

**Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Plenary Minutes
November 5-6, 2015
Office of the Chancellor**

Thursday, November 5, 2015 - 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium

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

Friday, November 6, 2015 - 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 8:05 a.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 José (Lee, Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Foroohar, LoCasio); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Senghas - *Sub*); Stanislaus (Filling, Strahm); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack).

Guest: Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs; Juan Cervantes, California State Student Association (CSSA) Liaison; Mark Crase, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer; Jennifer Eagan, California Faculty Association (CFA) Liaison; Harold Goldwhite, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA) Liaison; Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources; Margaret Merryfield, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Human Resources; Dia Poole, Alumni Council Liaison; Steve Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, Business & Finance; Steven Stepanek, CSU Faculty Trustee; Peter J. Taylor, CSU Trustee; Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor; Angela Williams, Intrasystem Enrollment Manager, Student Academic Support.

Approval of agenda

The Agenda was Approved.

Approval of September 3-4, 2015 minutes

The Minutes were Approved as Amended.

Announcements

Senator Yee-Melichar announced that the *Faculty-to-Faculty* Newsletter would be available.

Presentations/Introductions

Richard Senghas was introduced as the substitute from Sonoma State University.

Reports

Steven Filling, Chair

Chair Filling reported that he attended memorial of Senator Frehlich. Rather than sending flowers, donations for children's education fund are requested. Chair Filling thanked the ASCSU for their feedback on the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report. A draft report will be on the BoT agenda for November. The ASCSU was also thanked for their feedback on the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report. The task force is in the process of reviewing feedback. BA Program, UC transfer pathways, and SB 1440 transfer degrees will be of concerns to the ASCSU. Last September the Tech Steering Committee met. Human Resources (HR) systems will be reviewed for integration and combination. Chancellor White has integrated Academic Affairs and Student Affairs under Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard. The strategic directions and organizational structure of this combination will be discussed at a future meeting. Open Education resources will continue to be explored. A report will be made available in January. The identification, development, and review of Open Education materials will continue to be explored. The ASCSU budget of approximately \$960,000 was finalized. Increased funding for travel, hotel costs, assigned time, etc. will also continue to be explored to ensure that the vital work of the ASCSU continue. Joint work continues with campus senates, particularly data collections on best practices to address current challenges. Senators from Humboldt, Pomona, and San Luis Obispo were thanked for their hospitality. Senators offered the following updates:

San Bernardino

Senators reported that a climate survey would be launched. Problems continue on campus. There is a perception by the faculty that conditions are getting worse. A meeting with the President will occur within the next two weeks to discuss shared governance concerns. A second meeting has also been scheduled.

During Open Forum, Vice Chancellor Lori Lamb and Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard met with faculty staff and students. Suggested actions were offered and actions were requested of the CO and administration. Debate surrounding issues on campus continues. The president's appointment of the Provost violated shared governance. Any campus that has a standing committee that manages hires and reviews are asked for input on this situation.

San Luis Obispo (SLO)

Senators reported that there is significant administrative bloat on the campus. A 40% increase in Managerial Personnel Plan (MPP) hiring has been observed. A Dean interfered with faculty selection of a department Chair and selected a Chair without consultation. A senate resolution –

freezing MPP hires - was created. The Chancellor's Office (CO) was consulted and responded that this was an internal matter. Chair Filling visited the SLO campus to inquire about faculty concerns. The Chancellor visited the campus and had lunch with the faculty senate. The problems seem not to have been resolved.

San José State

Senators reported that the resignation of the previous President and the new interim President has increased campus morale. The Executive Committee of the campus Academic Senate was able to ensure shared governance.

East Bay

Senators reported that the campus President would not attend campus Senate Executive Committee meetings. The Provost was dismissed and a Dean was hired without consultation. The state of shared governance seems to be in crisis.

Channel Islands

Senators reported that a College of Engineering was created at Channel Islands. This college formation has occurred without faculty consultation.

Chair Filling further reported that shared governance is a contested field. It requires vigilance and active participation. Faculty primacy in the curriculum and prominent roles in the affairs of the university are central. Campus senate chairs met in October. Senator Soni was elected as Chair of the Chairs Council. The Sustainable Financial Model Draft Report was discussed at the Campus Chairs meeting. A switch to Zoom meetings during the interim has occurred. Problems with this switch should be sent to Chair Filling and technical assistance will be offered.

Standing committees

Academic Affairs (AA) - AA Chair Nelson thanked the AA committee and liaisons for their work. The committee has discussed the following aspects of graduate education: units required in residence and financial eligibility. Follow-up on these areas will occur at future meetings. AA will also engage in a review of graduate programs, curriculum requirements, graduate and undergrad requirements, consumer protections for students, and interstate reciprocity agreements. FGA was consulted on SB 850 (Block) for their work in tracking the bill, which proved useful to discussions of the California Community Colleges (CCC) baccalaureate pilot program. Campus senate chairs and the role of faculty in the classrooms will be discussed. AA will also discuss CSU Online courses, course match, and upper division courses related to the CCC baccalaureate pilots and the Chancellor's response to the general education B4 task force. AA will engage in the creation of two resolutions: the role of CSU faculty in course transfer and the Chancellor's response on the task force on quantitative reasoning.

Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) - APEP Chair Fleming reported that Assistant Vice Chancellor Sullivan would be bringing useful data to the committee. The Interim Vice Chancellor for Teacher Education, Joseph Aguerrebere, met with APEP on the importance of faculty input on matters of prospective benefactors, joint collaboration in programmatic matters, and needs, quality, and values assessments. APEP visited with Director Eric Forbes and

Vice Provost for Enrollment Management Meredith Kelley. A revamp of the Online Transfer Assistance Program is occurring. A January demo has been scheduled. APEP requested early access into the revision process to offer input. APEP also explored mathematics and B4. K-12 teacher preparation and Statistics Pathway (STATWAY) was also discussed. The implications all of these hold for stakeholders will continue to be discussed. The following concerns and questions have been raised:

1. Is it possible for APEP to discuss how the CSU can attract more males into the teaching profession?
2. How do we determine our response to teacher shortages?
3. Is it possible to consider a study of women in faculty positions within the CSU system?

Faculty Affairs (FA) - FA Chair Foroohar reported that FA discussed two second reading resolutions on the suspension of background check policy (HR 2015-08) and the addition of an Emerita/us faculty member to the BoT. FA will also continue discussion of first reading resolutions on the reaffirmation of shared governance in the CSU and the need for non-tenure track faculty attendance in faculty orientation programs. FA is also engaged in ongoing discussion of a new working group on Intellectual Property. FA also met with John Swarbrick, Associate Vice Chancellor - Labor Relations. FA stressed the importance of shared governance and how shared decision making requires consultation. FA also met with Vice Chancellor Lori Lamb and Assistant Vice Chancellor Merryfield. Discussion centered on HR 2015-08 and revisions were suggested for the policy to address current faculty and student concerns. Lastly, FA heard reports from CFA President Jennifer Eagan on the strike vote and the liaison report from State University Dean Van Cleve.

Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA) - FGA Chair Krabacher reported that the committee completed the final review of legislation tracking and Governor decisions. SB 694, its implications, and future status were also discussed. The committee will bring forward four resolutions: Commendation for Ron Vogel, Proposed Support Budget Request for 2016-17 (Second Reading), Campus recognition of taxpayers as donors to the CSU (First Reading), and the establishment of a task force on faculty recruitment. FGA met with Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) Jason Constantouros about prospects for augments to the CSU budget in the spring. The point was raised that the California Teacher's Association (CTA) has reported that there are propositions being discussed to replace Prop 30 when it sunsets. Current legislative focus does not seem to be on higher education. The possible extension of Prop 30 was also discussed. Vice Chancellor Ashley and Assistant Vice Chancellor Redfean were consulted on the recognition of taxpayers as supporters of the CSU. Assistant Vice Chancellor Merryfield was also consulted about the need for a task force on faculty recruitment. In-district advocacy will be an FGA goal before lobbying efforts begin in Sacramento. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. How do we get members of the CSU to stop saying that we are fully funded?
2. Is it possible to add average faculty salary to this discussion?
3. Is it possible for FGA to keep an eye on SB 634 on the interstate transfer of courses?

Steven Stepanek – CSU Faculty Trustee

Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported that Presidential search committee have met to review job descriptions. It will take three to four weeks for the jobs to be posted. Trustee Stepanek is serving on two of the searches. Stepanek chairs the Institutional Advancement Committee. Of central discussion is the retirement of the baby boomers and their philanthropic interests. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Regarding the Presidential job descriptions, what is the search agency using if the official job description has not been finalized?
2. To what extent is it possible to have greater faculty representation on the search committees, given the fact that the searched may be closed?
3. Given that 21 out of 23 campuses have resolutions in support of open presidential searches, what will you do as our faculty representative to ensure that these concerns are addressed?
4. On the discussion of advancement, is there any discussion about how this fundraising impacts other funds? Is there any conversation about the amounts of these funds that are earmarked? To what extent will these practices lead to “have” and “have not” campuses?
5. It is important to include all levels in discussions of legislation on open searches, as even some Dean searches are now becoming closed.
6. To what extent does the lack of candidate openness indicate a lack of readiness to serve as President?
7. Salaries are attached to these searches. How we approach this is important and not much thought seems to have been given to this point.
8. Why has the decision for closed searches been made before the search process has begun?
9. It seems that we are allowing well-off people to determine the funding of the CSU system.
10. To what extent is accountability and administrative flexibility being taken seriously?

Other committees and committee liaisons

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) - Senator Eadie reported that GEAC is focused on advising GE transfer. This week’s GEAC meeting focused on pilot work in Oral Communication. Online only courses in Oral Communication have been banned. This raised the following question: To what extent has the technology advanced to allow online oral communication? A more comprehensive report will be given in January. Santa Barbara Community College has tried to place oral communication across the curriculum. This did not work and they are looking into new strategies for implementation. Faculty from community colleges wanted guiding notes for articulation. GEAC will continue discussing how much humanities must a language course contain and where can it count. Transfer within the CSU and how Course Match courses count as GE were also discussed. How this will impact the CCC BA will also be considered at a future meeting. Lastly, GEAC also discussed critical thinking for

WICHE and Center for Teaching and Learning. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. We do have authority over upper division GE. [AS-3211-15/AA \(Rev\)](#) asked campuses to examine upper division GE and consider processes for articulation. Has any follow-up been done?
2. Over the last few years, GE was gutted due to the 120-unit requirement. Has there been any evaluation of critical thinking and GE within the system?
3. The community colleges held workshops today and will provide an update at a future meeting.

Ethnic Studies Task Force - Senator Kessinger reported that the feedback from campuses was very helpful. The initial round of feedback represented 15 campuses. Few academic senates offered feedback over the summer. Statewide and CSU committees also offered feedback and it is important to note that feedback was not submitted twice. In response to the second deadline, individuals also contributed. During the second round feedback request, there were two direct senate related responses. Many responses were brief and expressed support of the report. The majority of the responses supported the Task Force project and commented on the reports, strength, tone, data collection, etc. Some feedback also communicated unique – campus-based - circumstances. The task force met in September by phone to discuss the first round of feedback. The Task Force later met at the CO on October 16, 2015. The writing of the final report has been delegated to sub-committees, which are being constituted and will meet one last time to complete the report.

Jennifer Eagan - CFA Liaison Report

CFA President Eagan thanked the ASCSU for their support of CFA efforts and reported that there was a 94.4% response rate in favor of a strike. President Eagan further stated that this was an extraordinary turnout and show of solidarity. There was an 80% member turnout and the CFA goal was met. The number of members has increased over the past two weeks. These numbers will be given during a future report. November 17, 2015 will be the next step in the push for a salary increase. It is important to pay close attention to the possible Prop 30 extension politics and the CFA is already engaged in discussions about this issue. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. There is great concern about the minimal step increase for full professors.
2. To what extent might the rally be disruptive?
3. It is important to remember that this demonstration will be legitimate, permits have been obtained, and it was a UC system student that broke the windows of the CO during the last event.
4. How can the CFA address seniority and how senior faculty members are not benefiting from current bargaining strategies?
5. It is important to have a clearly salary schedule. The current schedule is stagnant. Only 20% of the faculty as a whole received an equity increase during this last bargaining round. The source of salary problems is the CSU.
6. This is an important victory and one that needs to be supported by further actions.

7. It is important to be models for our students and former students. If we do not stand up for ourselves, then how can we expect them to stand up for themselves?
8. There is a communication problem. It is important to never see equity in a bargaining discussion again. The administrators know our work and should reward our work.
9. There is discussion of valuing senior faculty; however, the actions do not match the words.
10. It is important to remember that reopeners will be engaged this year and next year and compensation for senior faculty are part of these bargaining discussions.
11. What percentage of the CSU faculty are members of the CFA?
12. 66% is the current membership percentage.
13. It is important to remember the aspects of the contract that relates to Lecturer hiring.
14. It is important to remember the impact that short-term hiring of Lecturers has on students.
15. San José State has established an equity program (i.e., Provost devised a three year equity pay program.).
16. System wide, the majority of campuses did not devise equity pay programs in consultation with faculty.
17. It is important to remember that we do not have to be unanimous to be united.
18. To what extent will this information be used to point out low union membership registration on campuses?
19. Where do we go from here in terms of collective bargaining?
20. November 23, 2015 and December 7, 2015 are dates set for fact finding.
21. The \$11 million budget allocation for increasing tenure density was a CFA recommendation.
22. It is important to remember that several campuses have no tenure-line counseling psychologists.
23. It is important to ensure consistency in the distribution of equity pay.

Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs

Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard reported that he was grateful for the outreach made by the ASCSU. He has engaged in day-long campus visits at 6 of the 23 CSU campuses, faculty, and students with the goal of visiting all by the end of this academic year. Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are central in the discussions that have ensued. Co-curricular innovations are also being examined and their potential impact on time to degree. Points of excellence are being examined to best inform stakeholders about the efforts used to ensure student success. The following important question has arisen: What can be a common definition of student success across the CSU that reduces the barriers our students face? Faculty excellence in research and practice is also of interest and related to this question. The Simms/Mann think tank was visited and faculty fellows were acknowledged. Discussion centered on the cultivation of 100,000 stem teachers by 2021. The CSU is participating in this initiative. This reception helped to illuminate the work of CSU faculty. On the subject of tenure density, 2015-16 included the hiring of more faculty and Assistant Vice Chancellor Merryfield is tracking hiring throughout the system.

Increase is expected despite current turnover rates. Background checks were also discussed. Vice Chancellor Lamb will work with the ASCSU to ensure improvement in implementation of the Background Check Policy. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard further reported that Quantitative Reasoning is a curricular matter; however, it cannot be discussed in isolation. Career and college readiness must be discussed in tandem with this topic and multiple stakeholders are interested in this CSU discussion. Lastly, further discussions have been held on how to respond to the ASCSU resolution and consultation on the development of a new Academic Freedom policy will begin in January. State University Dean Van Cleve will serve as the liaison to the CO. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. On the question of PACE, there seems to not be support; however, students value the program tremendously.
2. Students were consulted on the number of male vs. female science teachers they had overtime and the numbers were split. Is it possible to earmark money for getting more males into the teaching profession?
3. Boston College has a program that creates a collaborative between college science students and teaching.
4. There is an existing policy on Academic Freedom from 2005 that covers much legal ground; however, the new legal issues that the new policy is trying to cover are not clear. The policy was not drafted in collaboration with the ASCSU. It is possible to have consultation from the beginning of the policy drafting process? The ASCSU is here to help.
5. On quantitative reasoning and Simms/Mann Institute, we seem to say the same thing but do not agree on language. It is important to remember that national changes will have an impact on curriculum language. Philanthropic institutions may be given more power when interacting with the CO. The ASCSU needs to be central in consultation.
6. It is important to remember that the CO was honoring the faculty doing great work on early childhood development during the Simms/Mann Institute Think Tank.
7. On the subject of tenure density, 172 out of 17, 000 would be some progress; however, given current FTES growth, we need another 175 faculty. If we grow our faculty by 1% we will have a lower tenure density. Losing 570 and recruiting 472 is not growth. Growing enrollment will still be losing ground. We need 1075 if we grow FTES by 5%. We need to continue to focus on tenure density to make progress. If we want to grow FTES, then we will need a much more robust effort behind tenure density. It is important to convey this information to stakeholders.
8. APEP will explore the arc of mathematics from K through career and the linkages between different stakeholders. It is important to have a larger and more substantive conversation with the CO.
9. It is important to remember that what we are all talking about is balancing student success with academic quality. There will be a much better outcome if we are all in consultation from the beginning.
10. Only English versions of waivers are permitted on our campus. This Risk Management aversion practice shuts out the multilingual community members that we serve.

11. As a temporary faculty member since 1990, there are several models (i.e., University of Colorado, Washington State University, etc.) that suggest lecturer conversion to tenure line faculty can increase tenure density and save money.

Note: Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard later returned to the ASCSU and reported on the origins of the relationship between the Simms/Mann Institute and the CSU. This relationship began with the CSU Northridge campus and early childhood education experts on this campus. This cadre of expertise evolved to include faculty from seven other campuses. Earlier this year, institute representatives requested support for faculty fellows. This resulted in the honoring of 8 CSU faculty members. The CO was asked – along with the faculty – to participate in a think tank in Beverly Hills. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard was invited to honor the faculty at this meeting. The CO did not know that the university logo was used on the institute website. A press release will go out from the system office. Statement of pride in faculty will be central in the statement.

Timothy P. White – CSU Chancellor

Chancellor White reported that he has visited several campuses in the past weeks. It was an opportunity to meet with faculty from many disciplines. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. At San José State, the funding to athletics has been \$16 million, how can people justify spending this money on athletics, when it does not bring in fame? Is it possible that stakeholders in fundraising can be evaluated? What are the hidden costs of fundraising? Will the new campus president be given autonomy in the establishment of a Division I team?
2. Campuses do calculate the costs to raise dollars.
3. The relationship between management and labor has improved. In the media, the illusion is lent that our faculty colleagues are overpaid and underworked. Will a rebuttal be put forward from the CO?
4. The faculty are not overpaid and underworked. It is important to convey this information to the public.
5. Why do we engage in a profession that ruins the minds of young people? When are we going to fix SUGS?
6. Solutions must be found, as this is not sustainable.
7. Bullying seems to be a growing problem within the CSU. What are some of the CSU policies in place that address faculty bullying?
8. We have to find a way to have more respect work environment? How can we deliver them to the faculty in a way that we do not create culture of grievance? These are the challenges are before us.
9. Based on current national statistics, the recommendation is 1 counseling psychologist per 100 students. CSU Maritime, Channel Islands, and Humboldt meet this goal. Is it possible to look into this issue and provide additional support?

10. Most geographic organizations recognize that there are cost of living differences between their employees. Across California, the cost of living varies. What do you see -in the next couple of years- as the CSU response to this profound problem?
11. Exploration of purchasable land for the building of faculty housing will be engaged. We are trying to figure this out on the compensation side and private development side. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard asked Senators to provide information on their experiences with this issue.

Angela Williams – Intrasystem Enrollment Manager, Student Academic Support

Intrasystem Enrollment Manager Williams presented on Course Match Offerings. Central in her presentation were discussion of trends in course offering overtime. The implementation of AB 386 courses was also discussed. In Fall 2014, over 1400 courses were offered. As of Spring 2015, enrollment in Course Match has changed from paper to automated enrollment. Large numbers of courses are now being offered. Course Match completion rates have remained consistent. The slide was made available in the Dropbox. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What roles do faculty members play in articulation?
2. Are the numbers of students that drop included in the reported numbers?
3. Is it cost effective to continue with course match? Do these data include winter intersession?
4. Why is there the need for an extra process by the department chair to code a class for course match?
5. Campuses submit courses for review. 15 seats need to be reserved in order to be listed as a Course Match courses.
6. As part of the submission process, some campuses create an enrollment window. If there are remaining seats, then the class can be opened back up to local students.
7. Campuses are reimbursed for courses offered as AB 386 and Course Match.
8. A few years ago, students were enrolling in Course Match and local students were not. Is this still the case? Can students in Course Match be counted over and above the target?
9. All enrollment counts toward FTES; however, with Course Match there is an extra payment to campuses.
10. Is it possible to include the amount of funding that is sent to campuses?
11. The RFP contains information regarding campus compensation.

Dia Poole – Alumni Council Liaison report

Alumni Council Liaison Poole reported about the recent fall meeting that centered on best practices in engaging recent alumni. Central in this discussion was the notion that faculty relationships are important in aiding student transition to recent alumni. A key challenge faced by the council is the exponential increase in the number of alumni; the CSU adds 100,000 new alumni every year. CSU Faculty was invited to help with the endeavor. The annual alumni event was held in Washington, DC. Ms. Poole further reported that she was invited to attend an

advocacy-training panel in Sacramento. Advocacy planning for next year has begun and central in the goal of this advocacy is to ensure that the CSU has the resources it needs. The Alumni Trustee nomination period remains open. The concept of legacy alumni is being examined, as well as how first-generation college attendees are creating CSU legacies over generations. Stories will be shared with the ASCSU as they become available. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. How have departments become marginalized from alumni?
2. It is important to invite alumni back to departments as speakers, tutors, mentors, presenters, etc.
3. To what extent can these legacy families be called upon to advocate for a more affordable educational experience and one that is consistent with the Master Plan?
4. Is there any information on who is the largest legacy family? This could be a great public relations piece for the university.
5. When you contact alumni, what do you ask them for? Are they first asked to come back to the campus or for money? How do we help them reconnect, rather than ask them to reach for their wallet?
6. It is important for the university to say thank you.

Harold Goldwhite – ERFA Liaison Report

ERFA Liaison Goldwhite reported that CSU ERFA held their State Council meeting at Cal State Fullerton. Chancellor White and Trustee Stepanek were speakers. The Chancellor spent time discussing how to meet the challenges that the public universities of California face producing the one million more graduates that the state will need. This raised the questions as to whether or not the responsibilities of the state fall on the state and people. The council spent time – not action – on whether to include retired staff in CSU ERFA. Individual campuses differed in their attitude towards inclusion. A vote will be held at a future meeting. The association is still seeking an Executive Director. The Director works primarily out of the CSU Northridge campus. The deadline is in December. The CSU ERFA Reporter can be found at the CSU ERFA website (<http://csuerfa.org>). The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What prompted the need for the possible inclusion of the staff in CSU ERFA? Do they not have their own retirement organization?

Lori Lamb - Vice Chancellor, Human Resources; Steve Relyea Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer; Mark Crase – Assistant Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer

Vice Chancellor Lamb reported on the Common Human Resource Systems (CHRS) Completion Project. Central in the report was a discussion of the history of the project, the positives and negatives experienced, and recommendations made for completion. Also discussed were the definitions, benefits, and risks of the project. The project is once again underway. It is important to understand that this will impact faculty and students. This system creates a common platform and consolidates all the campus versions of People Soft. It is hoped that this will result in a consistent technology that all can use and a shared data warehouse, including data for campus. It is important to think about the modifications necessary to ensure usage efficiency.

Common business processes by campus will also need to be created. This should enable the reinvestment of resources into the core mission of the university system. This program may ultimately eliminate dual entry for payroll data. It is also hoped that this program will enable a better user experience for HR, hiring platforms, etc. What impact will this have on students? The student systems are in need of an upgrade; however, this upgrade must take place first. Risks include the end of technical support from PeopleSoft. Lack of reporting will create barriers to decision making. Mobile usage will also be limited.

Vice Chancellor Lamb further reported that a new project approach would include a reexamination of the governance model. A consultant was hired to assess the project and nineteen recommendations were offered for system improvement. The primary recommendation was to have a full time employee dedicated to the project, a dedicated functional lead on PeopleSoft, and other dedicated positions to assist with and maintain the system. The project budget and scope will be monitored throughout the upgrade. Campuses will be involved in planning, design, and implementation. A broad stakeholder group will be actively consulted throughout the process. Transparency in decision-making through the new governance model was also discussed.

Executive Vice Chancellor Steve Relyea reported on the new enterprise systems governance structures. This new governance structure ensures the integration of financial systems, HR, student systems, etc. In terms of CHRS, a preliminary outline of scope on PeopleSoft Modules (i.e., management, recruiting solutions, and workforce administration) was also discussed. Tracking Faculty events and self-service will also be evaluated as part of the scope. The project is estimated to take 3-4 years to complete. 6-12 months will be spent understanding how the software works. Campus implementations will be in phases by clusters. Estimates suggest that the cost will be \$6-7 million per year. There is no plan to tax each campus. There will be a need to back fill positions on campuses. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Different campuses use different rules. Will this approach clean up these differences?
2. To what extent does pooling all of these data increase our vulnerability to hacking? How will ensure security?
3. With this development of campus-based teams, how will jobs on campuses be affected?
4. It is important to know that jobs will change. The double entry of payroll information may ultimately be eliminated; however, there will be no reduction in workforce.
5. There will be an open recruiting process for people interested in being part of the central team. Employees should find that they have choices in the new employment structure.
6. What does a candidate gateway mean? Will this new effort discourage needed improvements in People Soft?
7. What will be the implications for faculty on the ground level? Is there a way to build in a mechanism that will alert the ASCSU to problems?
8. The faculty will be informed as much as possible as the project progresses.

9. What kind of faculty data is going to be in the “tracking of faculty events”? Will these data deal with RTP, will they be system-wide, and will faculty have accessed to these data?
10. Data is backed up off site within the U.S. An annual test is done to reload data and assess how long it will take.
11. Will a beta-test of the new process occur before it is rolled out to the entire system?
12. Please remember the needs of new department chairs and coordinators as the new program rolls out.
13. How much training will department chairs and coordinators need to use the system effectively?
14. Campuses will be engaged for their expertise in working with their campus community.
15. To what extent are priorities being considered here? How many tenure track hires could come from the \$6-7 million to be spent on this project?
16. This upgrade is vital to payroll. If this change is not made, then PeopleSoft support will be lost. Cost savings will be obtained from this move. This will enable us to position ourselves for the next step. It is important to remember that this is a necessary upgrade.

Juan Cervantes - CSSA Liaison Report

CSSA Liaison Juan Cervantes reported on the student support of the faculty. Central in the concerns of the CSSA are financial aid, student debt, sexual assault and campus safety, and food security. The CSSA will engage in shared governance discussions and budget advocacy this coming year. Student concerns on the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force report include a seeming lack of attention to the need for the legislature to increase CSU funding. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What is your stance on mental illness?
2. Extra obligations lead to stress and mental health issues among students. Counseling needs are inadequate.
3. It is important for students to take a stance on the use of money for athletics.
4. What types of shared discussions will be occurring?
5. There seems to be a push for student groups to be more like clubs rather than engaged in advocacy.
6. It is important to review the debt burden on students.
7. It is important to look into why students are reluctant to report sexual assaults and advocate for support groups.
8. It is important to review Senator Gubernat’s op-ed.

CSU Trustee Peter J. Taylor

CSU Trustee Peter J. Taylor reported that he is a UCLA alumnus and has been a trustee for the past six months. He was the CFO for the UC system. During his tenure, his goal was to see greater communication between the UC Academic Senate and Board of Regents. He has always been focused on public policy and his current works involve grant making in the vocational

areas. Trustee Taylor served as the Alumni Representative on UC Board of Regents and he also chaired the Task Force on African American Students at UCLA. His intellectual interests include national powers, their decline, and how is it that the U.S. avoids the same fate of other super powers? Trustee Taylor concludes that the answer lies in education. He believes that it is through education that there is hope for the future. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What does the CSU BoT think of faculty?
2. There is tremendous respect for the job that faculty do. The people that have the biggest impact on students during their growth are faculty. The tenure-track faculty has more impact than adjunct, because their job security allows them to engage more regularly as mentors. This consistent impact ensures greater knowledge exchange within the classroom. It seems the BoT understands this; however, this may not be communicated well.
3. To what extent do you believe that campuses should aspire to be unique? Do you believe that there is merit in having this tiered system in the CSU?
4. The academic vision is the province of the local faculty and administrators. It is difficult to dictate this notion from a central place.
5. Innovation is bottom up and not top down. It is possible for you to engage the ASCSU in order to solve problems? Reaching out to the ASCSU early can aid in the solving of problems. There is much talent within the ASCSU. The faculty needs to be appreciated, engaged to solve problems, etc. We need to feel like when we have a lobbying campaign that we are sharing in these opportunities. We have to recruit the talent and keep the talent.
6. With more money, the more opportunity for innovation. Why are we treating everyone the same? How can we drive cash into the classroom? It may be important to put money into our tenure and tenure-track faculty so that we are ensuring their success.
7. What is your view on shared governance? Have you had much experience with shared governance? Our ExCom meetings with ICAS. Shared governance seems more aligned in the other systems than it is in the CSU. How does your understanding of the UC and the CSU impact your views? What are the things that are done well in the CSU?
8. It is important for administrators to articulate a vision. Sometimes this does not occur and therefore communication is important.
9. What do you see as way to improve shared governance?
10. It is important to consider ways in which we can change our practice to ensure that the BoT understandings our goals and vision. It is important that the BoT understandings the need for ongoing conversation on increasing tenure density. The twin challenges of student enrollment growth and increasing tenure density need to be engaged in tandem.
11. It is helpful to look at others systems and what they are doing to keep us from exacerbating our problems.
12. There are several pressure points in education, fixed assets have been swept under the rug, and we are stuck with an investment policy, which precludes us from involving

ourselves in more liberal investments. What is your position on how we can loosen up the reigns on our current investment practices?

13. Executive Vice Chancellor Relyea is in active discussion with the Governor on how the CSU can have similar investment practices to the UC. Another discussion being engaged is how the current debt portfolio of the CSU can be modified to address deferred maintenance.
14. It is important for the faculty and students to be brought in from the beginning of curriculum discussions, etc.
15. Satisfaction with the selection of a president and teaching outcomes are intricately linked. What is your view on open presidential searches?
16. Is it possible to revisit this issue at a future time? I am on my first search committee for the position at CSUCI, and would like to discuss this issue after I've had a chance to experience the process for the first time.

Committee Recommendations:

Action Items

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <i>Call for Suspension of CSU Background Check Policy (HR-2015-08)</i>
<u>Approved</u> | <u>AS-3223-15/FA (Rev)</u>
Second Reading |
| 2. <i>Addition of an Emeritus/Emerita Faculty Member to the CSU Board of Trustees</i>
<u>Approved</u> | <u>AS-3228-15/FA (Rev)</u>
Second Reading |
| 3. <i>California State University 2016-17 Support Budget Preliminary Plan</i>
<u>Approved</u> | <u>AS-3229-15/FGA (Rev)</u>
Second Reading |
| 4. <i>Commendation for Associate Vice Chancellor Ron Vogel</i>
<u>Approved by Acclamation</u> | <u>AS-3231-15/FGA</u> |
| 5. <i>Commendation in Memory of CSU Academic Senator Shane G. Frehlich</i>
<u>Approved by Acclamation</u> | <u>AS-3233-15/EX</u> |
| 6. <i>Open and Transparent Presidential Searches</i>
<u>Approved Unanimously</u> | <u>AS-3234-15/EX</u>
First Reading/Waiver |
| 7. <i>Chancellor's Office Response to AS-3230-15/APEP/AA Establishing a Task Force on the Requirements of CSU General Education (GE) Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (B4) Credit</i>
<u>Approved</u> | <u>AS-3235-15/AA</u>
First Reading/Waiver |

First Reading Items

- | | |
|---|--|
| 8. Reaffirming the Principle of Shared Governance Within the California State University | <u>AS-3236-15/FA</u>
First Reading |
| 9. CSU Acknowledgement of California Taxpayers as University Donors | <u>AS-3237-15/FGA</u>
First Reading |
| 10. Role of California State University (CSU) Faculty in the Evaluation of Courses for Transfer | <u>AS-3238-15/AA</u>
First Reading |
| 11. Inclusion of Lecturers in Faculty Orientation Programs | <u>AS-3239-15/FA</u>
First Reading |
| 12. Vision Plan for On-going CSU Tenure/Tenure-Track Recruitment | <u>AS-3240-15/FGA</u>
First Reading |

Adjournment

The ASCSU Plenary adjourned at 3:00p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary