

**Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Plenary Minutes  
January 21-22, 2016  
Office of the Chancellor**

**Thursday, January 21, 2016 - 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium**

*Senate Social – Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee Hosting  
5:15 p.m. to 6:45 p.m., Munitz Lobby*

**Friday, January 22, 2016 - 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium**

**Call to order**

With a quorum being present, the plenary was called to order at 8:05a.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, Kensinger); 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); 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, Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Foroohar, LoCasio); 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; Kelsey Brewer, CSU Student Trustee; Juan Cervantes, CSSA Liaison; Jennifer Eagan, CFA Liaison; Harold Goldwhite, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA) Liaison; Andrew Martinez, CSU Senior Legislative Advocate and State Relations; Lori Redfearn, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advancement Services; Steven Stepanek, CSU Faculty Trustee; Maggie White, CSU Student Trustee (non-voting); Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor.

**Approval of agenda**

The Agenda was Approved.

**Approval of November 5-6, 2015 minutes**

The Minutes were Approved as Amended.

**Announcements**

Senator Yee-Melichar announced that the Faculty-to-Faculty Newsletter is now available.

## Reports

### *Steven Filling, Chair*

Chair Filling reported that the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force would be convened. The electronic version of the Chair's Report contains the Task Force composition and charge. This task force has representation from the faculty, industry, and state agencies. Significant attention has been given to best practices for moving the task force forward and ensuring effective outcomes. Central in these discussions has been the importance of maintaining faculty primacy in voice. The Lt. Governor has expressed interest in quantitative reasoning and this task force. Chair Filling also reported that the California Articulation Conference would take place in Irvine, CA. Senators interested in attending the conference should email Vice Chair Miller. A feedback link has been embedded in the Extended Education Pilot Summary. Comments from stakeholders are being requested. Senators may also speak with Senators Guerin, Shutte, or Brodowsky. Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) has recommended that the ASCSU engage in local office visits during the day at the capital. Andrew "Andy" Martinez, CSU Senior Legislative Advocate, Advocacy and State Relations, will attend plenary to offer strategies on effective lobbying. The CSU was provided with additional funding last year due to administrative, faculty, and student unity in lobbying. The year, the same approach will be needed to ensure success. Chair Filling further reported that the briefing he gave in Sacramento and the conversation had with the Department of Finance regarding Quantitative Reasoning were well received. Conversations on Academic Freedom continue and CSU General Council informed the ASCSU leadership that this topic was a bargaining topic. ASCSU leadership consulted with CFA on the issue. Three representatives CFA (Eagan, Brandfield, and Tombs) met with three representatives from the ACSU. The group is working towards a draft Academic Freedom Policy. A meeting with the CO will occur for the purpose of trying to create a common policy. The CSU Provosts and Presidents will be viewing a draft of the policy in the near future. Consultation has occurred and it has been agreed that the best to move forward is to convene a tri-party group that works on a mutually agreeable draft. Lastly, Chair Filling reported that the mechanics behind tenure density are being examined and recognition of the problem is occurring system wide. The CO has initiated examination of the concerns and EVC Blanchard and VC Lamb have been asked for transparency on how the \$11 million has been allocated throughout the system. Chair Filling participated on a conference on the budget and the budget for the CSU is in good shape; however, the governor would like to remain conservative on allocations to education, despite the growing need for additional resources. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What kinds of revisions were made to the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report?
2. Reorganization and reprioritizing of information has occurred (e.g., issues related to access has been moved to the front.). Explanations of SUGs have also expanded.
3. If Academic Freedom is part of collective bargaining, is it still part of the ASCSU purview?
4. Is it possible that the Intellectual Property and Shared Governance policies can come back to committee before they move forward? Who drafted the policies? All major universities have a definition of Academic Freedom on their websites as a goal of their university. Faculty rights are also addressed in these statements when Academic Freedom is violated. The goal of FA was to encourage the administration to consult with the ASCSU. A sentence in the contract on Academic Freedom has been the ground

for why the administration will not discuss the issue. The goal is to have a common definition.

5. Faculty Affairs (FA) met with Zed Mason, Interim VC for Research and Partnership and John Sworek, VC for Labor Relations, and legal council, on Intellectual Property. These individuals have been charged with writing the draft.
6. The campus senate chairs are discussing Intellectual Property.
7. A fishing scheme is sending out emails suggesting that W2s are available electronically purportedly from the CMS system.
8. It seems that performance based budgets and online classes now have the ear of the governor.
9. Senator Hood send the LAO report that illuminated discrepancies between educational systems. It is important to hold K-12 responsible for remediation.
10. It is important that students be provided with resources to learn how to learn online.

Chair Filling invited senators to offer the following updates from campuses:

#### *Chico*

Senators from Chico State reported on the vote of no confidence recently passed on three of their administrators. This vote passed 24-8 and a letter was sent to the CO and BoT. Senators are awaiting a response. An email was received, prior to the vote, requesting that the Academic Senate not proceed with the vote. A consultant is visiting the campus to interview faculty, staff, and students. The following concern and questions were raised:

1. Where is Chico State with the presidential search?
2. Can you clarify who dispatched the consultant?
3. The consultant will visit campus to discuss facilitating the transition of the new president.
4. AS 3075 needs to be followed. Faculty and administrators need to commit to the principles of shared governance.

#### *Standing committees*

*Academic Affairs (AA)* - AA Chair Nelson reported that the committee would continue discussing concerns surrounding quantitative reasoning, underrepresented groups in STEM, competency in the Natural Sciences, and the roles of faculty on honorary degree committees and in transfer to the CSU. Chair Nelson also gave a special thanks Director Ken O'Donnell, Don Darius, and VC Chris Mallon for their collaborative consultations that lent to the creation of the forth coming resolutions on "Selection of Faculty to Serve on Campus Honorary Degree Committee" (Second Reading) and the "Role of California State University (CSU) Campus Faculty in the Evaluation of Courses for Transfer" (First Reading).

*Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)* - APEP Chair Fleming reported that the committee met with representatives from the Bechtel Foundation to discuss the how to transform the recruitment, selection, and preparation of education candidates using next generation science standards. The committee would also continue conversation on Cal State Teach. APEP would

consult with Senator Yee-Melichar on how to reach more of our CSU colleagues and inform them of the program. The committee will continue discussion of mathematics and the how Computer Science might serve as a viable option for the Area C requirement. Chair Fleming also reported that Faculty Trustee Stepanek consulted with APEP on the multi-signatory letter to the UC Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). APEP would continue consultation with administrators to expand the discourse on mathematics. The goal of these conversations is to consider the viability of a First Reading resolution calling for a fourth year of mathematics. APEP would also explore the need for calls for the analyses of existing data on reducing time to degree, closing the achievement gap, and what constitutes the “New CSU Student”. APEP will also examine existing data behind Senator Locasio’s call for awareness on the underrepresentation of males in the teaching profession.

*Faculty Affairs (FA)* - FA Chair Foroohar reported that the committee would present a Second Reading resolution on the “Inclusion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Campus, College and Departmental Orientation Programs”. FA would continue to engage in extensive discussion of Shared Governance for the purposes of creating a resolution. FA would also introduce a resolution in First Reading on “Restoring Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) Funds as a Line Item in the CSU Operation Budget” and possibly another one on the rise of Islamophobia. The latter would ask for support for students and faculty that face this phobia in education and educational support programs for campus communities. Chair Foroohar further reported that FA would also hear reports from VC Lori Lamb and AVC Merryfield from Human Resources (HR) on background checks concerns. It seems that students are being exempted from background checks FA will also hear a report from CFA President Jen Eagan. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Is there data on faculty hiring?
2. It is important to look at what universities are doing to make academic freedom as a core value.
3. FERPs seem to be counted in tenure density.
4. It is important to disaggregate these data.

*Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)* - FGA Chair Krabacher reported the committee would be bringing two Resolutions in Second Reading: “Recognition of California Taxpayers for their Support in Funding the CSU” and “Request for Joint Task Force to Develop and Action Plan for Increasing Tenure/Tenure=Track Density in CSU”. The “Commendation for Karen Y. Zamarripa, Assistant Vice Chancellor CSU Advocacy and Slate Relations” will also be presented. Chair Krabacher further reported that committee meetings centered on the monitoring of legislation. This allowed for critical discussion of the impacts that the legislation may have on the CSU before positions are recommended. Chair Krabacher also reported that the committee discussed the spring strategies for advocacy. After consulting with ExCom, advocacy would be extended beyond advocacy day to train and allow faculty to speak with their local home district representatives. Andrew Martinez, CSU Senior Legislative Advocate, Advocacy and Slate Relations would present during the plenary and discuss what training will comprise. FGA also had a conference call with Christian Osmena, Principal Government Budget Analyst, California Department of Finance, on the governor’s budget. This conversation led to interest in further conversations with the ASCSU. The four-year graduation rate is a problematic benchmark upon which the funding of the CSU and UC are based. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. How many of the legislators went to the CSU and received a SUG? It is important to point out that the students that you tried to help are being hurt.
2. The Orange County legislature is proposing a bill that impacts faculty and textbooks.

***Steven Stepanek – CSU Faculty Trustee***

Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported on the presidential search process currently under way for five campuses (i.e., Chico, Channel Islands, San Jose, Sonoma, and Stanislaus). Central in this discussion was an explanation of the Trustee's Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP), which consists of a group of Trustees selected for a specific search, and the Advisory Committee to the Trustee's Committee (ACTCSP). This committee consists of campus and community representatives engaged in the search process. Trustee Stepanek also reported on the meeting schedule for the searches. The first meeting of the TCSP and ACTCSP for each search occurs on the campus and consists of an open forum to assess campus needs and characteristics. The second meeting occurs on the campus in a closed setting to review the material submitted by approximately six candidates. The third meeting occurs off campus, near a major airport, to interview the candidates, and the last meeting is reserved for the full board to interview the candidates. The following is a brief summary of Faculty Trustee Stepanek's service (i.e., meeting schedule with key activities. Please see his email for more details.): November 8-9, 2015 (CSU Chico), November 10, 2015 (First committee meeting at CSU Chico), November 2015 (Participated in multiple conference calls regarding selections.), November 17-18, 2015 (BoT meeting), December 2, 2015 (Second meeting of San Jose State University search and application review.), December 3, 2015 (WASC workshop), December 9, 2015 (Task Force on a Sustainable Financial Model for the CSU), December 12, 2015 (Winter Commencement at CSU San Bernardino), and January 15, 2016 (Third meeting of the San Jose State University.). Lastly, Faculty Trustee Stepanek encouraged the ASCSU to read his column in Faculty-To-Faculty Newsletter at the following URL: [http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Newsletter/December2015/Faculty\\_Trustee\\_Report.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Newsletter/December2015/Faculty_Trustee_Report.shtml). He further reminded the ASCSU that the Agenda for the January 25-27, 2015 Board of Trustees meeting can be viewed at the following URL: <http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas>. Faculty Trustee Stepanek will be available during the plenary to answer questions. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What is the process for the presidential searches and when can announcements be made?
2. The Chancellor has given a list of priorities. One of the priorities increases research. Has this been discussed with the BoT?
3. It seems that universities are towards an R1 model. It is important to discuss the role of research in the CSU.
4. Tenure density seems to be an issue raised by many people. What is your assessment of the BoT's understanding of this issue?
5. Increased education is always important. It is important to invite the Trustees to campuses.

## *Other committees and committee liaisons*

### *General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC)*

GEAC Chair, Senator Eadie, reported that Director Ken O'Donnell met with the committee and discussed changes to the California Community College (CCC) general education curriculum, STATWAY, and the status of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force. The committee also examined upper division GE transfer between the CSU and CCC Baccalaureate Degrees Pilots. GEAC also heard a report from CCC faculty members that outlined resolutions passed relating to the new baccalaureate degree pilots and how they and general education are to be structured. GE would be narrowly defined and limited to the CCC baccalaureate degree pilot cohorts. Chair Eadie further reported that there are only two classes in upper division GE. GEAC heard a report from Senator Van Selst regarding CID program. This program standardizes course numbers so that CCC lower division had identifiers for transfer. The committee also heard a report from the Institute for Teaching Learning. This report consisted of updates and discussion. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Provosts have made a statement about GE and lowering the number of course required. Is this going to be OK?
2. There has been no talk of revising the Executive Order.
3. All of the CCC degrees will require IGETSE. They are not able to require additional local courses in their GE programs. Chair Filling's email regarding linked learning is important to consider. For the math pilots, what standards are they being judged or held against?
4. Math pilots must be based in statistics.

### *Ethnic Studies Task Force*

Senator Kessinger reported that feedback to the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report is in the process of being drafted in its final format. One additional meeting will take place before the document moves forward.

### *Faculty-to-Faculty Newsletter*

At-Large Senator Yee-Melichar reported that the ASCSU Faculty-to-Faculty Newsletter is available and encouraged all to share this resource with their colleagues. Book reviews, op-ed, and senator spotlight articles are being solicited. Senator Yee-Melichar offered a special thanks to contributors. On behalf of the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL), a flier was circulated on the 19<sup>th</sup> Annual Teaching and Learning Symposium. All senators were encouraged to attend. Please contact Senator Yee-Melichar for more details. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Will the flier go to the campus senate chairs?
2. The fliers go to the campus Presidents, Provosts, and Senate Chairs.

### *Background Check Policy Task Force*

At-Large Senator Soni reported that the committee was formed. Senators Soni and Roberts served on the committee. In discussions with the executive committee, AVC Merryfield responded to the email requesting and examination of the efficacy of the current background check policy, stating that more information was being gathered, and the sharing of this information would occur. Senators wishing to offer input should send this information to Senator

Soni or Senator Roberts. Managers are being interviewed at each campus and the challenges they have faced in the implementation of the policy. Senator Roberts reported that VC Lamb visited FA and stated that guidelines were sent to campuses on how to clarify policy language. The responses received suggested that concerns raised regarding the policy were not valid and the policy was working. Senator Soni further reported that only students that are working with confidential information were potentially impacted. All faculty working with sensitive information and will receive background check. One new faculty hire was impacted, as the background check revealed sexual misconduct with a minor. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. For what duration will data be accumulated? This issue may have a shelf life longer than the current Task Force.
2. It is important to consider a long-term study of this issue and examine the concerns of faculty as they arise overtime.
3. It is important to pay attention to confidentiality. Who is the identified campus designee and how are they trained on who would be hired and who would not?
4. It is important to consider the potential institutional racism that is potentially associated with this practice.
5. Were there any additional concerns for students? There is concern that while wordsmith may be well done, the issue may not be addressed.
6. The background check policy may harm the hiring process.
7. Is there a way to find evidentiary material that can illuminate the problems of this policy? There are many incalculable problems with this policy.
8. We must pay attention to the subjectivity of criminality that is not indicated by background checks. It is important to continue monitoring this policy.
9. To what extent might this be an encroachment upon privacy?
10. Does the Task Force have a recommendation on how the body can move forward?
11. It is important to consider the recommendations on how to move forward.
12. Has there been any discussion on how far back the search goes?
13. Seven years are examined.
14. If these data are being collected from crime databases, then it will be in a crime record and not arrest record. Which is being used? Are they taking only convictions and not arrests?
15. The policy says only convictions are used.
16. If one is in the pipeline, then one may be impacted.
17. There are multiple vendors and not just one.

***Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs***

EVC Blanchard reported that a revised Academic Freedom Policy was shared with Chair Filling. The existing policy has been and continues to serve us well; however, this decade old policy is in need of updating. The revised draft includes gender-neutral language, broadens coverage, and expands formats. Fresno, SLO, Northridge, and Long Beach are examples of administrators defending Academic Freedom. This issue is subject to collective bargaining. EVC Blanchard

also reported that the search for an AVC for research is concluding. The search continues to support the foci on research and support for student research. Zed Mason, Associate Dean for Research and External Support, will serve as interim for the purposes of ensuring continuity in attentions to research within the CSU. It is hoped that next week an announcement of a permanent position holder will be announced. EVC Blanchard further reported on the CSU Graduation Initiative. The CSU is committed to cutting in half the achievement gaps for African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans. The 57% graduation rate has been achieved. This represents an 11% gain and 3% in excess of the initiative goals. New targets and strategies will be explored to reduce the achievement gaps. The work of Director Van Cleve on internationalization is to be commended. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Why does the CSU continue to pursue online education classes, given that research shows underrepresented students will fail?
2. Online education is only one of many strategies for obtaining a quality education. Achievement gap students often need more direct resources. For students who work or can't find classes, online education can provide them with a resource.
3. It is often heard that "budget should reflect your values." How is this consistent with the decline in instruction budget? What is happening on campuses with student achievement? It seems that students are far less prepared for college level work.
4. Working with closing the achievement gap should not be confused with diluting college education. Transfer partnerships are being engaged so that students come ready to hit the ground running. Particularly in math, resources are being provided to ensure students success. Campuses should not reduce standards so that students can reach their goals.
5. It is important to provide students with resources for how to learn online. How can we be sure that students are learning appropriately? It is not that they are not smart, it is that they do not know how to learn online.
6. It is important to remember that it takes a certain personality type to do well online. It stands to reason that this will be examined across the CSU and provide training for students in this area.
7. On the issue of Academic Freedom, it was reported that a Task Force will be formed and the Academic Freedom Policy revised. Unfortunately, we still have cases where Academic Freedom is being violated on campuses. It is hope that faculty voices will be allowed to contribute to the revisions of the policy so that it is consistent with the mission of the CSU system.
8. Counselor Virjee and VC Lamb concur that it is important to have the ASCSU and administration come together to address necessary updates to the Academic Freedom Policy. The ASCSU, presidents, etc. worked collaboratively to come up with the draft. This is a collective bargaining item; however, it is hope that the end product will be one that we can all be proud of.
9. On the question of online education, it is important to explore the relationship between online education and face-to-face education. There is an effect that online education is having on face-to-face instruction. Is it possible to explore the unintended consequences of online education on traditional face-to-face education that is beyond a demand driven model?
10. Inclusivity is an important issue; however, it ties into Academic Freedom. There are multiple perspectives on approaching issues of inclusion and diversity on college

campuses and people should not be penalized for their views. Diversity means diversity of opinion as well.

11. What specifically is the CSU administration doing to increase resources for instruction?
12. Campus matrices for allocating resources will require additional research as such practices are executed locally. The \$11 million allocation will be followed by reports from campuses to ensure six areas were addressed. This will allow us to understand how the dollars were spent. Large investments are being made across the system in the areas of hiring faculty and advising. 55% of the student success dollars went toward the hiring of new tenured and tenure track faculty.
13. Thank you, EVC Blanchard, for your time today, as it gives us time to share the views of the faculty. When we look at inclusivity and closing the achievement gap, what can address it is time with faculty.
14. We talk about improving diversity in the faculty and upper administration; however, not much has been done. It is important to expand this discussion of diversity and inclusivity among staff and upper administration. Prior to your tenure, reports have been received on closing the achievement gap. This raises the question: do we have appropriate programs in place? What programs and processes might improve closure of the achievement gap? Is it possible to check and see if is Prop 209 that prohibits campuses from having programs for specific groups of people? Is this true? If not, then what can we do further?
15. Counselor Fram Virjee is looking at Prop 209 and work is being proposed to close the achievement gap.
16. Counselor Fram Virjee reported the following: Prop 209 has had a half-life. Many assumed that Prop 209 meant prohibition. As issues on campuses become more prevalent, we are examining Prop 209 again. We will need to think dynamically and “out of the box” to create programs within the confines of 209. Best practices are being gathered for the purpose of disseminating to campuses strategies that can help us move forward the needle of diversity and inclusion.
17. Fullerton and Long Beach have programs that offer examples for how to close the achievement gap within the confines of Prop 209.
18. In the past, when a faculty member retired, the position was replaced. Now the discussion is on strategic hires. Where is this nonsense coming from?
19. Do we have any sense of how many hires are occurring? 2009,10,11 reports exist on success rates, disciplines, authors, etc. Are we continuing to build the infrastructure needed to support faculty hires? What is the benchmark?
20. Research is being gathered on faculty by disciplines in order to get a better sense of difficulties in faculty retention and what we can do at the system level to retain faculty. Salary is one side of this issue. We will explore other ways to get more faculty. The reality is that the benchmark is a work in progress and we are working with campuses to get a sense of where we need to be.
21. On diversity and tenure density, it is important to examine faculty retention in these areas as well.

22. We have many students that are struggling. If we are to be honest about student success, then it is important that students know their teachers will be there for them. As a lecturer, it is important to remember that lecturers teach. Many lecturers are at multiple universities, do not have offices, or have dedicated space for advising students. What can we do to ensure greater faculty presence? Is it possible for the CSU to hire lecturers into the tenure track? This can be a strategy for addressing tenure density.
23. On the graduation rate, it is important to contextualize this with the Task Force on Quantitative Reasoning. We have heard much about stakeholders interested in CSU math curricula. It is not clear how STATWAY is sufficient for Quantitative Reasoning in the CSU. It is hoped that our underrepresented students are not tracked, but prepared to engage in multiple disciplines.
24. On Academic Freedom and the CBA, the language suggesting that when language appears in the CBA, it is no longer the purview of the ASCSU, is problematic.
25. Counselor Virjee reported that the role of Academic Freedom is in the Higher Education Act. HEERA suggests that Academic Freedom does not interfere with the CBA. The CSU and UC should thrive on Academic Freedom. It also says that the wages, hours, and working conditions are within the scope of HEERA and must be address by CFA on these issues within scope. Discussion of Academic Freedom can be a consultation point with the ASCSU. The CFA must be bargained with on this issue. The current CBA mentions Academic Freedom and its protection. Academic Freedom is a grievance point in the CBA. The CFA has the right to bargain over the issue. The current approach will be to consult, get input, and discuss this issue with the CFA or meet collectively.

***CSU Student Trustee Kelsey Brewer and CSU Student Trustee (non-voting) Maggie White***

Student Trustees Brewer and White reported that it was a pleasure to be invited to the ASCSU plenary. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. SUGs are expensive and taking money away from student success. This is important given the discussion of inclusivity today and closing the achievement gap.
2. Have you discusses the Sustainability Financial Model Task Force Report? What is the student perspective? Students have been discussing what does the system look like post Prop 30. To avoid a reactive position, the proposed facilities fee has been revoked from the report. There is an increasing amount of deferred maintenance. There is an increase in tuition and campus fees. It is counterintuitive to the CSU Mission to build buildings and not maintain these buildings. There were concerns that recognized step increases are more favorable to lump increases. Student representatives are not in favor of tuition increases.
3. Are the students being consulted on their lived experiences within the CSU and will they be involved in the convening of “next steps” groups?
4. The Students Trustee will offer input and then the report will be revised.
5. Time to degree discourse is often used to discourage students from pursuing dual majors. It is important to remind all that dual majors are important to ensuring diversity.
6. It is important for students to understand that individual reality is not universal. There are things that students can do to take classes before coming to campuses (e.g., Summer Bridge, etc.). This allows students to explore a greater breadth of courses. Student

choice seems to be connected with institutional barriers. It is important balance graduation rates with student choice. It is important to remove the institutional barriers to student choice.

7. Besides tuition and cost, what are student worries today?
8. The top concerns are food insecurity, deferred maintenance and useful classrooms, enrollment increases, and diversity and safe spaces on campuses. It is important to understand the populations that we serve and the concerns that occur outside the classroom that impact performance in the classroom. There needs to be a more comprehensive response. Conversations need to be had about what does diversity look like on campuses. It is important for campus communities to respond positively to this diversity.
9. Considering AS 3228-15/FA, there are about 10,000 retired faculty members that have given their careers to serving students. The response was that the current BoT composition is sufficient. Was this the sentiment of the BoT?
10. What was your position on four-year graduation rates? Are the students and faculty in unison on the problematic assumptions behind this ideal rate?
11. It is important to consider student lives (e.g., single mothers, etc.). These ideals for many are unrealistic. It is important to understand the population being served.
12. It is not logical to consider four years and one semester as part of the six-year graduate rate. It is important to have conversations with legislative allies. Education must not always be looked at as a pathway to the workforce only, it is important to look at how students can be well rounded and what happened between the university and the job.
13. The Department of Finance has suggested that students are taking too many seats and not getting out quickly. Online courses have been suggested as a possible solution.
14. It is important to understand the relationship between quality and time to degree. Quality should be the benchmark. Online education can be incorporated; however, it is not the way to solve the problem of time to degree.
15. How are students addressing their concerns to legislators?
16. Student are attempting to explain as much as possible to the legislature, as legislators have very little time and went to school at a very different time period.
17. I do not hear your colleagues on the BoT understanding the lived realities of CSU students. It is important for the students to tell stories to the legislature that are consistent student lived realities.
18. Different backgrounds shape perceptions and this is important to consider when discussing the BoT. Outreach is occurring and sometimes students need to offer their perspectives more to the BoT. The new Trustee will visits to all 23 campuses.
19. CSU Stanislaus students voted to build a new student union, as a Trustee you say that you are not for fee increases, and yet this was done. How do you see yourself now dealing with these kinds of issues where government should be paying for these kinds of facilities; however, student are opting to pay for the facilities?
20. State money cannot be used on auxiliary buildings. Students need to have a certain amount of self-determination when building auxiliary buildings.

***Andy Merrifield, CFA Contract Development & Bargaining Strategy Committee Chair on behalf of Jennifer Eagan - CFA Liaison Report***

On behalf of CFA President Jennifer Eagan, Andy Merrifield, CFA Contract Development & Bargaining Strategy Committee Chair reported that President Eagan could not attend as she has been asked by Assemblywoman Atkins to attend the State of the State address. Merrifield also reported that the campaign of 5% GSI and SSI for all eligible are the key issues being engaged by CFA. As much of the public sector is recovering from the recession, cities and counties are getting raises that move them in the direction of replenishing the loss. The only two agencies that do not have built in SSIs are the CSU and UC. Bargaining concerns are not only about money, they are about respect, honesty, transparency, and competence. Compensation is critically important in CSU discourse; however, it is usually about hiring new presidents and input from campuses has been limited. Merrifield further reported that the ASCSU needs to engage the question of accuracy and whether or not the average faculty really makes \$72,000 and works nine months out of the year. It is important to question the priorities of the CSU and administrative competence. The faculty has played a vital role in the recent increases to CSU funding. These concerns and issues are about preserving the integrity of the institution and respect for the faculty. Lastly, Merrifield reported that the CSU and CFA are in fact finding now, which will go into March, and end the statutory process. The CFA is always willing to meet with the Chancellor. It is important to remember that this is about students and retaining good faculty. It is important to consider why the faculty continues lobbying in Sacramento for more money that never impacts them. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important to remember that at recent events the Chancellor was willing to take questions from the faculty. The moderator impacted the ability of faculty members to comment. What is the strategic purpose of heckling and interrupting speakers at public events by CFA?
2. On the issue of Academic Freedom, do you feel that this is a collective bargaining issue?
3. The CFA is not adverse to the ASCSU engaging in conversations on Academic Freedom. The ASCSU cannot create a Resolution that is enforceable by the contract. That purview lies with the CFA.
4. It seems that there are problems in the compensation priorities of the CSU. Administrator compensation is higher than the previous. Retired senior faculty is replaced with junior faculty with lower salaries. It is important to pay attention to this flaw.
5. If we go on strike, then how many lectures can we miss before the semester is dead intellectually?
6. If you are on strike, then that means that you are not working. Otherwise, this will allow management to wade out the strike. It is our hope that management will not drag this out. We do care about our students; however, this is for the integrity of the institution and profession. We have not lost all confidence in management and chapter presidents are being met with.
7. How much would the salary raises cost the CSU?
8. The total cost has been estimated to be \$100 million dollars as the compensation would extend to other unions that fall under the "me too" clause of the bargaining agreement.

***Harold Goldwhite – ERFA Liaison Report***

ERFA Liaison Goldwhite reported that the CSUERFA Executive Committee would be meeting next Saturday, January 23, 2016; the next State Council will be on April 23, 2016 at San Jose State University. The search for the Executive Director continues, and there are a number of candidates. The new Office Manager at the CSUN Office is Melanie Memakos. Efforts underway to find other locations have so far not succeeded. There are continuing discussions of whether retired staff members should be eligible for membership in CUERFA. A number of campus retiree organizations have both faculty and staff members. The question may be put to a vote of the State Council at a future meeting. The initiative petition drive headed by Messrs. Reed and Mr. DeMaio, which would have affected pensions for new public sector employees has been suspended. But don't breathe too easily! They plan to restart for the November 2018 election. Liaison Goldwhite further reported that there have been a number of recent cordial meetings between members of the Executive Committee and CSU Vice Chancellors. The Chancellor has designated Garrett Ashley, Vice Chancellor for Governmental and External Relations, as his liaison to CSUERFA. The CSUERFA President's Soles 4 Souls initiative is ongoing. The CSUERFA Executive Committee will at its next meeting hear from the President of that organization and decide on next steps. For more information, please visit the website at [csuerfa.org](http://csuerfa.org).

***Andrew Martinez, CSU Senior Legislative Advocate, Advocacy and State Relations***

Andrew Martinez offered presented on the Dos and Don'ts for advocacy and offered tips for success. Martinez' background includes graduating from Fresno State University, interning with Cruz Bustamante, Carol Migden, and Gloria McLeod. His experiences have given him an understanding of what matters in district offices and the capital and why it is important to read every bill that is come across. Legislative Advocate Martinez offered the following Dos and Don'ts were also discussed for effective advocacy:

1. One may meet with a legislator or staffers. It is important to remember that staffers will report information.
2. One may meet in an office or in a hallway.
3. Each office has unique process for scheduling (e.g., written request, etc.).
4. One should make the scheduler your new best friend. This individual is the most important person to ensure your meeting. One can email or text the scheduler.
5. The following should be done: be punctual, be flexible, have a plan, know logistics, designate a leader, know who says what, designate a note taker, ask why, and explain why.
6. Do the following during the conversation: get to the point, get to know who(m) you are meeting with (i.e., urban representative, rural representative, caucus, etc.), have a story, provide handouts, send a Thank You card, follow up, and have handouts.
7. Don't do the following during the conversation: just have data, overload the room, answer a question that you do not know, see only representatives from one political party, and argue or be rude.

Lastly, Legislative Advocate Martinez offered the following last tips for effective lobbying: The capital is made up of three buildings: Legislative Office Building (Assembly Policy Committee Staff), ANNEX (6 floors), and Capital (Senate and Assembly Floor – Rooms have 3 digits). The Assembly offices are in the north and the Senate is in the south wing of the building. It is important to plan for security. The north side is where the restaurants are. The south side is where the parking lot is. Don't touch the bear. Use the stairs. Parking is on L Street. LA-BOU is the cheapest food. Frank Fat's and Chops will offer one a real legislative experience. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Do you have any suggestions for visiting within districts?
2. It is easier to visit district offices. Thursdays and Fridays are best for in-district lobbying and legislators have more free time in the Fall.
3. Are staffers more important than the legislators?
4. The Staffers are very important.
5. Is it true that once money has been allocated to education, the issue is not thought about until the fiscal cycle?
6. Yes.
7. Could you share with us some of the CSU talking points that we should consider?
8. It is important to replicate the magic of the socks. CSU concerns need to resonate with the speaker. Twitter matters, as Sacramento is a Twitter town. There is a limit to how many letters can be written. Twitter allows for much greater communication. One of the goals is to have a mascot day. We are going try and work out side of the box this year.

### ***Juan Cervantes - CSSA Liaison Report***

CSSA Liaison Juan Cervantes reported that the CSSA would continue discussion of the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report and Online Course Evaluation of Faculty. The CSSA would also take action on ratemyprofessor.com and discussion the positive and negative roles of the student voice. Liaison Cervantes also reported that that background checks, faculty collective bargaining, fiscal sustainability, and the need to open meetings will be also be discussed. The role of athletics in the CSU has been discussed with the CSSA president. The CSSA will add to the conversation on athletics at the Systemwide level. Humboldt State's concerns about online faculty evaluation have been discussed by the CSSA. The need for a resolution on anonymous/confidential evaluation to reduce hostility in the work environment will be considered. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important to pay attention to the \$7 million of support that athletics receives at SLO.
2. What is the meaning of IRA fees?
3. These are fees that presidents can authorize. They are used to pay for trips. They are not used to pay for salaries. More information will be provided at a future plenary.
4. What is your philosophy on athletics?
5. San Jose State students have paid \$100million dollars to their athletics programs over a five-year period. It is important this be an agenda item in a future plenary.
6. EO 429, in December 1983, established instructional related fees. Not instruction or tuition. They are used as money for events.
7. Are you willing to share your perceptions on solutions to the background-check policy?

8. VC Lori Lamb will be talking to the CSSA. These solutions may not be consistent overtime.
9. What implications might this change in anonymity hold for bargaining? The CBA is quite clear.
10. Faculty from underrepresented groups tends to receive the lowest and most non-educationally related evaluations. Is it possible to offer students this information?
11. A Whitepaper will be sent to inform the CSSA on how the ASCSU has dealt with this issue.
12. According to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), student evaluations are anonymous.
13. What implications might your discussion hold for the ratemyprofessor.com phenomenon?

***Lori Redfearn, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advancement Services***

AVC Redfearn reported on highlights from the 2014-15 Philanthropy Report. Central in this report was a discussion of gifts receipts that reached a record \$315 million and gift commitments, which included pledges and revocable commitments, reaching \$411 million. During the Class of 3 Million celebration, alumni giving increased 44% to \$18 million, the number of individual alumni giving increased by 11,000 and 60,000 alumni reconnected with the CSU. AVC Redfearn further reported that trends to increase graduates in STEM, nursing, teacher preparation, and high impact practices to close achievement gaps are also being supported by increased donations. Over 70% of CSU students are receiving financial aid, including \$49 million from philanthropic scholarships. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What is the role of athletics in development? How does it take away from academics?
2. How do endowed chairs impact development?
3. How are funds distributed to campuses?
4. What are the top reasons for differences between system and campus fund raising?
5. The trend in development has been going from department to the university.
6. Is it possible to share the Power Point presented?
7. On slide 8, why was there a trend downward in 2014-15?
8. Out of how many are these fundraising rankings? How much is due to employee contributions?
9. It is important to ask donors to support international programs, speaker series, and history students to go to archives in the U.S.
10. What systemwide and campus-based mechanisms exist to inform donors of the importance and need of donations, but that they do not have the right to interfere in our curricula?
11. Is it possible to develop a statement about what donors can do and what they can't?
12. This is money that did not go into the general fund, which could benefit all. Fundraising is extra work. The CSU likes our work for lobbying; however, tenure density and pay equity are not prioritized.
13. How are smaller campuses being assisted with development?

14. More information can be found at the following URL: [www.calstate.edu/philanthropic](http://www.calstate.edu/philanthropic).
15. How many donations come from the corporate arena?
16. What impact do campus presidents have on donations?
17. Change in leadership is often accompanied by a dip in fundraising.
18. People donate to people – not programs. Is there a way to get faculty in front of donors?
19. There seems to be a relationship between honorary degrees and major donations. Are there CSU best practices that offer guidelines for development?
20. It is important to pay attention to the differences between development and philanthropy.
21. When we examine our funding profile, can the legislature take away funding based upon recent success in development?

### **Committee Recommendations**

#### Action Items:

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 1.  | <i>Recognition of California Taxpayers for Their Support in Funding the CSU</i><br><u>Approved</u>   | <u>AS-3237-15/FGA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading    |
| 2.  | <i>Role of California State University (CSU) Campus Faculty in the Evaluation of Courses for Transfer</i><br><u>Unanimously Approved</u>           | <u>AS-3238-15/AA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading     |
| 3.  | <i>Inclusion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Campus, College and Departmental Orientation Programs</i><br><u>Unanimously Approved</u>               | <u>AS-3239-15/FA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading     |
| 4.  | <i>Request for Joint Task Force to Develop an Action Plan for Increasing Tenure/Tenure-Track Density in the CSU</i><br><u>Unanimously Approved</u> | <u>AS-3240-15/FGA/FA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading |
| 5.  | <i>A Need for Analysis of the Data Related to Changing Demographics of California State University</i>   | <u>AS-3241-16/APEP</u><br>First Reading/ Waiver  |
| 6.  | <i>Acceptance of the ICAS Statement on Preparation in Natural Science Expected of Entering Freshman</i><br><u>Unanimously Approved</u>             | <u>AS-3242-16/EX</u><br>First Reading/Waiver     |
| 7.  | <i>Commendation for Karen Y. Zamarripa – Assistant Vice Chancellor CSU Advocacy and State Relations</i><br><u>Approved by Acclamation</u>          | <u>AS-3243-16/FGA</u><br>First Reading/Waiver    |
| 8.  | <i>Support for Four Years of Mathematics as a Requirement for Admission to the California State University</i>                                     | <u>AS-3244-16/APEP</u><br>First Reading          |
| 9.  | <i>Selection of Faculty to Serve on Campus Honorary Degree Committees</i>  | <u>AS-3245-16/AA</u><br>First Reading            |
| 10. | <i>Promoting Inclusion Within the CSU Community</i>  | <u>AS-3246-16/EX</u><br>First Reading            |

11. *Restoring Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA)*  
*Funds as a Line Item in the CSU Operations Budget*  
Approved

AS-3247-16/FA  
First Reading

Adjournment

The ASCSU Plenary adjourned at 1:30p.m.

**Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary**