

Minutes
Office of the Chancellor
November 3-4, 2016

Thursday, November 3, 2016 - 8:00 a.m. *TO* 5:00 p.m. — Dumke Auditorium

*Senate Social – Academic Affairs hosting
5:15 p.m. TO 6:45 p.m., Munitz Lobby*

Friday, November 4, 2016 - 8:00 a.m. *TO* 3:00 p.m. — Dumke Auditorium

Call to order

With a quorum being present, the meeting was called to order.

Roll call

Senators Present: Bakersfield (Frye, Murphy); Channel Islands (Aloisio, Yudelson); Chico (Schulte, Selvester); Dominguez Hills (Esposito, Norman); East Bay (Fleming, Karplus (SUB), Gubernat (Absent)); Fresno (Benavides, Schlievert); Fullerton (Bruschke, Hoven Stohs, Meyer); Humboldt (Creadon, Eschker); Long Beach (Hood, Klink (Absent), Soni); Los Angeles (Baaske, Bodinger-deUriarte); Maritime (Browne, Trevisan); Monterey Bay (Davis, Nishita); Northridge (Chong, Schutte, Swenson); Pomona (Speak, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Steffel, Ullman); San Diego (Butler-Byrd, Eadie, Ornatowski); San Francisco (Collins, Yee-Melichar, Vacant); San Jose (Frazier (SUB), Lee (Absent), Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Foroohar, LoCasio); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Reeder); Stanislaus (Filling, Strahm); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack); Office of the Chancellor (Van Cleve).

Guests: Jennifer Eagan, CFA Liaison; Harold Goldwhite, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA); Brock Grubb, Independent Consultant Ed Insights/ Student Success Network Coordinators: Student Success; Dia Poole, Alumni Council Liaison; Michael Ratcliff, CSSA Liaison; Deidre Sessoms, Director of Faculty Research Development and Professor in the College of Education at CSU Sacramento; ; Ryan Storm, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget; Andrea Venezia, Associate Professor in the Public Policy and Administration Department and Executive Director of the Education Insights Center (EdInsights) at CSU Sacramento; Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor.

Approval of agenda

The Agenda was Approved.

Approval of September 15-16, 2016 minutes

The Minutes were Approved as Amended.

Announcements

Beyond her written report, Chair Miller further announced that she would remain vigilant on Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property. Senator Soni would be providing a report on the Academic Conference. It is important to have similarly audacious goals in tandem with the graduation initiative, such as linking the initiative to shared governance. Shared governance discussions must be equally robust. It is important to consider how healthy is shared governance. Chair Eisen, Chancellor White, and Chair Miller will be interviewed by a representative of the Association of Governing Boards regarding shared governance (see Chair's Report below).

Presentations/Introductions

Senator Benavides introduced Senator Schlievert from CSU Fresno. Senator Fleming introduced Senator Karplus as the substitute for Senator Gubernat. Senator Sabalius introduced Senator Frazier as the substitute for Senator Lee.

Reports

Christine Miller, Chair

ASCSU Chair Miller reported on her efforts from the September to the November plenaries. The following activities – followed by summaries and commentary on key issues - were discussed:

Meetings and Activities

September, post-plenary

- Tenure Density Task Force meeting in Long Beach
- September Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- Graduation Initiative 2025 Symposium in Long Beach
- AAUP Shared Governance Conference in Washington, D.C.

October

- Academic Council meeting in Long Beach
- Hearings on faculty diversity in San Jose
- San Bernardino Campus Senate
- Visit by two trustees at Sacramento State
- Sonoma Campus Senate
- CFA Board of Director's meeting in Millbrae
- Interim meeting with Chancellor White in Long Beach
- Stanislaus Campus Senate
- Academic freedom conference call
- Campus Senate Chair's Council meeting in Long Beach
- Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association State Council meeting at Pomona
- Fresno Campus Senate
- Channel Islands Campus Senate
- Cal Poly Pomona Campus Senate
- Bakersfield Campus Senate

- Meetings with CSSA Executive Director, President, and ASCSU liaison
- Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Upcoming

- Lecturers in Governance conference in Los Angeles
- Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- San Jose State University Senate
- Wang awards selection (virtual)
- Academic Council in San Francisco
- Campus Senate Chair's Council meeting in Long Beech
- ASCSU virtual interim
- Interim meeting with Chancellor White
- San Diego State University Senate
- Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates in Sacramento
- Intersegmental Coordinating Committee in Sacramento
- Alumni Council meeting (virtual)

Key Issues

Graduation Initiative 2025

Now that a) the Board of Trustees has been briefed on the next phase of the Graduation Initiative which will take the system to 2025, b) the Department of Finance has been presented with the systemwide and campus plans for improving student success rates using one-time funds in the short run, c) the Symposium showcasing current student success achievements has taken place, and d) campuses have undertaken more long-range planning to improve student success if more state revenues are secured, the day-to-day "heavy lifting" to meet the ambitious goals of the Graduation Initiative has commenced. Chair Miller also reported that she has visited the senates of nearly half of the campuses in the system since her service as Chair began, and she could report that implementing the Initiative is being discussed widely in those venues.

General Education

As explained in her last report, Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-19: *General Education Requirements Survey* required each campus to submit an accounting of the requirements of its GE program to the Chancellor's Office. In August when she asked if the data and results of the survey were going to be shared with the Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) or with ASCSU, she was told there were no plans to do so, that the sole purpose of the survey was to provide Chancellor White with an understanding of GE curricula in the CSU. Also in her September report, she expressed disappointment that neither ASCSU nor GEAC was partnering with the Chancellor's Office on the survey, but she noted that the Executive Committee was assured that ASCSU would be supplied with the survey data.

Chair Miller further reported that she had received that survey data four days ago, on October 28, 2016. It was also provided to the chair of GEAC, as well as the chairs of two of ASCSU's committees: Academic Affairs (AA) and Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP). In addition, minutes before the start of GEAC's November 1, 2016 meeting, AVC Mallon

sent to her and to the Chair and Vice Chair of GEAC a request for assistance from that committee. AVC Mallon asked that GEAC examine the survey data to “provide recommendations, examples, or templates for clear, complete, and easy to understand GE requirements” as well as “suggestions for improving clarity in GE policy,” along with a clarification of the benefits of GE. The Executive Committee, along with the chairs of AA, APEP and GEAC, will meet with AVC Mallon and others on November 2 to discuss these matters. More information will be provided in committee meetings, and in our plenary session.

Task Forces

Quantitative Reasoning. Follow-up on the recommendations of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) continues. Along with the resolutions passed at our last plenary where we “received” the QRTF report and we drew attention to two of the four recommendations on which we had already taken a position, at this plenary we have a resolution to consider in second reading which will express our views on the other two recommendations.

In addition, on October 29, 2016 AVC Mallon sent Chair Miller an invitation for ASCSU to participate in a “Quantitative Reasoning Shared Governance Communication Group” situated within an organizational chart that she also shared. She forwarded the information to the Executive Committee, who will meet with AVC Mallon on November 2 to discuss the approach. Once again, more information will be provided in committee meetings and at the plenary. Finally, Chair Miller reported that she believed it to be important to note that the CSU Math Council took up the QRTF report at its meeting this month. The Council passed a resolution endorsing the findings and recommendations of the report and requesting inclusion in its implementation. Clearly, discussions regarding the QRTF report will continue.

Tenure Density. The first meeting of the Task Force on Tenure Density took place on September 19, 2016. The next meeting has not been scheduled. The Task Force is charged with making its recommendations by March 1, 2017. Chair Miller was told that data is being gathered for the consideration of the Task Force.

Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property. Three faculty representatives from ASCSU and three from CFA met to discuss the draft academic freedom policy developed by the Chancellor’s Office. The faculty is not scheduled to meet again. At this point, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the ASCSU is taking the lead on analyzing the draft policy and making recommendations to the Chancellor’s Office.

Academic Conference

The venue for Academic Conference has changed to San Diego State University. The dates (February 9-10) remain the same, as does the theme of “Closing the Achievement Gap.”

Shared Governance

As Chair Miller indicated in her last report, she was going to attend the American Association of University Professors’ conference on shared governance at the beginning of October. In addition to delivering a presentation alongside past ASCSU Chairs Guerin and Filling, she attended a fascinating session put on by the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), who surveyed its membership as well as chancellors and presidents. The AGB concluded that shared governance is merely “okay” on most campuses, which led them to pose the question in their survey report, “Is OK Good Enough?” As she has been traveling to different campus senate meetings, she has been discussing this report, and has linked it to the Graduation Initiative. She has argued that achieving

the audacious goals of the Graduation Initiative will require a similarly audacious commitment to shared governance. More specifically, she believes it will be impossible to achieve the goals of the Graduation Initiative without healthy and robust shared governance on both the campus and the system levels. Okay is not good enough.

Perhaps serendipitously, Chancellor White emailed Chair Miller on October 26 to let her know that the AGB has asked the CSU to participate in the next phase of its shared governance study: the collection of twelve case studies in shared governance to provide a sense of how it functions in institutions that are neither exemplars nor dysfunctional outliers. Thus, according to Chancellor White, the AGB thinks it would be productive if its members heard about “the real experiences of those actively working to improve or maintain healthy shared governance.” He accepted the invitation to participate, which means that the lead investigator, Drake University President Emeritus David Maxwell, will be contacting Chancellor White, Board Chair Eisen and her to participate in long-form phone interviews soliciting our perceptions. In closing, Chair Miller asked for feedback on what to share in her interview. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important to fix SUGS.
2. Julie Rollins has produced her book that includes her studies of our shared governance.
3. Do you know the agenda for the Graduation Initiative 2025? Do we know who the administrators are for Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property policy discussions?
4. Will we get a more detailed report on the academic conference during plenary?

Standing committees

Academic Affairs (AA) AA Chair Ullman reported that the committee would bring forward four resolutions during plenary: “Course Grading in the Golden Four,” Endorsement of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations,” Establishment of an Academic Senate (ASCSU) Task Force to Study General Education,” and “Commendation of the CSU Institute of Teaching and Learning (ITL) Summer Institute 2016.” Chair Ullman also reported that AA discussed the QRTF report and veterans’ issues with Patrick O’Rourke, Director, Active Duty and Veterans Affairs. Chair Ullman thanked Senator Browne who wrote a portion of a resolution that engages veterans’ issues. High Impact Practices (HIPS) were also discussed in relationship to the Graduation Initiative. Lastly, Chair Ullman reported that the social would feature AVC Ken O’Donnell and Senator LoCasio’s carrot cake.

Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) APEP Chair Fleming reported that the committee discussed the QRTFR and the teacher shortage in the State of California. APEP met with AVC Marquita Grenot-Scheyer about the teacher shortage and changing landscape of California. A Power Point was shown on steps that could be used to address the teacher shortage. Slides will be sent to body. These data are useful for provosts, teachers in K-12, etc. There is a need for a 10% increase in teacher preparation enrollment across California. Regional shortages are resulting in offering of incentives, signing bonuses, and housing stipends. Accreditation would no longer be by unit. Instead each campus would complete report cards. Lastly, Chair Fleming reported that the committee will continue looking for ways to advocate for funding and address the tensions between teacher need and matriculation rates. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important to seek avenues for recruiting more men into the teaching profession and address SUGs.
2. It is important to consider efficiency and clarity in student transfer across campuses.
3. Technological efficiencies can also help faculty.
4. To what extent is diversity part of APEP discussions of the teacher shortage?

Faculty Affairs (FA) FA Chair Norman reported that the committee discussed two resolutions: “Lactation Resource Policy and Practices in the California State University (CSU)” and “Academic Freedom Policy.” Chair Norman also reported that FA met with AVC Gerry Hanley. Central in this discussion was the question of the library system. FA also met with CFA President, Jen Eagan and discussed academic freedom, FA aims, goals, and values related to academic freedom.

Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) FGA Chair Soni reported that the following resolutions were discussed: “ACR 158 (Holden): Undergraduate Student Transfers” and “Support for the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees (BoT) 2017-18 Budget Request.” FGA also discussed local advocacy efforts led by Senator Swartz. Chair Soni reminded the body that FGA and the Executive Committee would visit Sacramento in April and meet with various legislators. It is important to try to develop a relationship with legislators, beyond this once a year affair. Chair Soni also reported that FGA committee members would try local advocacy as a pilot after the election. These efforts may enable legislators to recognize the faculty and their concerns. The committee would also meet with AVC Ryan Storm and CFA President Jen Eagan. Chair Soni further reported that FGA met with Christian Osmena, Department of Finance. It seems that the governor wants to send out a message of constraint. FGA also discussed Prop 55 and the implications it holds for more money for CSU. Chair Soni will provide a summary of future discussions. Chair Soni later reported, after Chancellor White’s report that he posed to FGA whether or not FGA should write a resolution for or against the student fee increase. The rationale behind this resolution would be to support the students. Chair Soni reported that the committee decided to wait to see how the budget cycle plays out with regard to the governor’s decision on CSU funding. In a similar vein, it is important to wait to see whether or not the Board of Trustees will consider the fee increase as an action item. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Does FGA plan to present a resolution on the fee increase?
2. It is important to consider inviting Emeritus faculty for local visits.
3. Senator Swartz, on behalf of the committee, invited senators to participate in the local advocacy pilot.
4. To what extent might priority registration increase the achievement gap?
5. It is important to develop relationships with legislators.
6. Did FGA discuss the ways in which the campuses may be involved in understanding the conversations that took place on the fee increase? The ASCSU Chair gets asked about what the senate thinks about the proposed fee increase. The only response at this point could be that we will wait and see. This will not be sufficient. While the committee’s rationale is respected, direction is needed in order for the ASCSU Chair to be a better representative of the body in communications with campus colleagues.
7. It is important to get feedback from the campus senate chairs. The committee felt that it was premature to make a decision on the resolution.

8. There seems to be varying opinions on the committee regarding the position to take. It seems that none of the constituencies had formed a position, due to the pending election and budget due in January. Taking a premature position on this issue could be a barrier to consensus.
9. Did the committee discuss the value of taking a position on student fee increases as a matter of principle, rather than the political? If we are against or in favors student fee increases, then we should say so.
10. It is important to speak in support of our students.
11. It is important to remember that the students are against the student fee increase.
12. If we want to truly exercise leadership and we are here for the students, then is it not our responsibility to execute our charge of supporting our students? We may promote positive actions with such a stance.
13. In the long run, analyses must take into consideration that not considering these student fee increases could lead to the downfall of the institution.
14. It is important to have an economist in the CSU to analyze the situation.
15. Although it did not pass unanimously, it is important to consider the resolution from CSU San Bernardino and produce a document that frames the issues surrounding the proposed student fee increase.
16. Tuition is a dirty word. We seem to raise tuition when people can least afford it. We can say no to tuition increase and yes to additions to student unions. This is inconsistent.
17. It is important to remember that this is about state need to invest in the future. This information needs to be presented in a clear and concise way that explains the needs of future generations. It is not necessarily the students' responsibility to pay for this increase.
18. It seems that student access to the university is a benefit to the state and country. It is important to look to other models. For examples, students in Germany do not need to pay fees if they complete their degrees within a designated time.
19. It may be possible to reach consensus in commonly agreed "Whereas" clauses.

Steven Stepanek – CSU Faculty Trustee Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported that on November 15-16, 2016, the CSU Board of Trustees met at the Chancellor's Office in Long Beach. A different agenda format was tried during this meeting. Closed session meetings to discuss executive personnel matters, pending litigation and collective bargaining, were moved from the meeting start on Tuesday to Wednesday morning. This allowed the open meeting activities of the Board to start on Tuesday at 8:00 am. Faculty Trustee Stepanek report also included, but was not limited to the following:

1. The first meeting on Tuesday was the standing Committee on Educational Policy to hear two informational items: recommended amendments to Title 5 regarding admission of veterans and an update on Graduation Initiative 2025. The recommended amendments to Title 5 were first reading items that the Board will vote on during its January 2017 meeting. The changes update the definition of "eligible veteran" to include National Guard and Reservists and to include all veterans who were discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable. Language

is also introduced to Title 5 to permit the CSU to admit eligible veterans regardless of the number of transferable units earned.

During the September 2016 Board meeting, the Board approved the CSU Graduation Initiative 2025. The presentation during the November meeting consisted of an update on the Graduation Initiative Student Success Symposium that occurred on September 21-22, 2016, the campus initiatives being funded by the 2015-2016 allocation of \$35 million, and systemwide initiatives. The system initiatives include the review of graduation procedures to streamline administrative procedures, review of drop-for-non-payment policies to provide greater flexibility for students, funding of high-demand courses to meet student need, and study of the use of technology to assist courses with high-enrollment, high-failure rates. Two dashboards were also demonstrated: one is intended for high school students, parents and advisors considering enrollment in a CSU campus (www.calstate.edu/highschool) and the other is the CSU Faculty Dashboard (www.calstate.edu/dashboard). Access to the CSU Faculty Dashboard requires local campus participation and access permission. This dashboard provides data on: “Who are my students? How quickly do they progress toward degree? What paths do they follow? In which courses do they struggle? Are there achievement gaps between certain groups? What are their academic outcomes? What actions can I take [to help them succeed]?”

During Board discussion regarding Graduation Initiative 2025, it was pointed out that the success of this initiative is contingent on the full funding by the State of the line item for this project in the CSU supplemental budget for a multi-year period-of-time. Trustee Stepanek pointed out that increasing the average student load will raise FTES (full-time equivalent student) without increasing headcount that translates to funding issues for the additional course sections. In response, and as a preview of the business of the Committee on Finance, it was pointed out that the proposed budget includes a request for the State to support an additional 3,616 FTES and that a large portion of these funds would be used to support additional courses rather than admission of additional students. He also pointed out that some of the bottleneck courses require access to laboratory space that may be resource limited or in need of refresh.

The second committee to meet was the Committee on Finance. Their agenda listed six items – four were action items and two were informational. The new 69,200 square foot Student Union project at CSU Monterey Bay will be funded from student body center fees that have been approved based upon student input. The San Jose State University Student Recreation and Aquatic Center is a 121,100 square foot facility with an estimated completion date of March 2019. The 2017-2018 Lottery Budget was approved. The first reading for this budget was in September. The CSU receives approximately \$45 million annually in lottery funds – 3.7% of the total lottery funds distributed to education. The 2017-2018 Support Budget Request was approved. The CSU’s total budget of \$5.4 billion is funded from two sources: \$3.2 billion from state general funds and \$2.2 billion from net tuition and fee revenue. As approved by the Board, the CSU budget contains the following

supplemental requests for state funding above the base amount: 3,600 FTES growth – \$38.5 million. Current compensation commitments (this includes continued funding of CFA 2016-2017 salary increases plus funding of the 2017-2018 increases) – \$139.1 million. Potential new compensation agreements – \$55.1 million. Facilities and Infrastructure needs – \$10 million. Mandatory cost increases (such as health insurance) – \$26 million. Graduation Initiative 2025 – \$75 million. This comes to a total of \$343.7 million in incremental expenditures that would be offset by \$176.0 million in anticipated new revenue (\$157.2 million general fund increase from Governor’s Funding Plan and \$18.8 million net tuition from enrollment growth.). This leaves \$167.7 million as a supplemental increase request. It remains a top priority of the Board that the CSU seek an increase in state funding from the governor and legislature to avoid a possible student tuition increase but the system needs to keep its options open in case the 2017-2018 CSU Support Budget is not fully funded by the state. One of the options is a possible increase in tuition of no more than \$270 per year for full-time undergraduate students. If a tuition increase becomes necessary, it would appear on the agenda of the March Board meeting.

The joint meeting of the Committees on Educational Policy and Finance was convened to approve the CSU Academic Sustainability Plan that was initially presented to the Board during its September meeting. This plan is required by law to be submitted each year to the California Department of Finance and the state legislature. It provides a three-year projection of available resources, projections of resident and non-resident enrollment in each of those years and covers the goals for 16 performance measures as described in state law for each of those years.

The Committee on Governmental Relations convened to receive as an informational item the Statement of State Legislative Principles for 2017-2018. The Board will vote this item on during its January 2017 meeting. At the beginning of every two-year legislative session, the Board reviews and adopts a Statement of Legislative Principles for the California State University. These principles provide the basic parameters to guide positions taken by the Chancellor and system representatives on matters pending before the California legislature. A few principles can be summarized as follows:

1. Work with the legislature and governor to allow the CSU to continue its oversight of academic affairs and matters relating to the internal governance of the university.
2. Preserve the integrity of the collective bargaining process.
3. Remain neutral on matters in which the state seeks to legislate the general public health and safety while not singling out the CSU.
4. Preserve the integrity of the CSU’s budgetary process, and seek adequate funding to serve current and future students, support the work of faculty and staff, provide for ongoing operations, capital outlay and infrastructure needs, and meet the workforce demands of the state.

Trustee Stepanek also reported on his convening of a joint committee meeting of the Committees on Educational Policy and Campus Planning, Building and Grounds. The one agenda item was an informational presentation on progress towards CSU Environmental Sustainability Goals. This presentation was an update on the system's progress towards achieving the goals set in the 2014 policy. The updated included the following:

1. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – the CSU has already exceeded its 2020 goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to its 1990 level or below, consistent with the statewide target set by state legislation (AB 32).
2. Energy Efficiency – the CSU has installed \$128 million worth of energy efficiency projects since 2005, yielding an approximate 20% reduction in total energy use from 10 years ago. These projects included upgrades to LED lighting, installation of high- efficiency heating and cooling systems, and building envelope improvements.
3. Renewable Energy – the CSU has already met the goal set by the state in the California Public Utilities Commission Renewable Portfolio Standard prior to the 2020 deadline requiring that 33% of electrical needs be procured from renewable sources.
4. Self-Generation Capacity – the CSU is on track to meet the goal of 80 MW of self-generation electricity by 2020. By 2017 the system will be generating 19.5 MW of solar photovoltaic electricity and an additional 23 MW of cogeneration capacity. Phase 4 of the system's solar energy plan is anticipated to result in a total of 78.5 MW of self- generation capacity by 2018.
5. Water Conservation – the CSU has already exceeded the 2016 water conservation goal of reducing water use by 10% and is on track to meet the 2020 goal of reducing water use by 20%. This will be achieved through campus projects including behavior change, landscaping changes and plumbing fixture changes.
6. Integration of Sustainability into the Academic Curriculum – the Board policy called for the integration of sustainability into campus academic curriculum within the scope of the normal consultative process. The campuses have embraced this call in many different forms including the Campus as a Living Lab (CALL) initiative, creation of institutes and centers engaged in sustainability studies, and creation of sustainability minors and pathways through general education.

Faculty Trustee Stepanek further reported that the Chancellor's Office is currently working to create achievement goals for a system sustainable procurement policy and on methods to collect data regarding campus sustainable food purchasing. Immediately after the joint committee meeting adjourned, the Board and meeting attendees were invited to a poster session and reception showcasing CSU environmental sustainability projects and the linking of academic projects with campus facilities maintenance and management. The Committee on Collective Bargaining then met in open session to hear public comment and then ratify the Collective Bargaining Agreement with Unit 11, the International Union United Automobile Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Works

of America (UAW), covering academic student employees; and the Collective Bargaining Agreement with Unit 14, the CSU Employees Union (CSUEU), SEIU Local 2579, covering English language instructors at CSU, Monterey Bay.

Public comments during Collective Bargaining session consisted of representatives from various collective bargaining units covering such topics as: endorsement of \$55 million request in supplemental support budget for future collective bargaining salary increases; appreciation of the new Unit 14 contract; a student commenting on tuition going up at the same time salaries go up for student employees; post national election harassment concerns; hate speech vs. free speech; need for more system policies; passage of Proposition 55; campus safety; working together for full funding of CSU; regret over governor's veto of legislation to create a staff trustee position; and the pending change of some employees' status from exempt to non-exempt to comply with changes in Federal code regarding overtime.

During the public comment session, the Board heard from: students associated with Students for a Quality Education speaking against tuition increases, against GI 2025 because of the perception that it would force students to graduate within four years, issue of number of student trustees (apparent desire for each campus to have a student trustee), concerns regarding national election results, belief that CSU student loan debt is at the same level as the average national student loan debt, demands for sanctuary status on campuses; collective bargaining representatives echoing student demands for sanctuary status, complementing on the recently released dashboards, asking for funding to support students lacking shelter or sufficient food; and William Blischke, President of the CSU emeritus and Retired Faculty Association remarked on that group's shoe campaign and the college affordability crisis. The Board also heard reports from Trustee Eisen and Chancellor White. Trustee Eisen reported on some of her recent campus visits, CSU environmental sustainability activities including the tiny house competition that several campuses participated in, and the one-year anniversary of the Paris attacks that took the life of CSU, Long Beach student Nohemi Gonzalez.

Chancellor White also recognized Nohemi and those lost nearly one year ago in San Bernardino. He also reflected on the recent passing of David Dowell, former interim provost and president for Academic Affairs at CSU, Long Beach. He commented on CSU activities to meet the needs of returning veterans and the importance of everyone working together towards the goal of full state funding of the CSU's 2017-2018 supplemental budget request. He talked about the importance of the state funding of the Graduation Initiative 2025 goals and how closely linked the graduation initiative goals are to the institutional priorities and founding mission of the CSU. He offered some personal reflections on the recent national election and the concerns by many regarding an uncertain future. He mentioned the recently released joint statement with CSSA president David Lopez regarding these uncertainties. He closed with the following statement [taken from the closed captioning transcript]: "We are inequality [sic] committed to supporting all members of our community. That is who we are. It is a core strength and part of our DNA. Elections are essential to

democracy yet they are not easy. They test our resolve but also our understanding and compassion. They can be difficult and sometimes even painful; specially [sic] for those who hope for different outcomes. Today, many in our community may feel anxious and perhaps vulnerable about their personal future, the future of those they care for, and the future of our nation. It is our duty as a community to listen to each other, to support each other throughout this time. It is also our responsibility to hold our political leaders to account regardless of party. To meet that obligation, the CSU and CSSA will together be leading advocates and advancing the rights of our students, faculty and staff. In this effort, we stand with California's political and civic leaders, our colleagues in the University of California and the California Community Colleges and our many peers nationwide who care about and are dedicated to a nation that lives up to its highest principles.

“Further, as you would expect of us, we have been thinking about the policy discussions of our time. This past July we provided guidance to campuses to clarify the relationship between our campus law enforcement activities and the US immigration and customs enforcement agency. Let me be clear there is no ambiguity here, we are deeply committed to fostering a campus community that is safe and welcoming for everyone. Primary jurisdiction for federal immigration laws rests with ICE, not with university police nor any other local municipalities' law enforcement unless we are directed by California government code or required by law. The CSU will not enter into agreements with state or local law enforcement agencies, ICE or any other federal agency for the enforcement of federal immigration law. Our police departments will not honor ICE immigration hold requests and our university police do not contact, detain, question or arrest individuals solely on the basis of being or suspected of being a person that lacks documentation. Further, we are joining hands with other universities, colleges and educational associations across America to protect accessible [sic], affordability, intellectual freedom, inclusivity and diversity for all students including supporting our DACA students and the communities that support them. And finally, to our campus presidents, faculty, staff and students, I couldn't be more proud of you. Each campus has created just the right set of circumstances to allow a cacophony of views to be expressed and provide support to those who seek to do so interspersed with academic and community discussions and forums of the issues at hand. The voices of nonviolent protest have a sacred place on our campuses and it will be one of many important forces going forward just as it has been in the past decades. It is regrettable that in a few cases there are participants involved in criminal activity including vandalism and violence. And the campuses are responding properly with law enforcement inquiry notification as situations warrant. Let me close with a comment directed to those individuals among us, our students, our faculty and staff who feel most vulnerable – your university supports you. As I look around the room I see others, the trustees, the presidents, the CSSA, the Academic Senate, the Alumni Council, our labor partners who will support you. As I look across the state, as mentioned earlier, I know we stand with the University of California and the community colleges and many other political and business leaders.”

The presentation can be viewed on video at: <http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/nov16/>.

Faculty Trustee Stepanek's complete report can be read on the ASCSU website at the following link:

https://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/documents/Faculty_Trustee_Report_Nov_2016.pdf.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

- 1 Were there any conclusions or recommendations that were put forth on repair of deferred maintenance?
- 2 A request in the next fiscal year has been made for an additional \$12 million. Such requests will continue to be made over time. There is a significant amount of deferred maintenance in the CSU. This is part of a state problem in infrastructure support.
- 3 What are the types of discussions that the BoT is having about sustainability?
- 4 In some areas, the goals set for 2020 have already been met. The system is starting to look as a whole into solutions that enable campuses to get involved.
- 5 It is important to think about air conditioning and the associated waste. It is also important to think about computers that function on AC and the saving that can occur from conversion.
- 6 Sometime the retrofits can be expensive and these costs must be monitored.
- 7 The rough calculation for CSU deferred maintenance over the next 5 years is approximately \$2 billion. This calculation may be incomplete, as campus reports continue to come in.

Praveen Soni – Chair, Trustee Recommending Committee Senator Soni reported that the committee would meet during lunch and meet again on 1/24/17 at 3:00 p.m. to discuss final logistics. Senator Soni also reported that during the March 2017 plenary, the ASCSU would vote on the new Faculty Trustee. At least two names must be forwarded to the plenary for vote. Chair Miller and the ASCSU Executive Committee would discuss putting the materials into Dropbox to allow for view of materials during the January and March plenaries. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What aspects of policy is the assumption about sending two names based?

The Executive Committee charged Senator Soni to make recommendations for changes to the policy and procedures.

2. It is important to pay close attention to policy changes.
3. Senator Soni will be soliciting questions from the senate for the candidates to answer.

Other committees and committee liaisons

Academic Conference Committee

Senator Soni reported on progress of the Academic Conference and that the goal behind venue selection was to showcase of a specific CSU campus. Senator Soni thanked Senator Eadie for his work with the committee and enabling the hosting of the conference at San Diego State University. The Union building is LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certified. The theme of the conference is “Closing the Achievement Gap: Student Success”. This theme, in combination with the Graduation Initiative, would address the 2025 goals. Senator Soni also reported that the conference would occur on February 9-10, 2017. Keynote speakers will include Diane Ravitch and Tia Brown. Dr. Ravitch was consulted to ensure that she could address the achievement gap in higher education. Campus Presidents, Provosts, Senate Chairs, and Vice Presidents of Student Affairs are all invited. Lastly, Senator Soni reported that the Hilton Double Tree would be the hotel for the venue. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Has anyone checked to see if the hotel is experiencing labor difficulties?
2. Will members of the Board of Trustees (BoT) be invited? It would be nice to have more interactions with the BoT members. What are the plans for ensuring greater interactions with the members of the BoT?
3. An icebreaker is in being planned.
4. Congratulation on securing Dr. Ravitch. She is a powerful advocate for public education.
5. Why is the Double Tree being used for the venue?
6. A website with all of conference information will be created in the near future.
7. Please make sure that your campus senate chairs are reminded to attend the conference.
8. When will invitations be sent out? Will the new campus presidents and provosts be invited? Are we going to encourage the sending of other decision-making stakeholders, if the president or provost is unable to attend?
9. All stakeholders are encouraged to attend, if those invited cannot attend.
10. The energy of conferences like this can be enhanced by student presence. Do we have a program and marketing format that appeals to students? Each campus is unique. What are you and the committee doing to convey the uniqueness of San Diego State University?
11. Senator Soni was a great advocate for showcasing campus uniqueness as part of the conference. The opening reception will be held in the Student Union and it is an iconic building. The reception will be on the third level that looks out onto the courtyard. Students designed the building and had it built. Sustainability features of the building will also be discussed. The rooftop garden will be highlighted. The San Diego Trolley will also be featured and is across the street from the hotel. It takes approximately 15 minutes to get to campus. The Alumni Center will be hosting the Friday events. There is a five to ten minute walk to the Alumni Center from the trolley stop.
12. Will we all receive the same invitations to ensure consistency in communication?

13. Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Blanchard will be speaking with the campus provosts about attending the conference. The Chancellor has informed the campus presidents of the conference and their role in sponsoring their campus teams. Statewide senators should encourage their campus representatives to attend the conference. The last time the conference occurred, the surveys revealed enthusiasm for the next conference.
14. Have there been any provisions made for inviting politicians from San Diego or Sacramento? Attending the conference would enable them to see the importance of funding the California State University (CSU) system and events like the Academic Conference.
15. Assembly members will be contacted for possible attendance.

Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) Immediate Past Chair Filling reported that he visited Sacramento to discuss the implementation of the QRTF recommendations. He had a conversation with the Lt. Governor on potential steps that the CSU can take towards implementation.

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) GEAC Chair Creadon reported that the committee heard an update on the Online Oral Communication Pilots. GEAC was introduced to Dr. Alison Wrynn, Associate Dean, Academic Programs and will work closely with her on General Education (GE) issues. Chair Creadon also reported that GEAC heard a report on the October Symposium of the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning. Senator Van Selst introduced the discussion of the complex implementation of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report recommendations. GEAC was also introduced to Dr. James Minor, CSU Senior Strategist for Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence and heard a report on graduation initiative. GEAC also discussed the general education survey with AVC Mallon. These data are ready for analysis. The need for GE requirements clarification in catalogues and to external sources was also discussed.

Michael Ratcliffe, CSSA Liaison Report California State Student Association (CSSA) Liaison Ratcliffe reported on student concerns surrounding the potential tuition increase. Veteran concerns, sustainability, social justice, ad hoc committees, mental health awareness, and an Ethnic Studies resolution will continue to be discussed. The students are against the tuition increase and the need for greater funding from the State of California is of concern. Advocacy efforts will be discussed in preparation for capital visits. Liaison Ratcliffe also reported that students would be attending the next Board of Trustees meeting to ensure that their voices are heard on the subject of the potential tuition increase. The CSSA is also engaging in a marketing strategy that will be used for next year. This will be discussed at the next CSSA meeting at CSU Channel Islands. Chancellor White, EVC Blanchard, and AVC of Budget, Ryan Storm will engage in conversation with the CSSA leadership. Lastly, Liaison Ratcliffe reported that the CSSA was updated on the launch of tuition.calstatestudents.org and the two letters published that provide an overview of the proposal. A resolution to “Oppose a Tuition Increase” will be presented to the CSSA Board at the CSSA meeting. The following concerns and question were raised:

1. Are you collecting resolutions in support? CSU San Bernardino passed a resolution in support of the CSSA position against the proposed fee increase.

2. In discussion of sustainability, has population sustainability been included. On the tuition increase, Fresno State University fired its football coach and he still makes a salary while sitting at home. Quality education must be paid for.
3. It is good that the students will be lobbying. Another part of the problem is the amount of the budget that goes to instruction. It is important for students to not be silent on this issue.
4. Is there a broad coalition of students working to make an impression?
5. Coalitions will be discussed this weekend at the CSSA meeting.
6. Lawmakers pay attention to students when they visit. It is important to pay attention to academic excellence. Do you see the CSSA allowing for progress fee increases in the future?
7. It is important to clarify that there is no connection between the tuition increase and the faculty pay raise.
8. It is important to dispel this rumor and how this will be presented publically will be discussed this weekend, along with the marketing of the idea.
9. It is important to address State University Grants (SUGs). This money does not go into the system. It is important to note that the underfunding of SUGs is actually hurting the people that it was intended to help.
10. To what extent is sexual violence prevention being discussed by CSSA? It is important to address concerns surrounding the redefinition of rape and mandatory sentencing.
11. Is there any discussion of what would be a reasonable tuition increase for students? Assuming tuition goes up over time, students could plan for this increase, as costs go up.
12. The last time this discussion occurred was during discussions of the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report (SFMTFR). The CSSA is looking at the models suggested in the report.
13. Can you offer the body insight into the nature of the Ethnic Studies Resolution being discussed by the CSSA?
14. On the topic of Academic Freedom, there is not clear definition in the CSU. There is confusion of freedom of speech with hate speech. Students and faculty have been accused of being terrorists and their personal information posted publically. The futures of faculty and students are jeopardized by such actions. What is on the CSSA agenda to defend the students against these political attacks?
15. These actions will be part of a larger discussion that we will have in the future. It may be possible to place these concerns and issues as an agenda item for discussion at our January meeting at Cal. Poly, San Luis Obispo (S.L.O).

Harold Goldwhite, ERFA Liaison Report California State University Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (CSU ERFA) Liaison Goldwhite reported on the meeting of the State Council of CSU-ERFA, held on October 22, 2016, at Cal Poly, Pomona's Kellogg West Center. Seventeen campuses were represented at the meeting by some 40 delegates. Attendees were welcomed by the Cal Poly delegation. CSU ERFA President Bill Blischke recognized, in his opening report, the outstanding service to CSU-ERFA of two members who have retired from their positions. Don

Cameron was Executive Director for over 8 years; Judd Grenier was Archivist for over 10 years. The Association presented them with certificates of appreciation and gifts. President Blischke is attending Board of Trustees meetings, and hopes to get standing for CSU-ERFA at those meetings equivalent to other major CSU groups like the Academic Senate. He also discussed the Million Shoe Campaign, further details of which are included in this issue of The Reporter, and on the CSU-ERFA website (<http://www.csuerfa.org>).

Liaison Goldwhite also reported that Treasurer Harry Sharp (Cal. Poly S.L.O) presented the current report and noted that CSU-ERFA's income from dues is slowly declining. The Association needs to recruit new members as a priority. The State Council was addressed by Christine Miller, Chair of the Academic Senate CSU. She discussed the Senate's priorities for this academic year, including the role of shared governance, and policies on academic freedom and intellectual property.

Leni Cook In her legislative committee report Leni Cook (CSU Dominguez Hills (DH)) representing Alan Wade (CSU Sacramento), its chair, reported that the committee studied the 17 propositions on the November ballot but had no recommendations for positions that the Association should take. She discussed the possible implications of the Marin County decision, upheld by a state appeals court, and now on its way to the State Supreme Court. This decision in a suit brought by unions against Marin Pension Board's interpretation of a 2013 state law aimed at curbing pension "spiking" could conceivably lead to pension reductions for some public employees if upheld. This is a case to watch closely.

Marshelle Thobaben (CSU Humboldt), Chair of the Grants Committee, described the new streamlined grants process that will be in place next year. Since 1997 CSU-ERFA has awarded over \$50,000 in grants to retired CSU-ERFA members for scholarly and creative work.

Harold Goldwhite Lastly, Liaison Goldwhite reported that President Blischke announced the appointment of Joanna Dunklee (CSU DH) as the new Association Archivist. He will be making an appointment to the Personnel Committee from the Executive Committee (as required by policy) in the near future. The Cal. Poly, Pomona delegation presented a proposal, prepared by Norman Nise (Cal. Poly Pomona) on "CSU-wide Emeriti Privileges". The Council referred the document to the Executive Committee. Prepared by Harold Goldwhite Executive Director, and drawing on the meeting minutes by Rita Jones (CSU LB), a comprehensive report was also heard from Merry Pawlowski (CSU Bakersfield).

Jennifer Eagan, CFA Liaison Report California Faculty Association (CFA) Liaison Eagan reported on the political activities on campuses and in Sacramento. The current main goal of the CFA is to aid in the passage of Prop 55. The University of California (UC) did not support Prop 55; however, the CSU and CFA are supporting Prop 55. Passage will impact general fund money. It is important to monitor the state legislative races. These races are very tough for public education advocates. There has been an increase in the amount of Political Action Committee (PAC) money. Moderate democrats have been seeing increases in money allocated to charter schools. There will be many close races. CFA Liaison Eagan also reported that CFA members have made many phone calls in support of Prop 55. It is important to pay attention to local candidates. The November discussion of the potential student fee increase will set the stage for the how the CFA will act this

coming year. The CFA's position is against the fee increase. Student activism is expected at the November BoT meeting. It is important to pay attention to the cost of living and socio-economic make up of our students. It is important to pay attention to generational difference in access to education. A research paper will be launched aimed at legislators. Central in the paper will be discussion of the relationship between the disinvestment in higher education and the changing ethnic demographics of the state. The CSU is getting 17.7% less dollars and admitting 13.5% more students that are not accounted for in the budget. It is important for state funding to reflect student need. Lastly, CFA Liaison Eagan reported that the CFA would continue working on tenure density and academic freedom. Unconstitutional speech policies are also being investigated. It is important to consider how appropriate it is for public universities to have policies that specify time, place, and manner in which Freedom of Speech is exercised. The CFA will also examine the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report and the role that Ethnic Studies plays in supporting CSU students. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. To what extent does whiteness have to do with defunding?
2. It is important to stay vigilant against systematic racism.
3. It is important also to pay attention to where the money will come from.
4. It is important to pay attention to the lack of will to fund the university. It is also important to teach our legislators who our students are and what they need.
5. The ASCSU is on record supporting stable and predictable fee increases, as it allows for students to plan for the increases.
6. On the subject of time, place, and manner policies, it is important to pay attention to the need for a comprehensive Academic Freedom policy.
7. In January, the Executive Committee has invited Vice Chancellor Virjee to talk about time, place, and manner issues.

Ryan Storm, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget: Tuition Assistant Vice Chancellor (AVC) Storm, joined by Kara Perkins, reported on the 2017-18 Support Budget and the tuition proposal for the 2017-18 year. Central in this report were the state and CSU budget timelines and how these related to the tuition proposal. AVC Storm also walked through the historical context of student feed in the CSU, the BoT fee policy, and how the proposal potentially impacts students. On the subject of timeline, the following was discussed:

1. The budget request always exceeds what the state suggests the CSU needs and reflects a requested 4% general fund increase per year.
2. The timeline is as follows:
 - Sept/Oct. 16: Proposal & Meeting with CSSA
 - November 2016: Board Budget and Revenue Discussion and continued consultation with the CSSA and Develop Advocacy Plan.
 - January 17: Governor's Budget Proposal
 - Early 17: Board Discussion and Potential Action
 - March – May 1: Advocacy

- May 17: Governor's Budget Revision (\$157 million increase expected.)
- June 17: Final State Budget Decisions
- July 17: Final CSU Budget Decisions & Campus Allocations

AVC Storm also reported that the goal of the CO is to ensure full funding of the CSU. The Board of Trustees would consider a series of information items and possible action items. March through May is the state legislative process and advocacy occurs during this time. It will be important to speak to the governor and legislature about CSU needs. This process must dovetail in with AB-1307 - Working Families Student Fee Transparency and Accountability Act (http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB1307). At the end of the last recession, this act ensures that students and families have enough notice on possible tuition increases. Students are given a timely proposal and two distinct meetings of the Board must follow before any action on increasing tuition. The Trustees have the option of raising – or not raising - tuition afterward. This timeline should be considered as a safeguard. On the subject of the budget, 70% (\$5.9 billion) of total budget-related expenses are educational. This excludes the non-profit auxiliaries, parking, etc. on campuses. \$8.5 billion is the total budget. Financial aid accounts for 12% of the support budget. This tuition is waived. The Support Budget and Expenses by category and Proposed Incremental Expenditures were also explained. This explanation included Graduation Initiative 2025, Compensation, Facilities and Infrastructure Needs, etc. AVC Storm further reported on the possible budget shortfalls. Layoff, program shrinkage, and tuition hikes can all accompany budget cuts. The language in the SFMTFR on sustainable tuition increases and comparisons with other institutions were also discussed. He also noted that the CSU continues to be a bargain. The maximum amount of the possible tuition increases would be as follow:

UG: $\$5472 + \$279 = \$5742$

Credential: $\$6348 + \$312 = \$6660$

Graduate: $\$6738 + \$438 = \$7176$

Lastly, AVC Storm reported that it is important to remember that SUGS, Cal Grants, etc. would cover these fees. On average, the CSU costs \$14, 388 and the national average is \$28, 950. More than 60% of students have tuition fully covered by grants/waivers. More than 80% receive financial aid. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Is it possible to receive copies of the Power Point?
2. On the subject of tenure track hiring, how would this be accounted? What is the relationship between tuition increases and graduation rates?
3. Earlier graduation would enable students to experience cost savings.
4. Would it be possible to obtain data?
5. The old data reveals that the one-year fee spike does have an impact. The cost of the CSU does not normally impact college going.
6. The CSU has had a flat tuition rate for the past five year.

7. Sensible measured tuition increases make sense, as inflation is a reality. Will this be an annual event? This could motivate students to talk to legislators.
8. \$325 million would be the total amount requested.
9. It is important to consider the burden being placed on students when asking them to take more classes.
10. Since we do not collect the money from SUGs and it is listed as an expense, how is this not problematic? It is important to include both City University of New York (CUNY) and SUNY in the discussion of the New York system. Otherwise, the assumptions may be problematic. Do you have the same information on faculty salaries?
11. In reference to slide six, to what extent is compensation used to show a link between the necessary tuition increases and increased compensation? To what extent does this lend the illusion that there is a linkage between CFA raises and tuition increases?
12. From the vantage point of general fund and tuition, one could argue that faculty salaries are paid by general fund and tuition.
13. To what extent does the CO take into account the cost of living in relationship to these numbers? Faculty and students do not always live in rural areas or university towns where the cost of living is low. Given food and housing insecurities, is it possible to suggest that comparable cost of living increase in financial aid be factored into this discussion?
14. Given that most of our students work, and the \$15 minimum wage increase, how might this impact the financial aid expenditures? Where are the numbers for the out-of-state and international students?
15. Each unique circumstance of the student is considered and scenarios are exemplified in our proposal.
16. In reference to the last slide, it says that the average loan debt of CSU students is half of the national average. Are public universities or private universities or all being included in the numbers? It is important to not compare student debt to institutions where the median income is higher.
17. Why are graduate students on the hook for the tuition increase?
18. The BoT suggests that graduate tuition should increase to 1.5 times the undergraduate tuition. The rationale is to ease the burden on the population that we are trying to reach.
19. In the spring, a tenure density committee was formed. In the charge, there was an assertion to have a report due out in March. It is not clear as to whether or not there is a clear indication of growth in faculty hires in the report. What influence might the hiring of additional tenured/tenure-track faculty on graduation rates? It is important to discuss this information soon.
20. Are the other comparator campuses' social demographics the same as the CSU? A significant number of CSU family salaries do not increase regularly, are undocumented, and/or come from locals segregated by either class or ethnicity.
21. We will look into these points for future presentations; however, these were also included in discussions of these data.

22. Our theme in the statewide senate is “Finding the Balance”. It is important to remember to send a statement to our students and stakeholder that affirms the original compact. It is still fiscally possible to live up to it.
23. EVC Van Cleve reported that all users of federal financial aid were included with this information.
24. Chair Miller reported that AVC Mallon would substitute for AVC Van Cleve at the Friday plenary.

Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor Chancellor White met with the ASCSU. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It was interesting to see the proposal to the California State Student Association (CSSA). When you are out on the road talking about the Graduate Initiative, it is hoped that the work that the CSU is already doing will be discussed. It is important to remind stakeholders of the roles that department chairs play in ensuring student degree completion and success. Please put in a plug for those of us in this position.
2. It is acknowledged that the faculty contributes to student success. It is important for senators to go to the URL on KQED to see the chancellor’s discussion of CSU funding needs and degree completion goals. Insight is being received from business leaders who are interested in why we do what we do in the CSU and the roles that faculty play in helping the State of California to succeed.
3. We had a great presentation on the CSU budget. How do you see the role of hiring new tenure-track faculty in the changing of tenure density?
4. The dollars are distributed to the campuses annually and campus decision makers decide on how to spend the money on new tenure track faculty hires. There is system-wide awareness that the campuses will be adding to current tenure track rates. Meetings have been had with the campus presidents and matrices reviewed to ensure growth. For a campus that is growing, they may be making progress on tenure-track faculty hiring, but not tenure density. It is important to pay attention to this issue. If one is dealing with a large campus, then it is possible to have a lower density and still be effective. It is important to move the tenure percentage needle; however, it is expensive. If one converted non-tenure track positions to tenured, then the teaching load would be different and the salary base would go up. The research output and committee work go up but the class availability goes down.
 5. In considering the role of tenured faculty/tenure-track faculty, they provide research opportunities for students and curriculum development. It is important to consider whether or not campuses have a goal for tenure density.
 6. This is a conversation that is possible to have with stakeholders and it is possible to do better.
 7. In considering ACR 73, one must consider the intellectual basis for tenure density numbers and goals. It is important to have this conversation.

8. It is important to make the argument to legislators that our passions lie with the students and we need to make student friendly schedules, etc. To do this, however, there needs to be a robust faculty. It is important to remember that when new sections are added, then the tenure density goes down. Adjunct faculty will go up and the roles of the faculty will increase as well.
9. It is important to consider the tenure density issue from another angle. Not having job security in a university means not having academic freedom. Looking at the costs in terms of dollars takes away from the realities of faculty experiences. If political attacks occur, then one will not teach the way that one should teach. In considering the goal of tenure density, the goal should be set high to include faculty success.
10. This morning we had a conversation about the potential student fee increase. Would you elaborate on the strategies being considered to secure additional state funding in order to avoid raising student fees?
11. No one wants to raise student fees; however, the resources must come from somewhere, if we are to obtain more professors, more class sections, etc. We need to have sufficient resources to serve the State of California. This is a dilemma. In the past three to four years, the budget has been supported. It is important to continue telling our story differently and building relationships, as these can lead to stakeholders understanding the service that we provide for the state. We must do our part to help California's future. We need to get students to their degrees by 2025. If we can't have a student fees conversation, then we will have to reduce our efforts. The strength of the pairing is that the asking for resources is tied to student success and the serving of needs in the State of California. More constructive conversations may occur if they are tied to student services. If the state is not willing to pay, then we will ask the students. In practicality, it may mean increasing student fees, state support, and possible cuts. It is important to remember that this is not a last minute conversation. This is a publication of a long thought out strategy that will move the needle on our resources in ways that are salient in our educational need and knowledge of public resources. We need to keep on the table the opportunity for other options. We did not come here to be stagnant. The student body leadership is remarkable. They are not expected to stand among their peers and ask for a student fee increase; however, they are expected to understand what is at stake. It may cost more for students while they are with us, but there may be cost savings in the long run with shorter time to degree.
12. On the topic of stagnation, our student body has changed in socio-economic composition and our legislation has changed. The one thing that has not changed in the twenty-one years of my experiences is the way we assess student fees and charge students for units. There is no differential between the first major and the second. This is a bit of a buffet philosophy. It is important to find a way to raise student fees so that students can plan. This will go a long way in enabling students to cope with the fee change.
13. There is much for us to think about. The conversations in the senate are valuable. At McDonald's one pays according to the size of the meal. In the CSU there are only two choices. What is the academic argument here? Do we go to a per unit charge? Maybe we should consider three tiers and find a way to further student investment in their

education. It is important to consider modeling and equity in student fees. In financial aid, we lead the country in the generosity of Cal Grants, SUGs, Pell Grants, etc. There are a lot of ways that students are assisted. Students do pay fees; however, 60% do not pay tuition. The Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report (SFMTFR) revealed the need for small predictable student fee increases. We must have the courage to take these issues on and think it through further. It must be understood that lower income students will be covered by the grants they normally receive. These matters will be discussed with the student leadership.

14. In talking about the Graduation Initiative and the need for faculty participation, there seems to be a conundrum. We can't meet this need without adequate resources. Government says we will give you these resources if you increase graduation rates; however, we cannot increase graduation rates without resources. If we do not have enough counselors, then we will not enable student success. If we do not have mentorships and advising, then we will not achieve what we are being asked to achieve. How is it that people making legislative decisions don't understand that things can't get accomplished without resources?
15. This is why advocacy important. "Stand with The CSU" was effective and the State University of New York (SUNY) took this idea and obtained a greater appropriation. We must find ways to continue telling our story successfully. It is important to develop relationships with young entry-level legislators and teach them about the greatness of our CSU system. This will be a multi-year plan.

Dia Poole, Alumni Council Liaison Report Alumni Council Liaison Poole reported that conversations on the council have centered on student success and the role that alumni can play in Graduation Initiative 2025. The 3.3 million alumni can serve as resources on solutions to enable student success as the CSU attempts to reach its goals. The next alumni conference will be held in March 2017 at CSU Bakersfield. The Alumni Council will be engaging faculty for insight into how alumni can be resources in the classroom and part of campus plans to enable student success. Alumni can be great resources for current students by offering strategies for overcoming obstacles. Alumni Council Liaison Poole also reported that the 2017-18 budget request is also of concern for the Alumni Council. There is support for the request above the governor's proposal. The additional funds would enable the showcasing of the value of the CSU to the State of California and allow all of us to improve on what we already do so well. Lastly, Alumni Council Liaison Poole reported that Trustee Nilon is a graduate of CSU Bakersfield. He will be engaging in campus visits to ask how the alumni can be a greater resource. CSU alumni are a product of the teaching excellence that our faculty reflect. Legacy families are being showcased through stories and these testimonies will be shared with decision makers and stakeholders to show the effectiveness of the CSU. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Would the Alumni Association be able to assist in advocacy this spring?
2. What is the protocol for bringing alumni into our classrooms?
3. In the past, representatives from the Alumni Council have attended lobbying in Sacramento. It would be nice to have Emeritus Faculty attend also.

4. Would it be possible to have a public service announcement on Title IX issues associated with alumni events such as “PubCrawls”?

Deidre Sessoms, Director of Faculty Research Development and Professor in the College of Education at CSU Sacramento; Andrea Venezia, Associate Professor in the Public Policy and Administration Department and Executive Director of the Education Insights Center (EdInsights) at CSU Sacramento; & Brock Grubb, Independent consultant Ed Insights/Student Success Network coordinators: Student Success

EdInsights reported on how and why they started a student success network. Housed at Sacramento State, their focus is on improving policymaking in K-12 and at post- secondary public universities. Their mission is to execute via policy research, program evaluation and capacity building. The guiding principle behind their missions is that it is important to not jump over those who work directly with students. Over the past twenty years, the goal has been to create a grass roots program that illuminates the relevance of such a principle. Kresge Foundation provided funding to explore the following: needs, definitions of student success, and student engagement. A research and planning group was started with the California Community Colleges (CCC) and has enabled collaboration on how to create a network. Ed Insights also reported that they communicated with campus provosts and created 13 work groups that engaged faculty, student affairs staff, and student learning and progression stakeholders. These work groups lent to the creation of their current conceptual framework. The Department of Finance reached out to EdInsights and asked if they were in need of support. \$1.1 million was provided in the state budget. The conditions for the funding were as follows:

1. Must be new dollars.
2. A philanthropic route had been the goal. Receiving state support allowed sustainability.

The conceptual framework is as follows:

Applied Research: Ed Insights does not always know the student voice. What do students have to say about their experiences? This question enables the building of a base of knowledge.

Student Success Labs: Enables the support of cross-campus, cross-role collaboration and spaces for communication. An annual conference allows for the sharing of lessons with stakeholders.

Convening: Ensures the creation of “middle leaders” that can learn from one another. The focus is on how to engage resistance on campuses and use logic models to enable student success.

Communication and Dissemination: Includes the sharing of lessons learned to various stakeholders through blogs, white papers, etc.

Infrastructure development: Includes examining how to spend general fund money, set up supports, pay staff, faculty, and administrators, etc., and establish a backbone.

Network development: The development of project network breadth and depth is still needed. Only 13 campuses expressed interest. Transparency is important as public dollars are being used for the project. Provosts will be met with in the future and an email list has been created of stakeholders within and outside of the CSU.

Lastly, EdInsights also discussed expected outcomes and what will be accomplished. The immediate goal is to start slow and focus on relationship building. It is important to campus entities to know who is EdInsights. An external evaluator will also be used for the purpose of sharing information on the progress made by the collaborative. Over the next year, a prototype scale will be created around their work strands. This will cultivate an increased awareness of EdInsights. Two leaps of faith will be the creation of a culture of inquiry in the CSU and support systems goals and changes in student engagement and learning.

Opportunities to engage with EdInsights are all follows:

1. Help co-develop the Network.
2. Help develop and implement the labs.
3. Take part in labs.
4. Conduct research with EdInsights.
5. Participate with convening events.

For more information, please contact Andrea Venezia (venezi@csus.edu) & Diedre Sessoms (sessoms@csus.edu)

EdInsights
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J. St.
Tahoe Hall 3065
Sacramento, CA 95819-6081
Phone: 916-278-3888
Fax: 916-278-3907
Email: edinsights@csus.edu

The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What are the lines and logic of the organization being in the CSU?
2. Who are the members of interim committee?
3. It is important to remember that the advisory group is not yet complete. It is important to have faculty and advisor voices as well.
4. Is it possible to collaborate on K-12 initiatives?
5. Is it possible to have ongoing communication with the Standing Committee Chairs? How does EdInsights coordinate with, duplicate, work with or work at odds with the many other initiatives within the CSU system?

6. It is important to examine the trends that can help us as we move forward. It is also important to understand our own campus programs. Sense-making is important and can be arena where we can collaborate.
7. Do you have any insight into the California transfer process? Do you have anything to add?
8. Some highpoints include but are not limited to policy programs and CCC feeder patterns. The following questions can be a point of collaboration: What happens when policy is implemented in ways that do not help students?
9. It is important to remember FGA discussions from last year that raised concerns about the role of third parties in CSU affairs, the ongoing work being done within the CSU that is ignored due to campus centric efforts, and efficacy (what efforts have been put forth to apply the applied research of yourself).
10. How might your resources enable cross campus acquisitions of resources?
11. A Wiki may be a possible to create; however, it would be important to start small to aggregate information and build from there.
12. To what extent do discussions of the graduation rates reify the notion of this being an actual problem? There needs to be an education initiative, rather than a graduation initiative. To what extent might reifying this problem not educate legislators about student need and the problems that they face?
13. Policy shifts have been examined and lead to the cautioned approach taken by the EdInsights group. Reframing of the achievement gap has occurred throughout examinations of opportunity gaps.

Committee Recommendations

| | |
|--|---|
| ACR 158 (Holden): Undergraduate Student Transfers Approved without dissent | <u>AS-3268-16/FGA (Rev)</u> Second Reading |
| Course Grading in the Golden Four Approved | <u>AS-3269-16/AA/APEP (Rev)</u> Second Reading |
| Endorsement of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations Approved without dissent | <u>AS-3270-16/APEP (Rev)</u> Second Reading |
| Establishment of an Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Task Force to Study General Education Approved | <u>AS-3271-16/AA (Rev)</u> Second Reading |
| Support for the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees (BOT) 2017-18 Budget Request | <u>AS-3273-16/FGA</u> First Reading/Waiver |

Unanimously Approved

Commendation of the CSU Institute of Teaching and Learning (ITL) Summer Institute 2016 AS-3274-16/AA
First Reading

Commendation of Ken O'Donnell Approved by Acclamation AS-3275-16/AA/APEP
First Reading

Academic Freedom Policy AS-3276-16/FA
First Reading

Lactation Resource Policy and Practices in the California State University (CSU) AS-3277-16/FA
First Reading

Resolution Opposing Student Fee Increase AS-3278-16/Floor

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary