California State University
Campus Academic Senate Chairs
Minutes: Meeting of 8 October 2015

PRESENT: Senate chairs from all CSU campuses except San Bernardino, Sonoma, Bakersfield and Stanislaus

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m.
2. The chairs of the CSU campus Academic Senates introduced themselves.
3. Agenda was approved.
4. Praveen Soni, CSULB was elected convener and Emily Bonney, CSUF was elected Secretary.
5. Report from Steven Filling from the ASCSU.
   a. Coordination between the Statewide Senate and the campus senates is important.
   b. General Education will be the focus of attention this year for several reasons.
      i. Community colleges have been conducting a pilot for a quantitative reasoning course that resulted in a much higher pass rate (75%) than the traditional remediation sequence (25-30%). The Math Council has embarked on a review of the course, which contains 70% less algebra than the traditional course.
      ii. High unit majors have been whittling away at the number of GE courses. GEAC will be considering requests from engineering to eliminate the critical thinking requirement on the theory that critical thinking is imbedded in their curriculum, but this argument does not acknowledge the need to consider social thinking as well.
      iii. Community College baccalaureate programs have chosen to offer six units of upper division GE raising questions about the transferability of those courses and whether the UC will accept in graduate admissions.
   c. Shared governance also will be an important topic particularly given the unfortunate circumstances at some CSU campuses such as Chico and San Bernardino.
      i. Discussion of the role of the ASCSU in these cases.
      ii. While the Executive Committee does not have any jurisdiction, visits by ASCSU leadership can still be helpful to reassure campus faculty.
   d. 15 Community College Baccalaureate programs were approved even though responses from some CSU campuses indicated 13 had duplicative content. Legislative auditor will review in five years.
   e. New Executive Chancellor Blanchard is committed to system and to students but the enormous scale of the CSU is an issue.
      i. RCSA notifications were late in going out.
      ii. Realized there was a problem with the background check policy when lecturers couldn’t meet classes at the beginning of the semester.
f. Discussion points
   i. Burden background check imposes on a range of activities that involve
      volunteers.
   ii. Concern that current trend over-emphasizes the professional skill set and
      the need to turn the argument back on industry
   iii. Lack of clear guidelines for transferability of GE units within the CSUs

   a. Each campus in attendance reported on the status of resolutions in favor of open
      presidential searches and discussion raised several points.
      i. Some concerns that good candidates will opt out of the process if they know
         their candidacy as a finalist will be made public.
      ii. In discussions need to separate the outcome (we were/were not happy with
         the ultimate choice) from the process.
      iii. One solution may be to seek larger number of faculty on the search
         committee to reassure campus that faculty voice will be heard.
      iv. Concern that passing such a resolution on a campus with a new president will
         be taken as a vote of no confidence.
      v. Need of campus community to meet and interview finalists for president and vice versa trumps argument that good people might opt out.
      vi. Assumption that people always have career goals and should be expected to be seeking opportunity so campuses shouldn’t feel betrayed when good administrators look for advancement.
   b. Consideration of draft resolution expressing support of CASC for open searches.
      i. Concern that such a resolution does not adequately express the diversity of
         the campuses’ views.
      ii. Postponement of any action.
      iii. Brief discussion of listserv etiquette.

7. Steve Relyea discussion on sustainability report and recommendations.
   a. Decision to undertake the study and report was that current system is not working.
      i. Relationship state of California and CSU has changed.
      ii. State funding and tuition remain constant but pressure to admit and graduate more students results in an unsustainable model.
      iii. At the end of the day the system remains committed to providing a high-quality education at a low cost to students who have fulfilled all requirements.
   b. Timetable: Gather comments through 12 October and submit revised second draft to Board of Trustees in November and then a further revised version out in January 2016.
   c. Discussion
      i. Current situation is formula driven and not everyone understands the formulas. Adjustments for campuses not yet large enough to sustain themselves. Have based model on enrollment and constant growth but some campuses are at capacity.
      ii. Want funding allocations to include as few strings as possible to allow for flexibility. Each campus should be able to make its own decisions.
      iii. While the system was fortunate to receive the funding requested, the state
will want an accounting and to see results.

iv. The imminence of performance-based funding means establishing appropriate metrics and avoiding the Draconian measures imposed in some states.

v. Reliance on market-based tuition and philanthropy to make up the difference between state and tuition support is problematic on several scores.

vi. Running a 12-month program also may work for only certain campuses or programs. Can’t get additional funding so more a matter of spreading students across the year.

vii. Agreement that we shouldn’t have to keep making the case that graduating students just for the sake of graduating them has no value. The health of the state depends on the continued vitality of the CSU system, and there is nowhere that the state gets a better return on its investment.

viii. Adjusting student fees, including the various Student Success Initiatives, has been difficult, and we want to avoid getting the state involved.

ix. One possibility would be to make tiny incremental changes to the tuition so that students and their families are not confronted with a significant increase in a single year. There has to be recognition that expenses increase.

8. Discussion of CBA 20.37
   a. During the discussion it emerged that some campuses are out of compliance because they have been unable to constitute a committee or reach consensus on the conditions of the awards.
   b. The majority of campuses have made awards with no one having yet faced an appeal.
   c. Agreement that the distinction appears to be between actions that are a normal expectation and those that are expected to be exceptional.
   d. For many institutions process seemed to take a lot of time for not very big awards.

   a. Poor morale at Chico had led to discontent such that there were discussions of a vote of no confidence in the President.
   b. A campus climate survey was conducted to clarify the issues.
   c. Resistance to releasing the analysis of the data and instability in the Provost’s office set in motion a series of events that led to a resolution that was forwarded to the Chancellor’s office.
   d. Chancellor’s response did not satisfy the Chico community which created a resolution response team that created a detailed questionnaire that took two-hours to complete and had a 55% response rate.
   e. There were further steps to resolve the issues including the president’s refusal to allow release of the questionnaire results until after convocation. President’s appointment of provost without consultation precipitated another plea to the chancellor’s office.
   f. Particular concerns about retribution and control of deans whose retreat rights would not be effective until three years after began appointment. Faculty did not feel safe.
g. Chancellor admonished faculty and refused to intervene.
h. Appreciation to Steve Filling for his support.
i. Discussion of other experiences of bad faculty-administration relationships in the system.
10. Request that chairs submit suggestions for other discussion topics. April 7 meeting will be at San Francisco State, December 3 in Long Beach and February 11 at Long Beach.
11. Meeting adjourned at 3:00.