

**Minutes
September 3-4, 2015
Office of the Chancellor**

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

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

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

Call to Order

With a quorum being present, the plenary was called to order at 8:07 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 (SUB)); Pomona (Neto, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Steffel, Ullman); San Diego (Eadie, Ornatowski, Wheeler); San Francisco (Collins, Ritter, Yee-Melichar); San Jose (Lee, Frazier (SUB), Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Froochar, Widmann (SUB)); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Roberts); Stanislaus (Filling, Strahm); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack)

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

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Approval of May 14-15, 2015 Minutes

The Minutes were approved as submitted.

Announcements

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

Presentations/Introductions

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

Reports

Steven Filling, Chair

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

Chair Filling discussed the situation of faculty colleagues at CSU San Bernardino. Senator Ullman offered a first-person perspective on faculty concerns. A resolution was created and the faculty asked the Chancellor for assistance. The Chancellor replied by indicating that shared leadership is not shared decision making. The faculty of CSU San Bernardino is trying to figure out how to move forward, as the culture of the campus seems to have changed. A campus climate survey will be conducted to assess faculty morale and needs. Chair Filling reviewed the situation of faculty colleagues at CSU Chico. Senator Schulte offered a first-person perspective on faculty concerns and explained the “Call For Strengthening Campus Morale” conducted in Fall 2014. In January 2015 a resolution response team was created and met with the cabinet. Discussion ensued. A campus climate survey was administered in May. Data was analyzed over the summer. Later, the campus president announced retirement, and before school started, appointed the Interim Provost to Provost. One thousand members of the campus community participated in an open and untraceable survey. Chair Filling was invited to present on shared governance. Vice Chancellor Lori Lam and Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard were sent from the CO to listen to - and observe – the situation. The survey and results will be

shared. Feedback and suggestions for moving forward were asked of senators. Senator Selvester reminded the plenary that faculty fear was of great concern. Therefore, institutional research set up situations where faculty could take the survey anonymously. The development of this culture of fear is of great concern and was shared with representatives from the Chancellor's Office.

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

The following concerns and questions were raised:

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

Standing Committees

Academic Affairs (AA):

AA Chair Nelson reported that the Academic Affairs Committee had a productive first meeting and made substantial progress through a very full agenda. The Committee agreed upon priorities for 2015-16. The Committee discussed the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report draft and will provide feedback. The focus of the feedback will be on curriculum review and resource allocation implications of the task force's recommendations. AA welcomed CO Liaison Chris Mallon, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development. The Committee provided Assistant Vice Chancellor Mallon with advice on consultation with our CCC colleagues about their baccalaureates pilots, particularly how to make consultation productive for both systems. The Committee also discussed with Assistant Vice Chancellor Mallon the ongoing conversation among presidents, provosts and graduate deans about MA degree requirements. The Committee is developing a list of conceptual criteria to distinguish between masters and baccalaureate degrees. Finally, the Committee will co-sponsor a resolution with APEP that calls for an ASCSU task force to evaluate the GE B4 Quantitative Reasoning Requirement. The resolution is in response to GEAC's September 1, 2015 motion to extend the STATWAY Alternative Statistical Pathway Pilot and recommend the creation of the task force.

Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP):

Chair Fleming reported on the resolution on B4 Requirements in light of GEAC's meeting on STATWAY. The committee will draft a Commendation for Dr. Beverly Young. The committee will also bring forward a resolution on the high school exit examination suspension. In addition, three successful meetings with CO colleagues have occurred. Director Ken O'Donnell called from the airport and was able to discuss the issues surrounding GEAC concerns. Director Eric

Forbes was able to present information on Early Start. Executive Director Joseph Aguirre has taken Dr. Young's position and the committee looks forward to future collaboration with him. The committee also plans to meet with Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Research & Resources Edward Sullivan regarding data and reports.

Faculty Affairs (FA):

Chair Foroohar reported that the committee discussed 2015-16 priorities during the Extended ExCom meeting. The committee is drafting policy on Academic Freedom, increasing tenure density by increasing the net of tenure track position, focusing on faculty retention, revisiting the CSU policy on Intellectual Property in relationship to online courses, and the enhancement of RSCA funding for faculty. The committee had two guests: CFA President Jennifer Egan who gave report on contract negotiation and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Human Resources Margie Merryfield who reported on Human Resource plans for the coming year. Assistant Vice Chancellor Merryfield answered questions on HR policy for background checks on new hires. HR policy for new hires created a lively discussion and a resolution was drafted asserting the need for the suspension of the policy and discussion and consultation with the ASCSU before further implementation. Potential impacts on new hires were also discussed. A resolution was draft and waiver was requested due to campus implementation without faculty consultation. A resolution draft recommending the addition of an Emerita/us Trustee to the BoT was also created. The need for a resolution on shared governance was also extensively discussed and will be prepared for discussion at the next plenary. Comments on the draft reports on Ethnic Studies and the Financial Sustainability Model were also discussed and offered.

Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)

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

Steven Stepanek- CSU Faculty Trustee

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

- a. Based on your experiences with Trustees, around which issues is a faculty perspective most needed?

- b. Most conversations have occurred before the meetings. Faculty perspectives are most needed around budget, planning for next year's academic budget, agreements with CCC, transfers, etc.

Other Committees and Committee Liaisons

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC)

Chair Eadie reported that GEAC would continue examining STATWAY and the discussed quantitative reasoning resolution.

Ethnic Studies Task Force:

Senator Kessinger reported that the Ethnic Studies Task Force has completed a draft report on the state of Ethnic Studies in the CSU system. This draft report has been shared with the ASCSU and senator and faculty colleague comments and feedback is requested on the draft. The original May 22, 2015 deadline has been extended to September 30, 2015 to ensure that faculty are able to offer input after summer.

Math Council:

The ASCSU will hear a report at a future plenary.

Early Start:

The ASCSU will hear a report at a future plenary.

Harold Goldwhite - ERFA Liaison Report

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

Jennifer Eagan – CFA Liaison Report

CFA President Jennifer Eagan (EB) reported that the bargaining reopener for 2015-16 has begun and the California Faculty Association (CFA) and California State University (CSU) are at an impasse. The CSU bargaining team refused to move from their 2% proposal and the CFA proposal of 5% General Salary Increase (GSI) for all faculty and 2.65% Service Salary Increase (SSI) for eligible faculty was rejected. Campus based equity programs were assumed to have been substantial by the CSU; however, several campuses are still waiting for program implementation. How these small increases are substantial remains a question in need of explanation, especially given the reality that most lecturer faculty, librarians, and coaches are excluded. President Eagan further suggested that campus-based equity money should be considered in negotiations, as increases for promotion seem to have been included in campus-based equity solutions. There is an indication that the Chancellor's Office will conduct a salary

study. September 18, 2015 will be the next mediation meeting. Central in the negotiation process is faculty lived experiences, work environment facts, and trend analyses. Strike vote authorization will be considered in event that the statutory does not yield an agreement. November 17, 2015 will be a time to prepare for action. Faculty salaries are connected to the experiences of CSU students and the degradation of our profession. Faculty colleagues were encouraged to be present at the Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting.

Timothy White – CSU Chancellor

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

The following concerns and questions were raised:

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

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

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

Response: This is a campus management decision.

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

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

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

Response: It is important to find the best president for the campus. Candidates – 80% of the time – will not enter into an open search. If candidates were amenable to the practices, then this could become practice.

Question: Dr. Susan Martin is appreciated, the longest interim service is a year and half, and one of the common concerns is where money is being spent (i.e., athletics, misspending, structural deficit, etc.).

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

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

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

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

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

Juan Cervantes - CSSA Liaison Report

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

Lou Monville – CSU Alumni Trustee Alumni

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

The following concerns and questions were raised:

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

Response: The goal is to leave the institution better than it was found. It is important to celebrate the additions to the budget and not criticize them. Sacramento is communicating where their priorities rest. Discussion of enhanced support will hopefully continue.

Question: What is the role of the BoT in the appointment of interim presidents?

Response: The BoT signs off on the appointments.

Question: Does the BoT understand the lived experiences of faculty on the campuses? What do you see as assisting in building of this connection in the future?

Response: Colleagues are encouraged to visit campuses. Trustees are encouraged to interact with the ASCSU. The first welcome letter – with explanations of functions - should be sent from the ASCSU. Welcoming and inviting the Trustees will strengthen collegiality.

Question: In the area of proposed support budget, it seems like the report is preliminary and it is disappointing. Is it possible that the 3:2:2 can be amended so that it recognizes that no increases were made and a 9.3% furlough was put into place? Can this be conveyed to the governor and how can it be done?

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

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

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

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

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

Dia Poole – Alumni Council Liaison Report

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

Back to College Night. The CSU has always had a large turnout and this is an incredible networking opportunity for alumni.

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

The plenary heard a report from Executive Vice Chancellor Relyea. Central in this report was an explanation of the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force background and report. His report began with a brief history of the task force (i.e., the Task Force was created in October 2014 with the goal of examining the internal budget model and how it relates to Sacramento funding practices, including changing relations with Sacramento overtime, the impact these relations have had on increased demand for entry into the CSU, and limitations in system-wide ability to accommodate students and ensure their success). What Task Force realized is that these will be ongoing problems that must be addressed. These problems lend to the inability within the system to deal with campus need (i.e., deferred maintenance, facilities, infrastructure needs, etc.). Therefore, the following central question arises: how do we continue to provide a high quality education at the lowest possible cost? An additional charge to the task force was an examination of smaller campuses and their financial health. The rationale behind this addition was that larger campuses could programmatic and facilities projects that the smaller campuses cannot, as smaller campuses do not have the same basic support structures as larger campuses. Vice Chancellor Relyea further suggested that the report revealed that a major goal should be to move away from a model of tuition adjustments that are unplanned, including huge spikes during financial downturns, so that when a crisis occurs, excessive reaction is not the response.

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

Resources Allocation: The Task Force found that existing resource allocation processes were not transparent, understandable, or consistent. Central in the discussion was the assertion that the CSU debt capacity must be managed strategically and cannot continue to ignore that the state will not be providing adequate funding for new academic facilities, infrastructure, and critical deferred maintenance. The goal will be to develop a resource allocation process that adjusts for more than just enrollment changes. Likewise, the allocation methodology must have a component to address the reality that smaller campuses don't have the critical mass to cover the support structure that some bigger campuses have by virtue of their size. Since the state

has said that the university system is “on your own” with regard to capital facility investment, funds have to be generated through targeted reserves. The university may, if all else fails, consider a dedicated facilities fee to fund new academic buildings, classrooms, and other critical campus needs. Deferred maintenance concerns need to be addressed by these strategies as well.

Financial Effectiveness: There are challenges to the university operating effectively within the current regulatory and statutory environments. Compliance is important, but old non-value added regulations get in the way of campuses being effective in the management of their programs and their resources. Our current Human Resources system need to be more fully implemented, and consolidated into a single instance, to effectively manage the resources of the institutions. For some campuses, if given new resources, does it may make sense to consider going to year-round operations? This was a questions thoroughly considered. The big issue raised was that there must also be an investment of resources by the state wedded with this practice. The traditional facilities model could continue to work for some projects; however, it needs supplementation with public-private partnerships. Procurement has been strategic; however, there needs to be more done. Better partnering could be done with UC, etc. to drive down costs. While there have been effective initiatives in CSU to reduce energy consumption, we need to continue to explore new ideas. Half of the campuses have broken away from utility providers, utilizing direct-access to energy, and will save \$35 million over the next five years. Consolidation of the data network infrastructure and intersegmental collaborations with UC and community colleges can also be enhanced. Healthcare cost and retirement cost continue to increase, having a growing impact on resources that can be used for other important items. Since retirement costs will now the responsibility of the CSU, this will be an ongoing concern. This increase will also eat into the CSU and campus abilities to support academic programs. The feasibility of some campuses to consider year-round operations and public private and public and additional public partnerships needs exploration. How can the university leverage the resources it has along with those in the private sector to increase the quality of the education we offer to our students?

Financial Aid: The state grant program has more than doubled in 7 years, and but has evolved from a true grant program to a program that discounts tuition. It has also become difficult to administer. Therefore, we may want to call it something more accurate, and explore ways of obtaining other funding sources to supplement financial aid for students.

Revenue: Currently, there is between a 0.6% and 0.7% return on our operating balances and reserves for capital projects. Most universities have mechanisms to invest such balances in conservative, balanced asset allocations so the inflation doesn't eat away at their resources. CSU is exploring the possibility of changing the statute to allow CSU to have this tool for a portion of its reserves as well. Philanthropy is uneven on campuses, and the task force felt that CSU might be under-investing in developing our relationships with alumni and potential donors. Tuition increases over the past two decades has been sporadic, with unplanned huge increases from time to time, and the task force believes that we should consider smaller, planned increases over time. Non-resident tuition needs examination. A central question that arises is as follows: how do we look at non-California residents and have their tuition reflect the market? Can we use market-based non-resident tuition as a way to enhance the quality of education for California residents?

Student Access: With more qualified students being turned away, student access needs to be of central importance in financial discussions. Not all incoming students will be equally prepared for college and this should also be an area of examination. Work with k-12 to find intersegmental approach to these problems must continue. There are different practices in terms of what can be done. Enhancing student retention and progress to degree needs to be a continued focus, and we need to find new ways to more easily re-direct applicants to campuses that have capacity.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

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

Response: We must act proactively to make our best case to communicate the importance of the State continuing to invest in the University. The report must be balanced, continuing our work with the State, but also putting the university to better weather the downturns in tax revenues. The best investment of state dollars is in the CSU, because our graduates will keep California competitive. Careful cultivation of alumni relationships can result in an increase of scholarships, etc.

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

Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs

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

close attention to how the work of the faculty leads to student success. The following concerns and questions were raised and answered:

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

Response: Assessment of why faculty exit is being conducted. Is this outside of retirement? If this is that they are not meeting tenure criteria, then the question becomes how do we ensure that they are supported to get them to tenure. It is important to stay focused on the kinds of needs that we have and work with the legislature so that they understand why continued investment is important to fulfill our commitment to faculty.

During the BoT meeting next week, there is a discussion of turnover within the system. It is important to understand why faculty is leaving before they receive tenure. It is important to look at the Outstanding Faculty Website.

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

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

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

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

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

activist scholarship be unfairly impacted? How might this deter activist scholars from applying to our system? Is it possible to modify the policy?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Committee Recommendations

Action Items:

Support for SB 707 (Wolk): Gun-Free School Zone
Approved Unanimously

AS-3222-15/FGA
First Reading/ Waiver

Support for SB 172 (Liu) Pupil Testing: High School Exit Examination: Suspension
Waiver
Approved Unanimously

AS-3224-15/FGA
First Reading/

Commendation for Beverly L. Young
Approved By Acclamation

AS-3226-15/FGA
First Reading/ Waiver

Establishing a Task Force on the Requirements of CSU General Education (GE) Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (B4)
Approved Unanimously

AS-3230-15/FGA
First Reading/Waiver

On the California High School Exit Examination
Approved Unanimously

AS-3232-15/APEP
First Reading/Waiver

First Reading Items:

Call for a Suspension of CSU Background Check Policy (HR- 2015-08)

AS-3223-15/FGA
First Reading/ Waiver

Response to Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Draft Report
Withdrawn

AS-3225-15/FGA
First Reading/ Waiver

Task Force on General Education (GE) Quantitative Reasoning Requirement (Area B4)
Withdrawn

AS-3227-15/FGA
First Reading/ Waiver

Addition of a Retired Faculty Member to the CSU Board of Trustees

AS-3228-15/FGA
First Reading/Waiver

California State University 2016-17 Support Budget Preliminary Plan

AS-3229-15/FGA
First Reading/ Waiver

Commendation for Associate Vice Chancellor Ron Vogel

AS-3231-15/FGA
First Reading/ Waiver

Adjournment

Plenary adjourned at 12:00p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary