

Meeting Minutes
CSU Statewide Senate Chairs
October 24, 2019 | 10 am – 2 pm
CSU Chancellor's Office: Anacapa conference room

Present in Person:

Michael B. Scott (Convener, CSUMB), Catherine Nelson (ASCSU Chair, Sonoma), Beth Steffel (CSUSB), Charles E. Thomas (CSUDH), Dinesh Pinisetty (CSU Maritime), Gregory Wood (CSUCI), Jessica Pandya (CSULB), Michael Lee (CSUEB), Phyllis Nelson (Cal Poly Pomona), Ravisha Mathur (SJSU), Sharon Hamill (CSUSM), Thomas Holyoke (CSU Fresno)

Present by Zoom:

Chiara Ferrari (CSU Chico), Mark Wheeler (SDSU), Nancy Gerber (SFSU), Stephanie Burkhalter (Humboldt), Steven Filling (CSU Stanislaus), Veena Prabhu (CSULA)

1. Introductions

Each member introduced themselves and gave campus updates

2. Election of Convener and Recorder for 2019-2020

Elected Convener and Recorder. Michael B. Scott Convener. Greg Wood recorder for today.

3. ASCSU Chair Catherine Nelson's report

Ethnic Studies. Feedback. Nov meeting - basis recommend 11th or 12th. Regular first reading. 2nd reading in January meeting. AA committee will recommend. No sense of this yet. AB 1460 may become a nonissue, no guarantee. 2-year bill - can be brought back this January. 23rd or 24th they will vote in Statewide.

Quantitative reasoning issue - before trustees this Nov. They are supportive of that. Keenly aware of limits for underserved high schools. Mitigate those impacts - asking CO to do this?

Land acknowledgment

Contingent to the faculty process - database register data and ask search committees will look into that. Can hire current lecturer into the w/o national search. (Her understanding is allowed).

Search firm for Chancellor. Search process. Don't know. Like searching for a President.

4. "Guidelines and Practices" document

Added and student success, to introduction; updated links

5. AB 1460/AS-3397-19/AA

Discussed in ASCSU Chair's Report

6. C-ID Reviewers in *History* and *Radio/TV/Film/Media*

ASCSU Chair solicited reviewers from Campus Senate Chairs

7. Visit with Dr. Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs (Time Certain: 11:00 a.m.)

Also AVC. Leo Van Cleve joins the room. Assist Vice Chancellor - liaison from CO to us. Loren B. welcomes us. He also meets statewide.

Update.

1. TW retiring end this aca year. Feels fortunate to work alongside TW. Dedicated and smart. Microfocused on student success. Loss but new opportunity.

2. Process. Search committee of board members. Advisory board include fac, students, community. Do outreach. Include statewide senate. Also number open forums. Throughout the state (may go national (?)). Scoping meetings. Might be electronic portal for information.

3. Quantitative Reasoning Proposal. Task force commissioned by statewide senate. Including community colleges, the governor, etc. Expectations for intro students. Require 4th year of quant reasoning in High School. During senior year to fill gap so they keep doing math all 4 years. Actual proposal is more general. Any year is OK. Could be science, math, beyond alg 2, elective with quant, also could be dual enroll or career develop. Is not new. Work has been at play 2-3 years. They have heard both opposition and support. In Nov we are presenting it for action to the Board (what board?) Do not want a negative equity impact. Want to improve equity. Not just about access, it is about completion.

Research shows that additional quant coursework increases opportunity to be successful not just 1st courses, but to graduate. They say also in CSU this is true (data - where is it?)

Those with 3 years of math and no quant, they are not graduating or not as fast. They have the data. Also have dept of ed data which validates. Opportunity also from beginning at CSu they more prepared to declare majors with quant reasoning emphasis.

We are trying to recruit into quant majors many students afraid. Increased chance to graduate. Question: will it be required in 4th (senior) year? Answer: No, but encouraged.

Question: will also required to transfer from CC? Answer No.

Question: Task Force endorsement? Answer: we have endorse of statewide senate. Not gone back to Task Force. It was a recommendation. To have a 4th year, that was math in senior year. Question: yes. But we are moving away from that. Did you go back to task force? Answer: Nov is the timeframe, but we can do that. Get extra info.

Question (SF) : Our recommend were interwoven, 4th year, explicitly (cuts out) of quantitative. Also estab. Institute to help k-12 to develop curriculum. That needs to be 6-12 year rollout and curric support.

Answer: 2026 runway: we have begun expand number bridge courses. Joint plan CSU and k-12 fac. Implement in schools. If you use this, process, the course qualifies. About 1k high schools already done this. Runway so we know where challenged highs chools. Focus courses in those schools and \$10M for teacher training in STEm fields directed to those challenged schools. It is a work in progress. Will look during those 6 year.

Q: SF - colleagues in developmental math were not involved.

A: No not a policy decision.

Q: SF - we are neglecting the developmental math faculty

A: Will look into it. Not by design.

CMRCI - math ready group.

Q: JP - fac and stu for the chancellor search.

A: No but board will find out. Jean Firender will chair trustee's earhc committee.

Eithnic Studies on our mind: Clear CO joined statewide in opposing AB 1460. Main reason

legis intrusion. Fac decide curriculum. Legis should not intrude. Also concern narrow focus on 4 areas. When you look at what we have now - we have many requirements that are broader, and look like our stud, fac, staff and not limited.

Q: Why only the CSUs? Not UC not CC's? Legis continue only CSU?

A: Bill did move forward for K-12 as well. For UC - they have more choice than CSU do. Author of Bill (Weber) is from one of our campuses (SDSU) one recommend was to add gen ed requirement in ethnic studies. Made it clear to council - we will update community CSU about level of work to comply with each recommendation. 2017 compendium of work done. 9% incr enroll in ethnic stud. 72 new tt fac in ethnic stu from report date to 2017. Now updating it again. Campuses asked to report what is their definition of diversity requirement. 2 trains are runing: statewide asked us for feedback. CO has asked also for reports (on ethnic studies size, definition etc). This will come as a recommendation. Title 5 change. Requires board action. Board is very interested in broader disc on GE within the CSU. See how this works together.

Q: Should this trigger title 5 action, would that open door broader?

A: Yes, 3 board members. Yes also interested in GE.

Q: Title 5? What

A: Modify Title 5.

Continues. We are collecting report to senator Pan.

Q: Timeline -

A: january earliest it can be back.

Q: JP - we can ask within CSU to do something like this and ask CO edit title 5.

Q: We want flexibility. Not stringent.

A: CN - why we're taking feedback. Are argument.

LB - bill indicates learning outcomes jointly estab by ethnic studies council (chair) in collab with statewide senate. Learning outcomes are plart of bill (in that it asks they will exist). Look careful bill on k-12 side. You will see the same reactions from diff cultural groups includsion for us, CSU.

Q: bill author is aware curric process and articulation so 1 year not sufficient. How can we do in one year? Can we push back?

A: (LB) I don't know. 1 year is unreallistic.

Q: CET - artic not in play if it were Upp div GE require

Q: JP - how likely csu we will have these?

A: CN - one way or another this will happen. I could be wrong.

A: LB - reality - if working clairify our requirement diversity, inclusion, ethnic studies, if we show evidence moving forward, difficult for legisl to come back and say we're doing the worgn thing.

Q: SF - Agree with LB. They did not see antyhing done, so if we are doing something it may make a difference.

LB continues - in GI 2025 Symposium. Hope we participate. Doing 4 years. Celebrate success also learn what other campuses are doing. Hear national voice. Good news: 4 year rate increased to 27% up from 19% when started. 6 year rate: 62% up from 57% in 2015. They 2 year transfer rate 40% up from 31% and 4 year 77% up from 73% in 2015. Funding helped this effort. Clear: success requires 450M\$ into 75\$M chunks designed incr avg unit loads reasonable chance to get 15 untis/sem. Lots to hire faculty. Aca support services. Tech infrastructure.

Also goal is to elim equity gaps. From last to this year, remained constant. Prior year, began to close that gap. We think it will change. With redesign develop math. 7k more students who successfully completed intro math. Other initiatives. Also honored faculty

(19). No way success w/o faculty. 230 nominations. All fac lead, driven, by statewide. LB ends with: 2019 is sig year. This year students measure our 6 year goal. All are important, but the time is now. Double down: study carefully the practices/policies. Change what is not working. Scale up successes. And get resources to continue. So, ultimately, students can meet their goals. Thanks faculty for what we have done so far. Continue to work collaboratively to reach goals.

Veena; Q: Thank you for GI 2025. Equity is a big issue at CSULA. No easy ways. Shout out to Geoff Gold. Dashboard useful. Equity needs more than this quick consideration. Thank you again.

A: LB: welcome. Dashboard good to hear it is useful. Look squarely at equity. For each pillar of GI (6 pillars) - is a workgroup. They made recommends to incr grad rates and close equity gaps. We will bring back to you. Can be valuable. Groups had faculty. Looked at best practices.

MBS: Q: Early start.

A: not this year - will external review of Early Start Program. Will look at results 1100 and 1110. Not decided who will do this (yet).

LB - I am here for information.

CN - continues the report. One other item: Transfer CC to CSU is an issue: dire need CSU faculty participate in course review process. When CC propose a course, CSU fac must also review the course. History radio/tv related fields need help. Other issue with Transfer: with ADT: Transfer model Curriculum. (TMC) the UC is establish similar to our TMC. And the CC are pushing us to align TMC to UC Pathways. Questions from state legislature as to why 2 different? Some answers are good. Get good answers, and align when possible. Tell them we are doing this. No law needed. CSU taken aback - did not know it was coming. Hesitant to align without disciplinary input in 7 areas. Try to work it out. By December.

Q: CF - hard to hear CN over the mike. What does History/Radio/TV? Need professors. I am one.

A: CN: Thank you send in your name.

Q: JP - can you re-send the request for C-ID people. For us to forward. The TMC is already problematic. We are trying to fix that now which is already complicated. Pandora's box you are opening is big.

Q: RM; many faculty not aware of C-ID process? Are fac paid? (Yes \$25 / course) Um...it is an intense activity.

Q: Stephanie - I am Poly Sci - I get courses, I don't have time. Can this be more formal? Recognize in RTP.

Q: SF - adjust mike (we adjust).

Time is 12:04pm. Lunch.

Yum.

12:34pm - reconvene - Look at Guidelines document.

Move February meeting tentatively at San Francisco State University. Tradition that one/year move to Nor Cal.

AB 1460.

CN - idea that CO may take up all GE if this passes? New to me.

RM - I will ask fac trustee if this has been raised.

Resolution on Campus Senates (?) DP from Maritime - issue - Question: Who passes resolutions? Had a committee on Gender & Equity wanted a Resolution. What is process? Involve Admin in discussion? (????NO????)

Fresno - Resol - come from floor, and whole senate. No admin involved.

PH - at CPP - exec sets agenda, must go through exec. Often a resolv could use some advice. A way to help ensure smooth. If not time sensitive, it takes 2 readings. Example: support Columbus Day move to Indigenous People's Day. First drafts were...strongly political.

RM - At SJSU - sense of senate resol - though exec or through policy committee. If from community, they work with exec. We vote as senate whole. Empowered during summer to pass resolv in exec, which we did on AB 1460 due to urgency.

Nancy - can come from exec, standing, anybody can bring to the floor. If not standing committee, there are hoops. It never happens. Agree no role for Admins. Don't need President's signature. We speak our voice. Can use to Preface a policy revision. Give sense of campus support to an idea.

Mark - Anyone can bring resolv to senate floor. Hoops. 4 day rule. To get onto agenda w/o special vote. Ask resolv to exec first (normally). To be helpful. Try not to gatekeep in exec. Committees often bring resolv. Also sometimes with a constituent. Almost never have admin involved. However, if questions, we ask them. Resolv signed by President become policy. However, not in proper language. So backfill process needed. Execpt during summer. Exec can pass. Senate can revoke that.

Q: Are resolv signed?

A: Mark - President signs before they become policy.

Michael - Lee - CSUEB - Resolv from anywhere. But need intro. All our motions unless on consent. Discuss all others. All from exec last year. We have a list of things the pres does sign, but these don't require sign. We resolved to move a plaque - minor. Other were directed to CSU. All Came from exec.

Stephanie - University senate like SDSU. Have admin on senate. Working well. They are there from formation. Can advise. Do send policy resolv to pres, for sign. Also sense of senate - one day, which we send to the president. Admin don't pass resolv.

Agenda - add items?

ML - Presidential Search, policy pass this year - refers to campus policies for IDmembers for these search committees. Senate chair, (others) required to be on it. Timeslines involved. Good idea to read it and write policy. May want a staff council to avoid San Marcos lawsuit as staff person was appointed by exec. Before, was not listed who was on committee.

Topics:

Mark - we're re-thinking funding model, FTES model NOW, but admin cannot change it. Interested in funding models.(2) EO 1100 - one way in engineering - take critical thinking into eng. What soln you have?

RM - 3 year Presid Reivew - feedback - letter -

(2) With review - cumbersome process letter to CO...wait, cannot be digital?

(3) Staff Council - we develop on our campus. Staff on senate.

MBS - SG, RTP, faculty of practices, path to tenure.

New Agenda:

Pres Search - MLee send policy. Line in it says: If campus has standing policy w/o election, review.

Nancy - yes we have it now. (One for President).

One search going on now (East Bay).

Mlee - senate chair is on search committee. 2 more slots. So we exclude the college of senate chair to get broader reps.

SH - San Marcos - staff elect own member to committee. They help set up.

Stephanie - Case for not trying to rep all colleges. Prior policy had that (2013). Just regular election - 2 candidates once reach 66% they were chosen (sorry not sure what that means) The CFA chair was elected and was awesome. I know all areas (science) want reps, but that is difficult. We asked other slots, they said NO. 3 total faculty chair plus 2. Lectureer ran but did not win.

Tom - Fresno did this in ad-hoc. Asking: how to define constitutincies.

ML -- answers - NO our constitution is ambiguous. Fac is defined 396 people. But for lect reps, we have definition. So when a letter calls for faculty, that includes lecturers.

Tom - we have one definition which excludes part time

CN - sonoma - voting elig fac get a vote. 2 highest.

Nancy - SFSU - Sent our policy around. We basically followed it. All full timme are elign. But 4 people were both on provost search and pres search, too much power. But went ahead with it.

Funding models -

Tom - funding model - away from FTES based model - but now, irrelevant. Not enough \$ to AA instead other divisions.

?What was model?

Tom - various weights to colleges...disadv to some colleges. It is horrifitc.

MLee - projects of FTES - based - Budget com - asked by Provost - advised on how allocate \$. 5 buckets - (list). Instruction. Efficiency, Outcomes, Measured Equity Grad rates, Research (grants) , and Diversity&Equity (new hires, retain diverse fac). Deans used to decide new hires. Now based on 5-year review and strat plan. From 5-year review, MOU details agreement, generates hires. Broaden to more factors.

PN - Pomona - changes in fundng model - not transparrent - large eng and bus colleges (they get x-fer students) - Proportion of transfer students. If more come, lib arts and sci don't make targets (they don't take GE don't need). Oscillating numbers created chaos. Multi-year funding model - for better projections - how translate into fac lines. Friction between areas who gets x-fer students. Two camps (GE versus majors). % transfer cahnges.

Nancy - SFSU - provost use marginal cost instr - huge (?) - not good at budgeting \$1M cuts with no explain - ready to move back to FTES model. No idea.

Mlee - one time money - doesn't work with FTES model. So effort awards \$50k to his dept. Other got more. So how to use it? Used for travel, research.
DP - CO released \$35M for tt hires, how allocated?
SH - don't know. How allocated.
RM - I heard - \$1.2 M for SJSU - how allocated? What cycle.
SF - Talk to your CFA chapter president - they know the amounts - CSU reports to legis. \$35M this year. To fund additional TT lines ONLY.
Mlee - we had 30 new searches - 6-7 of them with this \$. Did this create more?
Nancy - student success hires - in areas direct stu success (STEM education or other). So you can count them.

EO 1100 - Mark - issues - in Eng - Re-def of C-1 and C-2. Related to funding model. Eng attempts to take GE into their area failed. It is difficult.
PN - engineering faculty and ABET evaluator - during semester conversion - forced to cut units from eng - a3 is a problem. Crit thinking within engineering - was controversial but CO required. Part of the problem is that: number of GE units larger in CSU. Now 123 or 124 units, but we decreased upper division work - we are concerned. (example: mechanical engineering only one semester of design) Things are removed from curric. Our students compete with students with much more qualified. I think others should teach writing, crit thinking, but engineering is not in title 5, for additional units. All trying to figure out how to fit. ABET two years ago - 2 programs started with a "D" grade, not accredited, but we managed to show we were OK - but it is a close run thing! It is hard.
Mlee - we trying to get civil engineering. Other eng is 125 units an 89 units for major. No free electives left. Lots of advising. Issues with transfer.

President Review

Mlee - review - letter - very cumbersome - chair of senate is ment to inform. Chief of Staff of president was ment to inform. Are they doing that? Comparing letters - they are all the same. The letters which were the outcome!
RM - encourage response. Letter confusing - who consulted? Admin are not submitting letters. Due to confid is not 100%. Concerned. Pres does need feedback in many areas. Very top down. All at cabinet level. Very different for SJSU. (Example: lack delegate student issue).
MBS - 6 year review letters were all alike! Letters similar because the details passed along in private.
Thomas - What should be done? Complain.
MBS - trustees not chancellor do the letter.
PN - MPP review, normally confidential. The letter says the process was followed. Deeper question - could President sue CSU for neg letter. Supervisor required to interview. Nice to know what President told.
Tom - I don't disagree. But same letter sends a bad message.
Mlee - East Bay Maritime - from TWhite - Nov 28 2018 2 pages long 5th paragraph.
SF - deep issues - with letters - seems to make presidents seem perfect. Some times not a fine job. Don't say anything if there are problems. It is offensive.
GW - can we compare this to MPP reviews?
Nancy - wow - we cannot see letters to MPPs. Kept quiet - don't expect details, but the form letter is not helpful. Not genuine.
MBS - 6 year review - last year - were meetings with trutees - were set up by President (for their own eval).
RM - who consulted? All can email. Confusing.

Staff Council -

Nancy - we want create staff council - what about senate? What is rep staff on senate?

Do you exchange people?

Tom - no staff on senate but we want one.

Stephanie - Staff council and 2 staff senators. Council only staff issues - effective electing reps - own elections - staff to searches (president)

Charles - we have 2 staff on senate. Don't have council.

Mark - we have staff affairs committee of senate - move to staff senate (or council). Told union don't want? He was surprised by that. Are they delegates? The committee does good work.

PN - 40 years active staff council - activities sponsored, service award ceremony (which include faculty). No issues with unions.

Beth - President just made one. 3 years we've had one. 2 members on Shard Gov steering committee. Only staff on staff council. Our senate have student and admin, but no staff (yet).

Stepahnie - link to our Humboldt staff council. Send via email. Union - 2 councils - one is an assembly and the labor council for staff from each union.

Tom - we have those two groups also.

MBS - how?

Mark W - staff are talking with him about this. Prior senate were NOT in favor of this no prog last 3 years. But now, new senate secretary, and staff, may proceed.

8. Resolutions: Campus Senates

9. Faculty of Practice (Added Item)

Faculty of Practice -

Mark - Professor of Practice - 2 ways - within RTP - conform to CBA - changing language so that practice can count for tenure. Long contracts within unit 3, supporting aca professions - longer non-tenure contracts. As senate chair, pursue convo has this be done? Any offers to CFA? Language for longer term contracts?

PN - We have them in Engineering, but 1.0 lecturer basis - so its not 5 year contract. We'd like to retain these people. Follow usual entitlements.

MLee - ? - what is this? Between tt and lect? Create certainty? Is this erosion of tenure? I've not heard.

MBS - at concept level - think as elevating lecturers. In model on our campus - instead of research, they paid for service, but just teach maybe with curriculum. No research expectation.

RM - discussion on our campus on cabinet level - professors of clinical practice - (councilors) provide clinical rotation - don't fit in RTP (even though councilors are in RTP). Two councilor fac were denied tenure last year despite continued support over 6 years.