Minutes  
September 3-4, 2015  
Office of the Chancellor

Thursday, September 3, 2015 - 8:00a.m. to 5:00p.m. – Dumke Auditorium  
Thursday, September 3, 2015 - 1:00p.m. to 5:00p.m. Standing Committee reconvene  
Thursday, September 3, 2015 - 1:00p.m. to 5:00p.m. Standing Committee reconvene  

Senate Social – Executive Committee Hosting  
5:15p.m. to 6:45p.m., Munitz Lobby

Friday, September 4, 2015 - 8:00a.m. – 12:00 noon – Dumke Auditorium  
(lunch was not provided)

Call to Order

With a quorum being present, the Plenary was call to order at 8:07a.m.

Roll Call

Senators Present: Bakersfield (Frye, Murphy); Channel Islands (Aloisio, Yudelson); Chico (Schulte, Selvester); Dominguez Hills (Esposito, Norman); East Bay (Fleming, Gubernat); Fresno (Benvides, Kensingger); Fullerton (Guerin, Hoven Stohs, Walker); Humboldt (Creadon, Eschker); Long Beach (Hood, Klink, Soni); Los Angeles (Baaske, Bodinger-deUriarte); Maritime (Browne, Trevisan); Monterey Bay (Davis, Nishita); Northridge (Chong, Schutte, Swenson (SUB)); Pomona (Neto, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Steffel, Ullman); San Diego (Eadie, Ornatowski, Wheeler); San Francisco (Collins, Ritter, Yee-Melichar); San Jose (Lee, Frazier (SUB), Sabalus, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Foroohar, Widmann (SUB)); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Roberts); Stanislaus (Filling, Strahm); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack)

Guest: Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs; Juan Cervantes, CSSA Liaison; Jennifer Eagan, CFA Liaison; Harold Goldwhite, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA) Liaison; Lou Monville, CSU Trustee; Dia Poole, Alumni Council Liaison; Steve Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, Business & Finance; Steven Stepanek, CSU Faculty Trustee; Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor
Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Approval of May 14-15, 2015 Minutes

Minutes were approved as submitted.

Announcements

- Senator Swanson asked for stories for Senator Wheeler to encourage his recovery.

Presentations/Introductions

- Adam Swanson was introduced as the substitute from CSU Northridge.
- Stefan Frazier was introduced as the substitute from CSU San Jose.
- Jim Widmann was introduced as the substitute from San Luis Obispo.

Reports

Steven Filling, Chair

Chair Filling reported that he had been in contact with EVC Blanchard regarding the importance of shared governance to reduce barriers to student success. The University of California Academic Senate Executive Committee is now in charge of ICAS. Conversations about baccalaureate degree parameters have been discussed. Legislation regarding CCC baccalaureate degrees is also under ongoing discussion. Senators have been asked to offer commentary on - and review – the Natural Science Competencies for Fall 2016. Chair Filling has been in communications with the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) and their website materials now reflect the true nature of CSU involvement. On the subject of tenure density within the CSU, the need for a metrics has been suggested. With special thanks to Senator Kessinger’s work on the Ethnic Studies Task Force, Chair Filling asked all senators to review the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report before the September 30, 2015 deadline. Senators were also asked to review the Financial Sustainability Report and offer commentary and feedback before the deadline.

Chair Filling reviewed the situation of faculty colleagues at CSU San Bernardino. Senator Ullman offered a first-person perspective on faculty concerns. A resolution was created and the faculty asked the Chancellor for assistance. The Chancellor replied by indicating that shared leadership is not shared decision making. The faculty of CSU San Bernardino is trying to figure out how to move forward. This shift seems to have changed the culture of the campus. A climate survey will be conducted to assess faculty morale and needs. Chair Filling reviewed the situation of faculty colleagues at CSU Chico. Senator Schulte offered a first-person perspective on faculty concerns and explained the “Call For Strengthening Campus Morale” conducted in Fall 2014. In Jan. 2015 a resolution response team was created and met with the cabinet. Discussion ensued. A campus climate survey was administered in May. Data was analyzed over the summer. Later, the campus president announced retirement, and before school started, appointed the Interim Provost to Provost. One thousand members of the campus community
participated in an open and untraceable survey. Chair Filling was invited to present on shared
governance. VC Lori Lam and EVC Blanchard were sent from the CO to listen to - and observe
– the situation. The survey and results will be shared. Feedback and suggestions for moving
forward were asked of senators. Senator Selvester reminded the plenary that faculty fear was of
great concern. Therefore, institutional research set up situations where faculty could take the
survey anonymously. The culture of fear that has developed is of great concern and was shared
with representatives from the Chancellor’s Office.

Campus chairs will continue to be updated on ASCSU action items to ensure
collaboration through transparency. Chair Filling is considering a project that includes
mechanisms for showcasing best practices in shared governance. Four campus president searches
will occur this year and it is important to advocate for open searches. Chair Filling also shared
emergency evacuation protocol information with all senators. Senators were also reminded that
Carrie Kato is the block leader. In the event of an emergency, senators should look to Ms. Kato
for leadership. Lastly, Chair Filling reported that the Planning Committee for the next Academic
Conference is meeting and the tentative date will be set during spring 2017.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

   a. It is important to pay attention to the limitations of anonymity. The break down of trust is
      the ultimate break down.
   
   b. It is important to defer Senator Foroohar’s statement about campus events to a future
      action item.

Standing Committees

Academic Affairs (AA):

AA Chair nelson reported that the Academic Affairs Committee had a productive first meeting
and made substantial progress through a very full agenda. The Committee agreed upon priorities
for the 2015-16 year. The Committee discussed the Ethnic Studies Task Force’s Draft Report
and will provide feedback to the task force. The focus will be on the curricular review and
resource allocation implications of the task force’s recommendations. The Committee welcomed
our CO Liaison Chris Mallon, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty
Development. The Committee provided Associate AVC Mallon with advice on consultation
with our community colleges colleagues about CCC BA’s, particularly regarding how to make
the consultation productive for both systems given how quickly the timeline is unfolding and the
nature of the requirement for consultation. The Committee also discussed with AVC Mallon the
ongoing conversation among presidents, provosts and graduate deans about MA degree
requirements. The Committee is developing a list of conceptual criteria to distinguish MA
degree from a BA degree as the basis for moving the discussion forward. Finally, the Committee
will co-sponsor with our APEP colleagues a resolution that calls for an ASCSU task force to
evaluate the GE B4 quantitative reasoning requirement. The resolution is in response to GEAC’s
September 1, 2015 motion to extend the STATWAY alternative statistical pathway pilot and
recommend the creation of the task force.
**Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP):**  
Chair Fleming reported on the Resolution on B4 Requirements in light of GEAC’s meeting on STATWAY events. The committee will draft a Commendation for Dr. Beverly Young. The committee will also bring forward a Resolution on the high school exit act examination suspension. In addition, three successful meetings with CO colleagues have occurred. Director Ken O’Donnell called from airport and was able to discuss the issues surrounding GEAC concerns. Director Eric Forbes was able to present information on Early Start. Chair Fleming requested email of materials on Math and English. Executive Director Joseph Aguirre has taken Dr. Young’s position that committee looks forward to future collaboration with him. The committee also plans to meet with Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Research & Resources Edward Sullivan regarding data and reports.

**Faculty Affairs (FA):**  
Chair Foroohar reported that the committee discussed priorities during Extended ExCom meeting. The committee is drafting policy on Academic Freedom, increasing tenure density by increasing the net of tenure track position and focusing on retention, revisiting the CSU intellectual property policy in relationship to online courses, and RSCA funding for faculty by finding a way to enhance the funding. The committee had two guests: CFA President Jennifer Egan who gave report on contract negotiation and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Human Resources Margie Merryfield who reported on Human Resource plans for the coming year. AVC Merryfield answered questions on HR policy for background checks on new hires. HR policy for new hires created a lively discussion and a resolution was drafted asserting the need for the suspension of the policy and discussion and consultation with the ASCSU before further implementation. Potential impacts on new hires were also discussed. A Resolution was draft and waiver was requested due to campus implementation without faculty consultation. A Resolution draft recommending the addition of an Emerita/us Trustee to the BoT was also created. The need for a Resolution on shared governance was also extensively discussed and will be prepared for discussion at the next plenary. Comments on the draft reports on Ethnic Studies and the Financial Sustainability Model were also discussed and offered.

**Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)**  
Chair Krabacher reported that the FGA committee engaged a number of items. The committee will continue reviewing the end of the 2015 legislative season. The committee has updated the legislation matrix, with attention to ASCSU interests. A copy will be forwarded later today. September 11, 2015 will be the update of bills that go to governor’s desk. The governor has one month to act. A report on the final legislation will be submitted at the next plenary. Resolutions SB707 and SB 172 (California High School Exit Exam) will also receive support. The committee plans to bring forward as first reading item the ASCSU position on the budget request for the 2016-17. Strategies for legislation monitoring were also discussed. The November plenary and additional first reading items will continue to be discussed. Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer Ryan Storm was consulted on the Fiscal Sustainability Model Task Force Report and FGA comments were also compiled.

**Steven Stepanek- CSU Faculty Trustee**
Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported that he attended 19 commencement events and met with faculty, students, and families. He further reported that two BOT meetings occurred in May and
July. During the July meeting multiple conversations occurred, following his July 9, 2015 reappointment. As a Financial Sustainability Model Task Force member, Trustee Stepanek has been in conversation with Chancellor White and Trustee Monville. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- Based on your experiences with Trustees, around what issues is a faculty perspective most needed?
- Most conversations have occurred before the meetings. Budget, Planning for next academic year’s budget, agreements with CCC, transfers, etc.

Other Committees and Committee Liaisons

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC)
Chair Eadie reported that GEAC would continue examining STATWAY and the shared Quantitative Reasoning Resolution.

Ethnic Studies Task Force:
The ASCSU will hear a report at a future plenary.

Math Council:
The ASCSU will hear a report at a future plenary.

Early Start:
The ASCSU will hear a report at a future plenary.

Harold Goldwhite - ERFA Liaison Report
The ASCSU heard a report from California State University Emeritus and Retired Faculty (ERFA) Liaison Harold Goldwhite. He reported that he is the new ERFA Liaison and Dr. Bill Blischke is the new incoming president. The goals of ERFA continue to be as follows: campus support, outreach, philanthropy, support of retirees and the association. The CSU ERFA State Council will be held at CSU Fullerton on October 17, 2015 and all are invited. Chancellor White had been invited to speak at this event. A system-wide “Soles for Souls” campaign is in the planning stages. The search for a new Executive Director will commence and has been advertised in the ERFA newsletter on the CSU ERFA website: http://csuerfa.org/.

Jennifer Eagan – CFA Liaison Report
CFA President Jennifer Eagan (EB) reported that the bargaining reopener for 2015-16 has begun and the California Faculty Association (CFA) and California State University (CSU) are at an impasse. The CSU bargaining team refused to move from their 2% proposal and the CFA proposal of 5% General Salary Increase (GSI) for all faculty and 2.65% Service Salary Increase (SSI) for eligible faculty was rejected. Campus based equity programs were assumed to have been substantial by the CSU; however, several campuses are still waiting for their program. How these small increases are substantial remains a question in need of explanation, especially given the reality that most lecturer faculty, librarians, and coaches are excluded. President Eagan further suggested that campus-based equity money should be considered in the negotiations, as increases for promotion seem to have been included in campus-based equity solutions. There is an indication that the Chancellor’s Office will conduct a salary study.
September 18, 2015 will be the next mediation meeting. Central in the negotiation process is faculty live experiences, work environment facts, and trend analyses. Strike vote authorization will be considered in event that the statutory does not yield an agreement. November 17, 2015 will be a time to prepare for action. Faculty salaries are connected to the experiences of CSU students and the degradation of our profession. The time for action is now. Faculty colleagues are encouraged to be present at the Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting.

**Timothy White – CSU Chancellor**

Chancellor White gave a report to the ASCSU. Central in this report were umbrella discussions with faculty, staff, and students. Chancellor White has visited campuses for presidential searches, two of which are on track to close in January and March respectively. Due to ASCSU efforts, the CSU was more successful in gaining additional funding; however, it is going to be a “harder lift” next year, even with a better economy. It is important to continue reminding the state why the CSU important. The Trustee scholars will be celebrated at the next BoT meeting: Tuesday at the last hour of the meeting (4:00 Time Certain).

The following concerns and questions were raised:

**Question:** How are members selected for presidential search and how can our Sonoma campus community offer suggestions for the selection process?

**Response:** The committee that evaluates the next president is reflective of the circumstances in Sonoma. The Academic Senate will choose, staff will choose, and students will choose a person. The Chancellor’s role is to wait until the end of selection process to ensure equity in representation.

**Question:** Given that the music center is in debt, is there a policy or opinion on how the debt can be offset so that it does not affect the academic budget?

**Response:** This is a campus management decision.

**Question:** Will there be a closing of the loop on questions and concerns submitted from CSU Fullerton?

**Response:** A letter was sent; however, the details of the review were not included. It would be good to see that the letter is publicized on campus. The Chancellor mentioned that he reads every offering of input, from these a narrative is created that speaks to the topics requiring input, and a letter is written based upon input, campus visits, staff and student interactions, etc. This is then submitted to – and discussed with - the BoT.

**Question:** Where there is the option to have an open search, is that a possibility, especially for those willing to have their names and candidacy mentioned?

**Response:** It is important to find the best president for the campus. Candidates – 80% of the time – will not enter into an open search. If candidates were amenable to the practices, then this could become practice.
Question: Dr. Susan Martin is appreciated, the longest interim service is a year and half, and one of the common concerns is where money is being spent (i.e., athletics, misspending, structural deficit, etc.).

Response: In the new budget model there is language for campuses to have a reserve.

Question: Thank you for sending EVC Loren Blanchard and VC Lori Lam to our campus. It is important to note that an evaluation of the president had occurred and it has not been received.

Response: The letter has been sent and it is a public letter.

Question: On the topic of Academic Freedom, last year a Resolution was sent with a request for a CSU policy on Academic Freedom. Has any progress been made on the issue?

Response: It was conveyed that the desire was to include EVC Blanchard in the conversation and he will discuss the plan on Friday.

Juan Cervantes - CSSA Liaison Report
Liaison Cervantes briefly mentioned the Student Involvement Representation Fee (SIRF). This policy, the agenda, and speech planning will be discussed at the next plenary.

Lou Monville – CSU Alumni Trustee Alumni
The ASCSU met with CSU Trustee Lou Monville. He expressed gratitude for the advocacy efforts that led to the full funding of the CSU. He encouraged all to redouble their efforts for the next year and looks forward to working with the ASCSU. Trustee Monville also mentioned that four presidential searches will be at the forefront of concerns for the coming year and each Trustee will need to serve on at least two searches. Trustee Stepanek will also take on double duty. The BoT will receive its first update on the Financial Sustainability Report. Given higher education funding trends, we must consider how we can use the resources that we have to ensure more students get a quality degree. This is a California reality.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

Concern/Question: When the draft report finalized, it this report one that you want to be your swan song. It suggests a privatization of resources, our campus, and a reversal of the master plan. It places an onus on families, students, etc.

Answer: My goal is to leave the institution better than I found it. We should celebrate the additions to the budget and not criticize them. Sacramento is communicating where are their priorities. Discussion of support will hopefully continue.

Concern/Question: What is the role of the BoT on the appointment of interim presidents?
Answer: The BoT signs off on the appointments.
Concern/Question: Does the BoT understand the lived experiences of faculty on the campuses? What do you see as assisting in building of this connection in the future?

Answer: Colleagues are encouraged to visit campuses. Trustees are encouraged to interact with the ASCSU. The first welcome letter – with explanations of functions - should be sent from the ASCSU. Welcome and invite Trustee. It will strengthen collegiality.

Concern/Question: Proposed Support Budget, it seems like the report is preliminary and it is disappointing. Is it possible that the 3:2:2 can be amended so that it recognizes that no increases were made and a 9.3% furlough was put into place? Can this be conveyed to the governor and how can it be done?

Answer: The balancing act is how do we give our faculty and staff more with declining resources and ensuring that we treat all of our campuses fairly. This is more than a labor issue. Our budget comes down to competing priorities.

Concern/Question: These are difficult conversations to have and it is difficult to get to the essentials. Where can we go from here? Faulty propositions seem to be the foundation of some of these conversations. This is the source of disconnect. Collective courageous advocacy has to come first. Do we have the courage to deal with the concerns of faculty, staff, and students first?

Answer: The BoT is open to new ideas. There has been some headway on middle class scholarships; however, we have to be realistic on solutions that can be delivered on. It is important to continue telling the message – as we have for the last 3 and 4 years – that we have not received our fair share. It is important to continue working on bringing more resources; however, these issues cannot be solved on resources alone.

Concern/Question: It is disturbing to hear that so much moral is lost. We are asking our students to pay more, we are engaging in philanthropy, etc. Do you think that a severance tax is viable? Is it possible to bring attention to more progressive ideas that can bring confidence back to the system?

Answer: Focus is being place on things that the BoT feels that they can control. It is expected that the BoT will have a strong dialogue. The feedback is appreciated and this report is a work in progress.

Dia Poole – Alumni Council Liaison Report
Alumni Council Liaison Dia Poole reported that she is an alumna of CSU San Bernardino and a mid-career returning student. She experienced tuition reimbursement, which reduced barriers to her educational successes, and is now dedicate to bring back opportunities to the CSU. Liaison Poole’s report included several quotes from the CSU Class of 3 million (classof3million.calstate.edu) website which exhibits alumni quotes about their CSU experiences. Alumni Trustee elections will soon be held. Alumni Trustee performance expectations have been modified to better define the trustee’s role. This action is part of a larger
goal to encourage alumni to seek leadership opportunities within the CSU. September 16 will be Back to College Night. The CSU has always had a large turnout and this is an incredible networking opportunity for alumni.

Steven Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, Business & Finance

The plenary heard a report from Executive Vice Chancellor Relyea. Central in this report was an explanation of the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force background and report. His report began with a brief history of the task force (i.e., the Task Force was created in October 2014 with the goal of examining the internal budget model and how it relates to Sacramento funding practices, including changing relations with Sacramento overtime, the impact these relations have had on increased demand for entry into the CSU, and limitations in system-wide ability to accommodate students and ensure their success). What Task Force realized is that these will be ongoing problems that must be addressed. These problems lend to the inability within the system to deal with campus need (i.e., deferred maintenance, facilities, infrastructure needs, etc.). Therefore, the following central question arises: how do we continue to provide a high quality education at the lowest possible cost? An additional charge to the task force was an examination of smaller campuses and their financial health. The rationale behind this addition was that larger campuses could programmatic and facilities projects that the smaller campuses cannot, as smaller campuses do not have the same basic support structures as larger campuses. VC Relyea further suggested that the report revealed that a major goal should be to move away from a model of frozen tuition – without planning – so that when a crisis occurs, excessive reaction is not the response.

Membership on the Task Forces consisted of three representatives from ASCSU and Chancellor’s Office (CO) (Stepanek, Relyea, and Filling), student and staff members, two Provosts, and three CFOs. The vast majority of campuses were not represented, as the committee needed to be nimble and small. The consultation process would be the space for greater discussion and faculty input. The Task Force finished their work at beginning of summer. A draft report was released to coincide with the budget process now being engaged. The message to stakeholders was that there are needs by the university and faculty. The aim of this message was to enable a long-term examination of the university situation. September and October will be used for discussions with faculty, legislators, financial stakeholders, provosts, student affairs, and trustees. Feedback will be actively solicited overtime regarding the ideas and conclusions and that should be included in the report. Trustees will then be consulted and the final report presented in January at BoT meeting. It must be noted that the Task Force met bi-weekly, with homework in between, and the output was impressive. Internal and external data were gathered on the following five areas: resource allocation, financial effectiveness, financial aid, strategies for generating revenue, and student access.

Resources Allocation: The Task Force found that existing resource allocation processes were not transparent, understandable, or consistent. Debt capacity was also discussed. Central in the discussion was the assertion that the CSU infrastructure must be managed strategically and cannot continue to ignore that the university and the state were at various levels of examining performance measures that can influence resource allocations. The CSU does not have a strategy at this point for making resources allocation transparent. The goal will be to develop a resource allocation process that adjusts for enrollment changes. These will be significant changes from how things were done before. Likewise, a component to address the reality that smaller
campuses have concerns that big campuses do not have is needed. Since the state has said that the university system is “on your own”, funds have to be generated through targeted reserves. The university should consider a dedicated facilities fee to support facilities management. Many universities outside of the CSU have a dedicated facilities fee. Creating a capital reserve could also assist with ongoing deferred maintenance concerns.

Financial Effectiveness: The challenges found were the needs for regulative and statutory environments. Compliance gets in the way of campuses being effective in the management of their programs. Human Resources need to be more fully implemented to effectively manage the resources of the institutions. Does it make sense to consider going to year-round operations? This was a questions thoroughly considered. The big issue raised was that there must also be an investment of resources by the state wedded with this practice. The traditional facilities model could continue to work; however, it needs supplementation with public-private partnerships. Workload seems to be driven by compliance that compounds overtime. Procurement has been strategic; however, there needs to be more done. Better partnering could be done with UC, etc. to drive down costs. Energy is another big area. Our goal should be to decrease it. Half of the campuses have broken away from utility providers. $35 million over the next five years in saving is on the horizon given this practice. PUC and legislation should be examined in tandem with this practice. Data network infrastructure and intersegmental collaborations in administration should also be examined. Healthcare cost and retirement cost will need to be examined, as it will eat into our cost overtime. Since retirement costs will now the responsibility of the CSU, this will be an ongoing concern. 2016 numbers will double and this increase will eat into the CSU and campus abilities to support academic programs. The feasibility of pilot campuses to consider year-round operations and public private and public and public partnerships needs exploration. How can the university leverage the resources it has to get an infusion of investment and capital into the campuses should be of central importance.

Financial Aid: The state grant program has more than doubled. It has also become difficult to administer. This program has now moved from a grant program to a discount program. Therefore, we should call it a university discount program and see new sources for obtaining needed funding.

Revenue: Currently, there is a 0.71% return on our investments. The low amount of philanthropy on campuses is a problem. Tuition increases create havoc. Non-resident tuition needs examination. A central question that arises is as follows: how do we look at non-California residents and have their tuition reflect the market? We need to have a balanced portfolio. If we are now in charge of financing our own buildings, then we must mange our money more effectively. Such management requires changes in state law that enables this to occur. The UC has done this already. This will be a long-term strategy. Tuition planning should begin now. There needs to be a new predictable model for tuition. Non-resident tuition should be a proposal-based item on campuses. The CSU must continue to focus on California residents.

Student Access: With more graduates, student access needs to be of central importance in financial discussions. Students may not be prepared for college and this should also be an area of examination. We are not currently set up for success. Work with k-12 to find intersegmental
approach to these problems must continue. There are different practices in terms of what can be done. Enhancing student retention and progress to degree needs to be examined.

**The following concerns and questions were raised:**

Question: FGA will be emphasizing that increased state support is just not going to return. Discussion will center on how this can be restored. Targeted audiences must be considered. Externally, this report suggests that the CSU is now developing a plan that lets it meet fiscal needs without further state support. Extending public-private partnerships beyond bookstores to operations, risks encroachment upon university independence. There is a concern about the absence of a discussion on student fees. The freeze on student success fees are also of concern. This is a model that does not support the public university.

Response: We must act proactively toward what the state is doing to the university. The report must be balanced. The best investment of state dollars is in the CSU rather than more prisons. Mission based donations are also being considered. Careful cultivation of alumni relationships can result in an increase of scholarships, etc.

Question: This discussion of returning state support needs to be place in the report. The title should be changed. The statement about a new approach to funding sends the wrong message. Efficient management of funding should be used and focused on. Will greater efficiency enable us to meet increasing demand? Is this realistic? To what extent does this approach do a disservice to the university? If we accommodate more students without increased resources, does this not reduce quality? Quality is not discussed until page 25. The current discussion centers on access and not excellence.

Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs

EVC Blanchard reported that he is excited about the work that can be done with the ASCSU. His student success efforts enabled him to be part of Xavier University of Louisiana and make an impact on at-risk and students from low socio-economic backgrounds. EVC Blanchard stated that it is good to see the deep level of support that faculty give to students on campuses and it is important to remember that one faction does not ensure student success. It takes a group to make this happen, to have campuses that recognize student needs, and to ensure the synergy necessary for student success - not just lip service. Enrollment management – student supports and academic supports – seeks to ensure that students are able to graduate and succeed. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge and pay close attention to how the work of the faculty leads to student success. The following concerns and questions were raised and answered:

Question: Tenure density is dropping in the CSU. Do you have any thought on how we might address the net drop in tenure density?

Response: Assessment of why faculty exit is being conducted. Is this outside of retirement? If this is that they are not meeting tenure criteria, then the question becomes how do we ensure that they are supported to get them to tenure. It is important to stay focused on the kinds of needs that we have and work with the legislature so that they understand why continued investment is important and fulfill our commitment to faculty.
In the BoT meeting next week, there is a discussion of turnover within the system. It is important to understand why faculty is leaving before they receive tenure. It is important to look at the Outstanding Faculty Website.

Question: Welcome. All evidence suggests that the UC system is moving towards a privatization model. We are concerned that we are not open to all eligible students within our system. How might we maintain public access and still balance the books? Are there any strategies from Louisiana that you can contribute to CSU system?

Response: The Chancellor and I are concerned about the number of eligible students that are denied access to the campuses. How to address this issue requires a rich diversity in approaches. There must be a more systematic approach to address this issue. This ties right back to the dollars allocated to us by the legislature. Language proficiency is also an issue that must be discussed, as it clearly relates to the concerns of our international students. We also must explore whether or not the international students are taking the seats of California residents. Louisiana has different concerns. Many students take courses outside of the state and return to the system two years later as transfers.

Questions: I was delighted to hear of you uniting student affairs and academic affairs. These entities are usually at odds. How do you get both to work together?

Response: We must understand the student success plans on each campus and make sure that everyone understands his or her roles in student success. Usually there is not one person in charge. We must understand the number of hands that are tied to our students. We must also understand the joint roles that one has in student success and effective learning in classes. Work habits, mental health issues, etc. can enable us to understand why students are performing the way that they are.

Question: On the issue of Academic Freedom, the last policy was approved in 1971. It is limited and outdated and does not respond to the issues that are coming up in our system. We have asked for a consultative process for drafting a new comprehensive policy on Academic Freedom and were waiting for your leadership before we can move forward. We have also been discussing a new HR policy - HR 2015-08 - about background check for all new hires for the CSU. Such background checks for working with children, for example, are necessary; however, this raises questions for scholarship and teaching. To what extent might those who engage in activist scholarship be unfairly impacted? How might this deter activist scholars from applying to our system? Is it possible to modify the policy?

Response: It is important to look into the campus-based concerns that can serve as a guide for what we can do at the system level. This will enable us to redesign system policy with attention and respect to campus based policies.

Question: It is important to look at poverty in the San Joaquin Valley and our students come to us from poverty, rural areas, and peoples of color. It is important to understand
the regional variations and associated needs. It is hoped that you will give attention to students from the Central Valley and their needs.

Response: This will be examined. Particular examination of students from rural and industrial areas in Louisiana will guide approaches to looking at the variations in student needs regionally in California and shaping career plans for students that enable their success. This may sound like common sense; however, it provides vital attention to student needs and address the barriers students in achievement gap group face so that they can get to where they want to go.

Question: What do you see as the role of technology in higher education and how will you support it? What is your view of online education and what is the support that you will lend to the Commission on Online Learning?

Response: With attention to the sophisticated ways that students are using technology, it is important to provide both student and faculty with supports for using the technology. It is important to review and monitor the technological capacity that we have with an eye forward to see where our campuses should be in 3-5 years. This will enable students to have access to changing technology. Online learning is really important; however, it is important to understand that older learners will need this resource as well. It is important to have measurements that ensure high quality technological use and appropriate policies and practices to ensure success. Quality Matters has worked well and support for their endeavors will be advocated. It is important to have an eye forward with respect to the work to be done.

Question: With further attention to online education and how it affects student success, online teaching and learning has not been given a clear fit into Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) and workload. What strategies might you offer to enable clarification?

Response: It is important to remember that the new pedagogical style should measure up to the old style (i.e., positive impact on student learning.). There should be an assessment of online education to see if there are particular needs for faculty that can ensure their success. As for workload, campus by campus, there needs to be more discussion regarding prep time and teaching time. This will be examined and a conversation can be had at a future time.

Concern: With attention to student success and effective implementation, despite being controversial in its infancy, the data on the success of Early Start is coming out. It is important to ask critical questions regarding the success of the program. Data can be spun to look like success. The cost to campuses should also be examined.
Committee Recommendations

Action Items:

Support for SB 707 (Wolk)  
Approved Unanimously  
AS-3222-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Support for SB 172 (Liu) Pupil Testing: High School Exit Examination: Suspension  
Approved Unanimously  
AS-3224-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Commendation for Beverly Young  
Approved By Acclamation  
AS-3226-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Minimum Prerequisites or Included Content for the Awarding Of CSU General Education Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning (B4)  
Approved Unanimously  
AS-3230-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

On the California High School Exit Examination  
Approved Unanimously  
AS-3232-15/APEP  
First Reading/Waiver

First Reading Items:

Suspension of CSU Background Check Policy, HR- 2015-08  
AS-3223-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Response to Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Draft Report  
AS-3225-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Task Force on General Education (GE) Quantitative Reasoning Requirement (Area B4)  
AS-3227-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Addition of an Emeritus/Emerita Faculty Member to the CSU Board of Trustees  
AS-3228-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Board of Trustees 2016-2017 Proposed Support Budget  
AS-3229-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Commendation for Ron Vogel  
AS-3231-15/FGA  
First Reading/ Waiver

Adjournment

Plenary adjourned at 12:00p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary