of consultation and advising, both were mentioned but the close was advising. Is only one being given attention? What is your approach to consultation?
13. We have a great starting point, which is the information obtained from the task force.

Academic Senate CSU

14. On the Graduation Initiative, we were given a presentation that showed much of the CSU budget going towards this initiative. How does the proposed governor's budget impact this initiative? Is there any new money for tenure-track hires?
15. What we have been granted is \$35million in one time funds. The trustee's budget has asked for \$75million on an ongoing basis. This would allow for 3000 classes, 400 faculty, 200 advisors, allow for the examination of academic supports that are working well, and allow campuses to expand these best-practice programs.

Harold Goldwhite – ERFA Liaison Report (Time Approximate: Thursday 1:00 p.m.)

CSU ERFA Liaison Goldwhite reported that since his last report the activities of CSUERFA have been limited. The pocket calendars for 2016-17 were distributed to members in December. This is a regular and popular activity of the Association. The Million Shoes Campaign (re-named from the Soles4Souls campaign) has been launched, and a number of campuses are participating. Please "check your local listings" and support your own campus involvement. Some key CSUERFA documents have been revised, and new versions are in production including the recruitment brochure; and the third edition of "The Survivors' Guide."). CSU ERFA Liaison Goldwhite also reported that the November edition of "The Reporter" was published and included useful articles on the new pharmacy benefit manager for most CSU employee health plans. There were a number of very impressive proposals for CSUERFA's grant program, which offers grants to CSUERFA members for scholarly and creative activities. Grant recipients will be announced next week, and the grant awards will be sent. Finally, CSUERFA Liaison Goldwhite reported on the following upcoming meetings: The CSUERFA Executive Committee will be meeting on Saturday January 28; and the State Council will be meeting on the Dominguez Hills campus on Saturday April 15. The following concerned and question were raised:

1. Senator Swartz thanked the CSUERFA liaisons – President Blische and Liaison Goldwhite for their work.

Timothy P. White – CSU Chancellor (Time Certain: Thursday 2:00 p.m.)

Due to illness, Chancellor White will give a report at a future plenary.

Framroze Virjee – Executive Vice Chancellor General Counsel (Time Certain: Thursday 3:00 p.m.)

EVC Virjee reported on "Free Speech and Expression on Campus". Central in this report were the following major points:

1. What is protected by the First Amendment (i.e., written and spoken words and expressive conduct (i.e., art, clothing, flag burning, etc.).
2. What is not protected by the First Amendment (i.e., fighting words (e.g., words that inflict injury or incite an immediate breach of the peace), true threats, defamation (e.g., slander or libel), false advertising, obscenity, severe harassment, etc.).
3. The Differences, Similarities, and Intersections of Free Speech on Campuses. Particular attention was given to CSU campuses, as public institutions, being "free speech zones" for differing viewpoints, academic inquiry, and robust discussion,

and the need for balance in the free speech protected by the First Amendment with civility, respect, and tolerance for all viewpoints. EVC Virjee further discussed how and why universities enact Time, Place, and Manner (T/P/M) Policies to help balance First Amendment rights with the needs of campus communities. Such restrictions must be free of viewpoint discrimination or censorship and all speakers must be treated equally on terms and conditions of access.

4. Incitement of Violence or Harm (i.e., advocating the use of force or producing imminent lawless action is not protected.).
5. Hate Speech (i.e., this form of speech is not an exception to the First Amendment).

EVC Virjee also discusses what campus communities could do before protests occurred (i.e., issue a positive letter expressing campus values, fight negative speech with positive speech, host a forum, create a positive forum at the same time a negative forum is held, etc.) and walked the ASCSU through several comprehensive exercises regarding hate speech, event protestors, offensive fliers, etc. His PowerPoint presentation can be found on the ASCSU website. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. As faculty members, we control what occurs in our classrooms. Sometimes students are disruptive to the environment. Can I ask the student to leave? What options do I have?
2. Because the comments are protected, they can say what they want. Provocations and disruptions can be controlled.
3. Can non-targeted parties invoke restrictions?
4. Yes. Words that create a hostile educational environment are restricted.
5. Language in evaluations can be harassing. What options do faculty have? This is an ongoing issue that faculty have.
6. If this creates a hostile work environment for faculty, then it will need to be followed up on. This is a Human Resources (HR) as well as a legal issue.
7. We used to have a handbook on Free Speech issues. Has it been revised and can you send the ASCSU copies? There are websites that post the names of students and professors and sometimes call employers. Does the CSU use its legal resources to take websites to court?
8. The handbook is in the processing of revision. The CSU does not traditionally go after third parties, as their biggest defense is that this is their opinion.
9. Is it possible for us to get a copy of your Power Point?
10. If students and faculty see postings that they want to take does, then can they? What are our responsibilities in navigating between kindness and hate?
11. It is important to use such situations as teaching moments and inform the students of campus policies.
12. Campus behavior has been mentioned; however, is off-campus behavior protected? Would the CSU defend a professor in court?
13. If the efforts are in the interest of work and research, then yes.

Academic Senate CSU

14. Showing respect for others and demonstrating restraint is sometime difficult when human rights are being encroached upon.
15. One does not have to respect the content of an opinion to treat a person respectably.
16. Thank you very much for the presentation. On harassment, when you mention severity and pervasiveness, one could talk about probability. If it is a more passive environment, then the definition of harassment must be expanded. How should one handle this as an instructor?
17. It is important to listen to a student's concerns. The First Amendment is a balance.
18. Is it possible for you to address why Academic Freedom is a bargaining issue?
19. First Amendment rights are in both the California and U.S. Constitutions. Academic Freedom is a result of agreement. When rules are put on Academic Freedom as a condition of employment, then it must be negotiated under bargaining.
20. How is it that campuses can have their own Academic Freedom policies?
21. No one stopped them from doing so and no one told them not to do so.
22. If a colleague is videotaped and uploaded to a conservative website by a student, then what implications does this hold for the need to understand consent?
23. In a one party state, consent only comes from one person. California is a two party state. If there is not a reasonable expectation of a privacy setting, then consent is not acceptable.
24. On disruption in the classroom, can disruptive students be removed?
25. If students are continuously disruptive and preventing the deliverance of course materials, then yes.
26. Public universities have a different relationship with the First Amendment than private universities. Private institutions can limit Freedom of Speech. Public institutions cannot encroach upon the right.
27. How do we untangle the notions of excellence from Academic Freedom in the HEERA Preamble?
28. It is important to pay attention to the way the different sections of HEERA interact.
29. Will the policy being drafted receive feedback from the ASCSU, be bargained with the CFA, and then reach agreement before moving forward?
30. What does the CO think that Academic Freedom will look like in the future?

Michael Ratcliffe - CSSA Liaison Report (Time Approximate: Friday 10:30 a.m.)

California State Student Association (CSSA) Liaison Ratcliffe reported that students are trying to cope with living in a post truth and alternative facts era. Students are also spending time in reflection on the election and how it might impact their lives. All aspects of the students' worlds have been affected. CSSA Liaison Ratcliffe also reported that the CSSA has not met since November and would meet this weekend. The CSSA Board of Directors is working on a letter of mutual respect, given the resistance events that have happened on CSU campuses. Legislative Affairs is working on the Bridge Act, and SB 16 Wotowski, which lowers the private loan garnishment to the federal level of 15% from the current 25%. The California Higher Education Student Summit (CHESS) will be

meeting with state legislators to discuss the need for greater funding for the CSU. The CSSA will be sharing student stories. Planning for combating the fee increase is underway and the CSSA will discuss Academic Freedom during their upcoming plenary. Resolution for supporting undocumented students, Ethnic Studies, and holding the CSU accountable will also be discussed. CSSA Liaison Ratcliffe further reported that the University Affairs committee would be discussing the first system wide faculty evaluation, open course evaluations, and the relevance of third party websites that present polarizing and outdated reviews. The committee would also be discussing a possible new course of action. The CSSA would also have a mental health resolution in first reading and discuss food and housing insecurity. Lastly, CSSA Liaison Ratcliffe reported that the CSU Legacy Alumni project would also be discussed; however, their main focus would be on the tuition increase. The students are against the tuition increase no matter what and are bringing their stories together to create records of their experiences. Legislative Affairs committee will continue to look into strategies for how to get out of this fee increase cycle. The following concerns and question were raised:

1. What is meant by open course evaluations?
2. Are there other bills that the CSSA is watching or trying to get introduced?
3. The CSSA is watching all bills that may affect the CSU. The main goal for now is to focus on CHESS.
4. Is there a mechanism by which the CSSA is searching our archives to see what the ASCSU has already worked on?
5. The monolithic approach to tuition is in some ways self-defeating. Are there discussions of access to higher education and the need for taking multiple avenues to finding the revenue needed?
6. The CSSA believes all students to be equal. There are no plans of actions focused on accessibility, rather the focus is on common concerns. There is much valuable dialogue in the ASCSU that the CSSA needs to hear about. More students are concerned with the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report (QRTFR). Accessibility to higher education is a conversation that the CSSA needs to have.
7. Is it possible to put the CHESS on the ASCSU list serve?
8. The CSSA has already been included in the ASCSU list serve.

Kathleen Chavira – Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advocacy and State Relations (Time Approximate: Friday 10:00 a.m. Virtual)

AVC Chavira reported on advocacy the need for more intimate interactions with stakeholders in order to obtain further support for the CSU. The goal of such an approach is to set a positive tone for future avenues of communication. AVC Chavira also reported that February, 23, 2017 would be the last day for the introduction of bills and tracking has already begun. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What are the top three bills that are most concerning for the CSU?
2. A couple of proposal will be given to the BoT for sponsorship. The Doctorate of Nursing Practices will be proposed. Several pilots – like those at Fresno and

Fullerton - will be discussed. Administrative authority of the CO and BoT to adopt regulations and overseas accounts for study abroad programs will also be discussed. FDIC regulations may impact these accounts and the nature of these regulations and standards required additional discussion. A limited exception in government code will be sought.

3. What points of interest have you heard being discussed?
4. From introductory meetings with new members of the legislature, faculty diversity has been discussed, there is interest in the CSU Graduation Initiative, proposed tuition adjustments, the need for making the case that we have a unique student body, and the need to see if meeting the goals of improving 4 and year 6 graduation rates are appropriate for the unique student body in the CSU. Student supports for veterans is also being discussed.
5. What are the plans for budget advocacy and what might be in play for this year?
6. The first event occurred on Jan 23, 2017. Advocates will be working to organize campus based advocacy activities and have already started to organize for March 14, 2017 event. Campuses will be engaged in advocacy in February. This will allow for communication of concerns before budget hearings start. The expectation will be to formulate a community effort. An event will be hosted on the CSU Golden Bear on April 24, 2017. The goal will be to create a broader CSU community effort.
7. The GEAC meeting will occur at this time and the ASCSU would be happy to participate.
8. Will the March 14, 2017 event be held in Sacramento? Will there be an informational guide for those that can't make it that can be used at the local level?
9. The legislative liaison will be working on this in February. It is less critical that you engage in advocacy on the same day. The members will be in Sacramento.
10. The ASCSU has been engaged in more in-district advocacy. As you develop the talking points and strategies, please share them with the ASCSU.
11. It is important for the CSU and ASCSU to work on a common message.
12. What are the strategies being discussed for generating revenues? Is there a higher source of funding that is of priority than student fees?
13. A tuition adjustment is being discussed in relationship to student services. This seems to make sense to the legislature. We should never expect to have students support tuition increases. It is incumbent upon us to make our case. There seems to be an openness to conversation. Republican legislators are not in favor of any tuition increase.
14. The legislature has not yet been clear about their budget priorities.
15. Could you explain the logic behind the budget shortfalls?
16. The budget meets the mandatory costs and obligations. Graduate Initiative, deferred maintenance, etc. fall under these.
17. If the state is not funding the needs of the CSU, the state is underfunding the CSU. How do we get more funding?
18. The budget request is made with the intent to cover what is needed. We will need to pay attention to see what the governor and legislature prioritize.

19. Are you aware of any bills that have an impact on curriculum development? It is important to pay attention to intrusion upon curriculum in the CSU.
20. The Department of Education is very interested in our general education. A pilot program is being discussed for examining multiple avenues for assessment in placement. There may be more.
21. It seems that the rainy-day fund is projected to be \$8.7 billion. How can we convince the governor to tap into the rainy-day fund to get him the graduates that he wants? There seems to be disagreement on the availability of resources for such projects. The governor wants to put one billion dollars away for a possible economic down turn. The advocacy events will be our chance to make our case to the governor.

Committee and Floor Recommendations

Support for the CSU Institute of Teaching and Learning (ITL) Institute	<u>AS-3274-16/AA (Rev)</u> Second Reading
Unanimously Approved	
Academic Freedom Policy	<u>AS-3276-16/FA (Rev)</u>
Unanimously Approved	Second Reading
Lactation Resource Policy and Practices in the California State University (CSU)	<u>AS-3277-16/FA (Rev)</u> Second Reading
Unanimously Approved	
Tuition Increases in the California State University	<u>AS-3282-16/Floor</u>
Approved without dissent	
Tuition Increases in the California State University University (CSU)	<u>AS-3278-16/Floor (Rev)</u> Second Reading
Approved	
Support for the Letter to President Trump from the Leaders of California's Systems of Higher Education about the Continuance of DACA	<u>AS-3279-16/FGA</u> First Reading/Waiver
Unanimously Approved	
Opposition to the Appointment of Betsy DeVos as US Secretary of Education	<u>AS-3280-16/APEP</u> First Reading/Waiver
Approved Without Dissent	

Advice to the CSU Tenure Density Task Force AS-3281-16/AA
First Reading/Waiver

Unanimously Approved

Employment Security for Contingent Faculty, Librarians,
Coaches and Counselors AS-3283-16/FA
First Reading

Cessation of Implied Equivalency of General Education Area
B4 for Intermediate Algebra AS-3284-16/APEP
First Reading

Saving California's Master Plan Through Tax Reform AS-3285-16/FA
First Reading

Support for Graduate Education in the California State
University (CSU) AS-3286-16/AA
First Reading

Support of the Safety and Rights of CSU Students Studying
Under Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) AS-3287-16/FA
First Reading

Adjournment

The ASCSU Plenary adjourned at 3:00p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary