

Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU)
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

DRAFT - Minutes

March 15-16, 2018
Office of the Chancellor

Thursday, March 15, 2018 - 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium

*Senate Social – Faculty Affairs Committee Hosting
Thursday 5:15 p.m. to 6:45 p.m., Munitz Lobby*

Friday, March 16, 2018 - 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium

1. Call to order
2. Roll call

Bakersfield (Millar (absent), Tarjan); Channel Islands (Aloisio, Yudelson); Chico (Ford, Selvester); Dominguez Hills (Esposito, Norman); East Bay (Fleming, Karplus (SUB-absent)); Fresno (Jenkins, Schlievert); Fullerton (Bruschke, Shahi, Stohs); Humboldt (Creadon, Eschker); Long Beach (Janousek, Klink, Soni); Los Angeles (Baaske, Riggio); Maritime (Browne, Trevisan); Monterey Bay (Davis, Waltz); Northridge (Chong, Schutte, Swenson); Pomona (Speak, Urey); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Steffel, Ullman); San Diego (Butler-Byrd (absent), Peter (SUB), Ornatowski); San Francisco (Collins, Sinha, Yee-Melichar); San Jose (Lee, Rodan, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Laver, LoCascio); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky (absent)); Sonoma (Nelson, Reeder); Stanislaus (Filling, Strahm); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack, Swartz); Office of the Chancellor (Van Cleve).

Guests: Timothy White, CSU Chancellor; Loren Blanchard, CSU Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs; Rommy Sabalius, CSU Faculty Trustee; Adam Day, Vice Chair, CSU Board of Trustees; Jane W. Carney, CSU Board of Trustees; Ryan Brown (CSSA Liaison).

3. Moment of silence for the passing of Robert Kully, Member of the ASCSU from 1973 to 1982, Campus Senate Chair CSU Los Angeles 1974-1975, and ASCSU Chair 1979-1982

4. Approval of agenda

FGA would like to withdraw 10.1

FA would like to add two first readings without waiver:

Protecting Faculty from Attacks by Outsiders

Appreciation of the AAUP Support

Academic Senate CSU

5. AA would like to add a 15-minute Committee of the Whole on Friday before 10.9 to discuss Definition of Student Success.

m/s/approved

6. Approval of January 24-25, 2018 minutes
m/s/approved

7. Announcements
None

8. Presentations/Introductions
None

9. Reports

- 9.1. Chair

Written report can be found at: http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/
Report back to plenary regarding shared governance talks. Each member of Exec also shared perspective with the senate.

Comments/Questions

Comment that Senate Chair should also sign Executive Orders.

Comment about shared governance v. shared decision making.

Concern about sharing draft document on consultation in separate meetings rather than with whole Senate.

Comment that revisiting past is needed.

Document is not ready to be shared.

Discussion of pros and cons about sharing document.

Concern about recent FAQs issued related to EO 1110.

Comment about consequences to decision making process.

Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Work Group report in BOT agenda.

Advocacy: Thank Sen. Baaske for representing ASCSU at CA Senate hearing on student success next week. Hearing is scheduled during the BOT meeting.

Tenure Density Task Force report coming soon.

ASCSU Budget. Changes to the website. Changes to space, hopefully by the September plenary.

Still looking for volunteer for review of OER.

Questions/Comments

Question about ability to fund hotel stay for people in LA area who drive, but who are not eligible for reimbursement.

Comment about budget and additional April in-person meeting proposal.

Comment about local advocacy effectiveness.

9.2. Standing committees

Academic Affairs- Ullman

Academic Affairs had a very full day yesterday. Once again, I'd like to thank my diligent academic affairs colleagues for their high level engagement and hard work. We will bring forward two resolutions in first read and are eager for your feedback. The bulk of our time was spent on these two resolutions.

The first resolution we will bring forward is on SUG and encourages full funding from the State, we have talked a lot about SUGs over the years, and really no measurable action has been taken as a result of our talking so we moving forward with this resolution in hopes of beginning to more formally address this issue.

The second resolution we are bringing forward is on student success. Specifically, we have had a working group consisting of Senators Creadon, Schlievert, Sylvester and Tarjan write the first draft of a white paper on defining student success. We are interested in both defining student success and also re-inserting the critical role and value of quality student/faculty success back into discussions (and funding) of student success. This is important to us and we need your input, and Exec and the body have graciously allowed us to have a 15-minute committee of the whole to engage the body in a discussion of this white paper and resolution of introduction.

We had a joint meeting with APEP, members of the Chancellor's Office and WestEd personnel about the descriptive studies

that they are preparing to conduct. Their initial research questions are as follows:

1. What courses, course adaptations and new course pathways have been designed in response to the Executive Order 1110?
2. What is the range of instructional interventions that have been developed across the campuses?
3. What are the various Early Start instructional models being implemented?

They plan to use a range of qualitative methods to gather data about these questions. Some of the concern and raised were although their research questions are clearly descriptive, they may be a push or inclination to infer an evaluation component. It also seems odd to many of us, that materials are being gathered but there is no data being gathered about success or effectiveness of these programs. Especially since it seems nature to what to infer more than description. Another request was to contextualize both the fast time frame for implementation and context of the campuses selected. WestEd and the CO seem very open to feedback and indeed have been forthcoming with drafts of their research plan. WestEd will be visiting various campuses although we don't know which campuses yet.

Academic Senate CSU

Finally there is new EO 1110 FAQ. There are some concerns that some information may be incorrect and we will gather the information that appears to be incorrect and speak with the GI 2025 group responsible.

Although the Academic Affairs Committee did not have time to discuss the update from the General Education Task Force, I hope faculty will take time to read and respond with any questions or input.

Questions/Comments

Request to keep us up to date on EO 1110 FAQs.

APEP – Barsky

I want to thank APEP members for their great work yesterday, and warn this body that the questions on the Chair's report went on long enough that I had plenty of time to write this report...

APEP largely divided its day yesterday in three primary activities:

- We met with one of our liaisons, AVC Eric Forbes
- We met jointly with Academic Affairs to learn about the Academic Preparation Evaluation Study being conducted by WestEd
- We developed two resolutions:
 - o Participation in Peaceful Protests
 - o Equity and Responsibility in Admission to the Distinctive Universities and Campuses of the California State University System

We were unable to meet with our second CO liaison, AVC Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, as she was attending a meeting of the CSU Deans of Education and a NGEI (Next Generation of Educators Initiative). She had made arrangements to be able to speak with us by phone, but we were still meeting with AA during that time. We did receive a written report from AVC Grenot-Scheyer. Some items of particular interest

- Dr. Sharon Russell, Director of CalStateTEACH, will be retiring this summer.
- Progress on the ITEP salary differential matter. ACSA (Association of California School Administrators) HR Directors have agreed to recognize all the normally post-bac courses students take as undergraduates. These will be reflected on a transcript in a panel beneath the BA courses. Campuses will provide a letter for students to provide to HR Directors that confirms the courses and post-bac units.
- We also received a brief on the Kern Urban Teacher Residency, which is a partnership between CSU Bakersfield and Bakersfield City School District, that creates a pipeline of quality teachers in Bakersfield. This residency has residents getting more than twice the number of hours (1380 hours; over 170 eight-hour days) than the traditional clinical model (only 600 hours; equivalent to 75 eight-hour days).

Academic Preparation Evaluation Study meeting:

The purpose of the study is to document the changes that have taken and will take place in response to EO1110. The goal is to provide a reflective study showing what we (CSU) are doing and the process for how those curricular

changes were and are developed. We might see similar evaluation studies in the future in association with Graduation Initiative undertakings. We note that educational outcomes are not explicitly addressed in the current proposed work-plan; AA Chair mentioned that they were doing focus groups with students, but not looking at actual student work-products. In this particular meeting we were reviewing the first piece of this study which is focused on chronicling and examining the curriculum changes that are being made. Members of the two committees made a number of specific suggestions about this aspect of the study. I should add that (and Senator Van Selst has already previewed this in his comments to the AA report), after this part of the meeting ended and the two committees separated, APEP members discussed the matter and, while we appreciate that we are being consulted on this matter, we are not entirely certain that it is necessary that two entire standing committees spend roughly 20% of their meeting time providing feedback on the plan, and indeed I believe that we are reasonably certain that it is not necessary.

Eric Forbes:

Admission processes: There was “abundant glitch-fixing” in CalStateApply, but this was done in real time and we have been assured that this did not affect student applications. Overall, applications for Fall 2019 are up from Fall 2018 levels throughout the system (21 of the 23 campuses). Looking forward, we now have point-in-time data that we never had with CSU Mentor about the number of students who have begun their applications; with Mentor, we only knew about the interest of potential students once they had hit the “Submit” button and crossed the threshold, moving from being a potential applicant to being an actual applicant. There still are some “irritations” with the credential application process, but these are being addressed; apparently there are a lot of questions that are appropriate only for multiple-subject and single-subject credential applicants, that all credential applicants are being required to wade through. Data from CalStateApply is loaded into CMS; we have heard that some campuses have not been checking this data before running the AutoDeny process.

Area D in the A-G Requirement Package: UC is moving forward with raising this requirement from 2 years of “Laboratory Science” to 3 years of a category named more broadly, “Science.” BOARS will be meeting jointly with the Admissions Advisory Committee here in this building in May, and APEP members will also be invited to this meeting. We expect that the CSU will follow the UC’s lead and also

require 3 years in this category, although it sounds like we might give it a slightly different label, perhaps “Natural Science.” APEP had already looked into this matter back in October and we understand that this updating of admission expectations is entirely in keeping with changes occurring in high schools as a result of adoption of the NGSS.

I am not going to say very much about the two resolutions we are bringing later in this plenary, but I also don’t want to miss an opportunity to give a little plug for these while I have this opportunity.

Academic Senate CSU

The first resolution that you will see is one for which we will be seeking a waiver. If you watched the news yesterday, it would be hard to miss the coverage of students across the country making a statement yesterday by walking out of their classrooms at 10:00 protesting gun violence and calling for meaningful legislation to address this chronic crisis. As a sometime-follower of my son's Twitter account, where tweets might typically show up once or twice a week, I was surprised to see a dozen plus show up all at once about three weeks ago. These were retweets directed to the university urging that they join other institutions in reassuring students that, should they be subject to disciplinary action stemming from peaceful participation in protests, this would not be held against them by the college admissions office. I am very pleased that the CSU has taken this position, and the APEP resolution thanks Chancellor White for having done this for our future students.

The second resolution supports a Local Admission Priority Policy that the BoT is expected to adopt at its meeting next week. They are required by language in the 2017-18 California State Budget to adopt such a policy by May 2018. We appreciate that the proposed policy will give an advantage to local applicants, but will not require CSU campuses to admit all CSU-eligible applicants before admitting any out-of-area applicants. We think that the policy strikes a reasonable balance, that is appropriate for our system.

I will try to answer any questions, but I also encourage APEP members who would like to expand on anything I have said or to bring to the attention of this body any other matters that I may have not addressed to do so now.

Questions/Comments

Concern about impact of requiring three years of high school science effect on underserved students.

Question about "auto-deny" students who are not providing documents and what gets communicated to the student. A. Do not know.

Faculty Affairs – Norman

Productive meeting with a few guest presentations

Margy Merrifield as mentioned before discussed the number of hires

Gerry Hanley answered question about policies related to online instruction, shared the possibility of the Commission on Online Education being reformed

Jen Eagan- advocacy updates shared with us that like Chair Miller was not consulted by the AAUP before the letter

Lunch Meeting with Sabrina Sanders on Faculty Innovation Awards

Counseling Support Services and Student Success- Browdowski and Davis

Thanks to AA for co-sponsoring it is a joy to work with them- our Zooms were merged yesterday.

First Reading-

Condemning the Intrusion of Outside Groups into the Development of Curriculum- Lee
Protecting Faculty from Attacks by Outside Groups- Strahm and Brusckke

Appreciation of the AAUP's Support of Shared Governance at the CSU – Bruschke, Lee

Waiting for the Tenure Density Task Force report to finalize work in progress
A small amount of time planning of this evening's Social Question of the body Shrimp or No Shrimp?

Questions/Comments

Comment about Commission on Online Education not meeting.
Is the committee interested in pursuing best practices about staff awards.
Question about "outside influence" resolution.

FGA – Filling

Worked on resolutions. Spent most of the committee working on the legislative omnibus bill. About 30 bills on that list.

Questions/Comments

Question about advocacy day. A. Will need to plan that more.

9.3. CSU Faculty Trustee

Trustee Sabalius' written report was emailed to the Senate. Trustee Sabalius will not be able to be here Friday afternoon, he will be visiting the CSU Palm Desert campus. He will visit CSULA next week. Invited in February to give a speech to the CFA Board of Directors. Speech was emailed to Senators. Call for joint advocacy without blaming each other for budget problems. Invited in March to speak to Campus Senate Chairs. Accompanied Trustee Kimball on SJSU visit. Participated in statewide Super Sunday.
BOT meeting. On Monday, new Presidents at Bakersfield and CSUDH will be selected.
Passing of new admission policy. Budget of the CSU. Entire CSU budget is \$10.4B. \$92M is not even 1% of this. Tuition has nearly doubled since 2008/2009. Decision on tuition increase postponed until May. Optimistic that we will get more money in May, but not that it would close the deficit. Trustee Sabalius does not believe this is a good enough reason to increase tuition.

Questions/Comments

Question about positions on tuition, athletics, and SUGs.
A. Position on tuition clearly articulated, including that tuition should decrease when there is a budget surplus. With regard to athletics, views have not changed. SUGs has not been on the agenda.

9.4. Other committees and committee liaisons

GEAC – Baaske

Met and discussed Guiding Notes for GE courses. Used by Community Colleges when they create courses to articulate with the CSU. Guiding Notes cannot be new policy, but should interpret and explain policy. Looked at the "Golden Four" A1, A2, A3, and B4.

Academic Senate CSU

Next time will look at more guiding notes. Will be asking question about physical education requirement or if there are physical education courses in block E.

Status of campus based GE program assessment. Asked to highlight Best Practices. Please send assessment plan to Sen Baaske if you have a plan, or if you are developing a plan, or if you do it as part of program review. Will be sending an email to senators.

Questions/Comments

Is the raw data going to be made available to CSU and Chancellor?

A. Probably not the raw data. The report will be.

Comment about performance based assessment.

Concerns about having a plan versus having actual assessment and whether it is being implemented.

ITL – Yee-Melechar

CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning; Darlene Yee-Melichar (SF State)

The CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (aka ITL) met last week for a productive session.

Senators Ornatowski, Reeder, Selvester and I represented the Academic Senate CSU.

Written meeting minutes are being drafted and will be shared with ASCSU when ready.

Meanwhile, a few details for your information:

ITL Director Emily McGruder provided a comprehensive and informative report on ITL programming. A few items of interest include the following:

1) Professional Development efforts Supporting o Math/QR (with Center for Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning) o Written Communication (with Center for Advancement of Reading) 2) California Faculty Collaborative— Creating Equitable Learning Environments 3) Professional Development efforts for the Faculty Development Council 4) 20th Annual CSU Symposium on University Teaching Entitled Productive Disruption Will be held at CalPoly Pomona On April 13 and 14 Registration on CalPoly Pomona website 5) 2018 Summer Academy which is a work in progress During a working lunch, we discussed

•ACE-CASE Faculty Development Professional Learning Community

Faculty Development Council—Catherine Haras (CSU LA) focus on a beta faculty development center matrix Academic Senate of the California State University—Darlene Yee-Melichar focus on our plenary resolutions CSU Center for Community Engagement—Judy Botelho focus on 20th anniversary and report to BOT in November Academic Human Resources—Margaret Merryfield focus on orientation meetings for new department chairs and new faculty A written report will be available with attachments for your further interest.

GE Task Force – Ullman

Background and Membership:

The General Education Task Force (GETF) was established in 2017 by ASCSU resolution (<https://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2016-2017/documents/3271.shtml>). The GETF enjoys a broad membership, not only from our CSU colleagues, including CSSA, the Office of the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, but also from our CCC and UC sister segments. The task force works in a collegial and safe environment, in which difficult issues are discussed openly, collaboratively, and productively.

Overview of Work to Date:

Since Spring 2017, the General Education Task Force has convened nine times. The session topics have been purposefully broad as we sought to “build capacity” by familiarizing ourselves with GE in three forms: “global” (e.g., history, purposes, models of GE in the United States), “systemic” (e.g., GE writ large in the CSU, as defined and guided by policies, such as the recent Executive Orders; informed by our important relationships with our UC and CC sister segments; and impacted, limited, or mandated by governmental and other quasi-external forces), and “local” (e.g., the culture and ethos of GE at the campus level, GE as a mark of campus identity, the merits and drawbacks of a campus-by-campus model, etc.).

At the same time, we have been careful to situate these complex conversations within a framework premised on faculty purview over the curriculum in the service of high quality student learning.

We have working groups engaged in deeper-dive research on some of the thorny issues surrounding GE as we contemplate drafting a set of overarching principles. To further assist us in this task, we will meet with Nicholas Lemann at our upcoming April meeting to discuss his novel concept of general education (<https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Case-for-a-New-Kind-of/238479>).

It is important to convey that the GETF has not yet drafted any recommendations. The purpose of this update is to augment prior brief reports by offering a more detailed accounting of the group’s work to date, and to solicit input that will inform our future work. We anticipate repeating this process at several points in time, prior to issuing our report. Our CCC and UC colleagues are also beginning to seek feedback as we progress. Our work will continue into the next academic year, since we recognize the difficulties posed by summer consultation. We value your input at all stages, please send any input to either of the co-chairs of the General Education Task Force: Chris Miller (cmiller@csus.edu) or Jodie Ullman (jullman@csusb.edu).

We value your thoughts on any and all parts of this update. It is simply a working draft. We feel it’s better to “over-inform” than “under-inform”.

Academic Senate CSU

Our Current Consensus on Broad GE Themes

General education for CSU students must be:

1. Student centric. General Education exists to prepare students with the skills, abilities, and dispositions to excel and navigate a lifetime of changes. Changes to General Education need to place students in the center of all decisions and concerns. Grounding students at the center allows consideration of what is the best way to prepare them as lifelong learners, willing and able to adapt to a changing world.
2. Coherent. For students to benefit fully from a GE program, they need understand how it cohere with their college experience. If students are not aware of the why GE matters, and how its foci intersect and interact, the critical meta-cognition and intentionality of the program is lost. Key to a successful GE program is the ability for most students to articulate why they are required to take general education courses, and how their general education curricula form a program of GE, rather than a set of random courses across a variety of areas. Examples of explicit coherence models are themed or “pathway” programs.
3. Contextualized. Successful GE programs explicitly position the curriculum within the broader context of the students’ overall undergraduate experience. This overall experience includes the uniqueness of the campus, the region, and the students’ full curricular and co-curricular undergraduate career. Contextualizing GE also helps to make GE relevant and intentional.
4. Able to prepare both first time freshman and transfer students. A large percentage of our students transfer from community colleges with much of their GE completed (add percentages), any revision should continue to support a robust transfer model for CCC students. In addition, transfer students still graduate from a CSU campus, and their experience in their campus GE program should reflect the same intentionality and allow for the same meta-cognitive experiences as native students enjoy.

Four Major Areas Enjoying Lively Discussion

We are interested in feedback on all areas of this document, but particularly on these areas of discussion an on any areas not listed that we should be discussing.

1. Models of GE. Currently, many campuses have “cafeteria style” GE packages in which students select courses from a variety within each category. This approach allows for maximum choice for students, and maximum course inclusion for academic departments on a campus. However, some students report that the variety and sheer volume of course choices is overwhelming. The cafeteria style GE program may also lead to students’ lack of awareness about the purpose of GE and the intentionality of the program. Other models for GE exist, including pathways/thematic tracks, cluster models, and cohort models. Also, on some campuses it is possible to earn a certificate or minor in a GE area.

2. American Institutions (AI). EO 1061 governs American Institutions; however, on many CSU and CCC campuses the AI requirements are double-counted with GE requirements. Thus, we need your feedback here, most especially from discipline experts. We are discussing the current role

of AI as a standalone requirement for graduation in the CSU. The UC waives this requirement if students have a B or better in their corresponding high school class. We need our discipline experts to help us understand what curricula and level are taught in AI. At one end of a continuum could be a version of the high school curriculum, and at the other could be an engaging extension of the basics learned in high school. Some argue it could be all lower division or upper division. How many units are optimal to meet the needs of our students? Rather than teaching a chronology of history, perhaps it would be better to offer thematic approaches (such as the history of oppression in America) developed by discipline experts. Such an approach could apply to American/Californian government, too. Our conversations here have just begun.

3. Upper Division GE (UDGE). Beyond thinking it is very important, the Task Force is discussing how many units should be included and why. In addition, we are considering the question of what problem could be fixed by changing anything related to UDGE, and how any recommendation in this area helps students. We are asking, what is the purpose of upper division GE? The answer isn't as obvious as it first appears. We are discussing how best to think about UDGE and maximize the experience for students.

4. The EO 1100 (revised) categories A, B, C, D, and E. We are asking questions such as the following: Are these the correct groupings and is the unit distribution in the categories optimal? Would groupings based on outcomes help students understand the intentionality of their GE program experience? What would the rationale be to make changes in these categories? What problem would be fixed, and how would it help students? We have only just begun to discuss this issue.

Comments/Questions

Comment about whether GE was campus based or system based.

A. Campus based. Ideas brought from Task Force, which is made up of faculty, students, trustees, and administrators.

Concern that attempts are focused on simplifying GE rather than valuing GE.

Conference on Shared Governance – written report from Davis

Academic Senate CSU

10. Discussion Items

10.1. Loren Blanchard – Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs: (Time Certain: Thursday 11:00 a.m.)

Preparing for BOT meeting. Five topics for educational policy committee. Ongoing work on Enrollment Management, Title 5 change. Policies on Redirection and on Impaction. Admissions Advisory Council has been working on putting these two policies forward. Designed for all CSU eligible students to be redirected to another campus when they are not admitted to campus of first choice. Impaction Policy designed to provide priority status to local applicants. Local applicants would receive a bump. More discussion with regards to the LAO Eligibility Study. Public Policy Institute of California takes another view. We are currently enrolling at the 40.8% mark, rather than the Master Plan mark of 33%. LAO and PPIC reports will be discussed at BOT meeting. Second item, Title 5 change to include Adult School students to be eligible for resident tuition. Third item, Title 5 change, related to DNP program. Last year we were granted permanent DNP authority. We need to update and clarify Title 5. Fourth topic on Academic Planning. Familiarize Trustees with degree planning process. 43 new degree program projections. 39 programs proposed to be removed from Academic Plans. Discontinued programs from campuses. Final item is Academic Preparation. Will provide annual update.

Will also discuss budget, specifically the \$77M related to student success. These were to be used to hire TT faculty, hire or strengthen advising, or to strengthen high impact practice. 1400 new TT faculty have or will be hired, 400 new positions. Equates to new sections and seats. New academic advisors have also been hired.

Advocacy. Full funding ask is \$263M for fair compensation, student success, access to the CSU, and facilitates. About \$171M short of the request. Chair Miller will be invited to round table opportunities to speak with legislators around specific topics.

Hosted a Basic Needs statewide conference at Sacramento State. Food and Housing insecurity was the focus. Evidence of the work that is already being done by campuses. Food pantries, emergency housing, emergency grants all examples of this.

Shared governance. Feel good about the progress being made and looking forward to a good outcome.

Campus Senate Chairs meeting. Provided updates on implementations of recent policies and talked about GI2025. Heard candid feedback from senate chairs.

Comments/Questions

Comment about WestEd and measures of student success. Study looks at patterns of implementation rather than evidence that measures are meeting needs.

A. Looking at all six pillars of Graduation Initiative. Responsibility to evaluate these and understand how we are impacting these. Encourage ASCSU to engage in these conversations.

Why 33% or 40%? How are these numbers established?

A. Gains K-12 is making in general education. Larger number of students are eligible. There needs to be a broader discussion around the Master Plan. The number is embedded in the Master Plan, and these conversations have been started after about 10 years.

Concern that there is pressure that preparation classes be offered at larger sizes than what is recommended. Concern that this will affect outcomes. Is this something that is being discussed at Academic Council?

A. Have heard that there is need for one-time dollars in order to help for implementation. Asked for more information about what those one-time dollars look like. Has not heard this feedback through Academic Council.

Comment that most recent FAQ on Academic Preparation contains mistakes, particularly about Early Start and directed self-placement. Request that current FAQ be pulled off of the website and to tell AVPs to hold off on action until mistakes are corrected. English Council still not sent FAQs.

A. Would like to staff about concerns. FAQs will go out today to English Council. Will pull back most recent ones until more clarification is obtained.

Concern that reduction of students admitted will negatively affect marginalized groups disproportionately. If the cut is made, it should be made equitably.

A. This concern has been expressed by the President's Council. Cutting enrollment is not the way to close the achievement gap. We are not currently facing enrollment reduction, but if we are, we do not want to disproportionately impact students of color.

Question about what are the metrics used to measure success in EO 1110 initiatives? What are the warning flags that we should be keeping an eye on?

A. Have not figured out all of the metrics and targets. Want to do that with faculty and with others. Persistence and preparation for next courses are examples of possible metrics. Examples of warning flags might be changes in pass rates for students.

Question about what goals CSU is negotiating with legislature to get added funding?

A. Fair compensation, ongoing student success efforts (\$450M over four years, tied to additional faculty), increased access to the CSU, facilities and infrastructure needs.

Question about relationship between CSU and Complete College America?

A. Do not know what the relationship is.

Question about how the additional 400-faculty will effect the tenure-density of the CSU?

A. Probably small, but will get it to us.

Concern that taking more students without funding.

A. Agree that it makes it difficult to make the case for funding. We have campuses that are overenrolled, meaning we are getting students we are not getting full funding for.

Academic Senate CSU

Comment about Complete College America website message. Are we meeting needs of industry?

A. Need to find out more about Complete College America. We are examining workforce needs in Academic Planning, as well as meeting the future needs of California.

Comment that we do not have faculty or staff needed to meet Basic Needs. Comment about dedication of staff. Basic Needs conference had examples of students whose lives were changed by actions.

A. Agreed.

Question about whether Enrollment Management will be looking at graduate student profile?

A. Not included. However, Academic Planning shows growth.

Question about redirections and place bound students and changing majors?

A. Redirection policy does not allow for redirection within same university but different major.

Comment on mistakes on Academic Preparation FAQs. Points to inconsistencies.

10.2. James Swartz – ERFA Liaison Report (Time Approximate: Thursday 1:00 p.m.)

CSU ERFA has voted to extend membership to all CALPERS eligible. Name changes will be considered at the next state council. Keynote speaker will be Hank Reichman from AAUP. Dr. Pasternack will deliver report to the BOT next week.

10.3. Adam Day – Vice Chair, CSU Board of Trustees & Jane W. Carney – Member, CSU Board of Trustees (Time Certain: Friday 9:00 a.m.)

Trustee Carney

It is difficult to have dialogue or discussion in this format. I would like to have a discussion. I know what you do and thank you for it.

Trustee Day

I am a product of higher education. Grandfather was Dean of Education at Notre Dame. Father was a faculty member and academic senate member at University of Maryland. Understands the role of higher education. Served ten years as Board of Supervisors in San Diego. Now City Manager for Native American tribe. Has travelled to 20 campuses, needs to get to Bakersfield and Humboldt. Mental and Behavioral Health services important issue to me.

Comments/Questions

Comment about SUGs resolution on agenda today.

A. Familiar with SUGs issue. Many of our problems reflect statewide systemic problems.

Comment on the importance of mental health. Profits from alcohol sales to support counselors.

President Selection Process. Concern about not having campus visits in the process. Several campus resolutions to that effect. Request a revisit of the process.

A. Will take a look at the process. See value of confidential search as well as open search. Within selection committee, process is open and focused on place. BOT members and Chancellor usually sit back on those committees. Concerns about candidates who get “punished” for applying for these positions at their current positions.

Comment about merits of open Presidential searches.

Comment to request meeting with department chairs without others present. Go to a “typical” classroom. More description about typical student.

A. Will ask for these things.

Comment about Executive Order 1110 being an large experiment on our students. How will this be assessed? What are the red flags? What will cause us to abort experiment?

A. Not most experienced person on curriculum development or educational policy. Want to create an environment where students are learning and want to remove artificial barriers. One of the most difficult thing for an institution to do is to admit when a mistake is made. Trustees need to be sure to evaluate what is working and what is not. Metrics will tell us if more students are persisting, if the achievement gap is shrinking, etc... Trustees must give the CO the protection to be honest, especially if it is not working well.

Concern about “lobby groups” such as Complete College America and what they say about faculty, particularly that faculty are not innovative or interested in change and that is hurting underserved students. In fact, faculty are innovators.

A. Do not disagree with anything said. Understands the role and importance of faculty. Would give much greater weight to faculty on curricular issues. Faculty are engaged and innovative, and should continue to be so. Some foundations look for leaders who are being innovative and then try and use resources to scale that up. Some other foundations think they know what the answer is, then try to implement ideas. This latter approach gets foundations into trouble. The CSU can use money from some foundations to help those innovative ideas move forward. Reason so many foundations work in the higher education space is because it is so important.

Comment about value of having perspective of BOT. Would like to increase the representation of faculty members of BOT.

Comment that faculty are the ones who see our students every day. Increased responsibility of faculty and staff. Executive Orders then come down from CO (recall 120

Academic Senate CSU

units, quarter-to-semester). Number of faculty not growing proportionally to the students. Comment to ask the faculty for more input/advice.

Comment about lecturers and circumstances they live under. Two out of three classes are taught by lecturer faculty. Teaching force is being shifted almost exclusively to lecturers.
A. Agree with this comment.

Comment about lack of consultation in recent Executive Orders.

Comment about that trustees are experienced and have impressive backgrounds, but usually do not have many years of experience on the BOT. This is why faculty input is needed.

Comment about fee structure not being adequate 0-6 units and 7 and up units. Wasteful of resources. Per unit charge would yield better results.

Comment about emeritus faculty being valuable asset for BOT.

Comment about College of Ethnic Studies at SFSU. Ethnic studies task force report results. What roles do you see Ethnic Studies in the CSU?
A. It is critically important for all students to be exposed to these areas of study.

Question to clarify comment on SUGs.

Comment about former trustee's comments violating confidentiality of presidential search.

Highlight important of mental health needs. Range of student-to-counselor ration is between 1000-1 to over 3000-1.

Suggestion for advocacy.

Comment of alternative models of employment for non-tenure track faculty. Would you be interested in exploring alternate models of employment for non tenure-track faculty?
A. We will ask more questions about this.

Comment about the 400 new TT faculty not being net.

Two issues that have galvanized all campuses – Presidential searches and Executive Orders.

Also, 120/180 unit recommendations.

10.4. Ryan Brown – CSSA Liaison Report (Time Approximate: Friday 11:00 a.m.)

Appreciate faculty discussion with Trustees.

CSSA passed a resolution to establish a Veteran Support Center on campuses.

Priority 1 is mental health access for students. Ratio of 1000-1. Wait time of under two weeks. Crisis wait time of under 48 hours. Crisis help line. Councilors that are representative of student population. Engagement of faculty.

Campus safety issues discussed at last meeting.

Trying to engage gubernatorial candidates. Holding a forum with Gavin Newsome.

Passed a resolution supporting Project Rebound.

California Higher Education Student Summit (CHESS) was last week. Back to basics rally held, emphasizing priority of Basic Needs.

Comments/Questions

Concern about 24-hour crisis line as possible substitute for face-to-face help.

A. On the CSSA radar.

Can we get an update on Basic Needs issues?

A. Positions on over a dozen bills, about 80% having to do with Basic Needs.

Question about emergency housing bill.

A. Working to determine needs.

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

DACA. Employees and students who are in the DACA program can continue to renew. Uncertainty on how long that will last.

Budget. Advocacy day as well as Glazer hearing. Team included Chancellor, Chair Miller, student, CFA, CSUEU representatives. Positive responses. Shared goals with each other as well as with the state of California. Planning for about a 1% cut to campus budgets to cover \$60M shortfall of costs. Contracts have been keeping up at about the rate of inflation during current years for faculty. For CSUEU, it is slightly less than the rate of inflation. CSU contracts are similar to other state agencies. Our budget does not get augmented for compensation needs, as other agencies so. It would be a surprise if the governor changes appropriation in May revision. Speaker and Pro Tem need to have CSU (higher education) as top one or two items on agenda. Campuses are on trajectory to hold enrollment constant. Student success is moving in a positive direction.

Tenure Density. Two cover letters and report are ready. \$100M to move 1% point. Tenure density is important to the system. Wants campuses to create a plan.

Academic Senate CSU

Comments/Questions

Comment about student-to-councilor ratio on campuses.

A. Agree that this is an emerging crisis.

Comment that we have 16,000 lecturers; about 85% of these are part-time. Would the CSU consider a category similar to “security employment” in the UC.

A. Agree this should be discussed.

Question about what changes CO would make with implementation of EOs based on feedback so far?

A. Campuses can petition for changes in timelines.

Comment about students who walked out. Should also cover CSU students and faculty.

A. Some campuses installing assault proof locks on doors, which are very expensive.

Difficult decisions. Safety is a basic need.

Comment about student success and evidence of success to see how our efforts are working.

Comment about WestEd and data. Question of how things we have already been doing have effected the graduation rates. Comment about asking faculty being a priority.

Question about providing data on 120 and on semester conversion on graduation rates.

CSULA is number one on social mobility. Student research collaboration activities. S-factor units are used. Effort to eliminate units. What is the commitment of CO to maintain such units.

A. Do not know details about S units, but research is important.

Question cost benefit analysis of quarter to semester conversion.

CSUF history department expects to be cut in half. Concerns that negative effects of EO on faculty are not being communicated to Chancellor.

Tenure density comments. Will have more discussion of this.

11. Committee Recommendations
- 11.1. Resolution of Concern Related to the Governor's Proposal for a State Education Online Learning Lab withdrawn from agenda AS-3314-18/FGA (Rev)
Second Reading
 - 11.2. Revisions to Faculty Trustee Recommendation Criteria and Procedures m/s/approved unanimously AS-3315-18/EX (Rev)
Second Reading
 - 11.3. Tuition Increases in the California State University (CSU) m/s/approved AS-3316-18/FGA (Rev)
Second Reading
 - 11.4. Counseling Support Services and Student Success m/s/approved unanimously AS-3317-18/FA/AA (Rev)
Second Reading
 - 11.5. 2018 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) m/s/approved unanimously AS-3318-18/FGA (Rev)
Second Reading
 - 11.6. Call for Continued Advocacy for Adequate Funding of the California State University in Lieu of a Tuition Increase m/s/approved unanimously AS-3319-18/FGA (Rev)
Second Reading
 - 11.7. Participation in Peaceful Protests m/s/approved unanimously AS-3320-18/APEP
First Reading/Waiver
 - 11.8. Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2018-2019 meetings AS-3321-18/EX
First Reading
 - 11.9. Endorsement of the "White Paper on Student Success" AS-3322-18/AA
First Reading

Academic Senate CSU

- 11.10. Condemning the Intrusion of Outside Groups into the Development of Curriculum AS-3323-18/FA
First Reading
- 11.11. Equity and Responsibility in Admissions to the Distinctive Universities and Campuses of the California State University System AS-3324-18/APEP
First Reading
- 11.12. The State University Grant Program: A Call for Full Funding from the State AS-3325-18/AA
First Reading

12. Adjournment