

*Minutes*  
Office of the Chancellor  
September 15-16, 2016

**Thursday, September 15, 2016 - 8:00 a.m. TO 5:00 p.m. — Dumke Auditorium**

**Thursday, September 15, 2016 - 9:00 a.m. TO 10:00 a.m.**

*Election of the CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee — Dumke Auditorium*

*Senate Social – Executive Committee Hosting*

*5:15 p.m. to 6:45 p.m., — Munitz Lobby*

**Friday, September 16, 2016 - 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium**

**Call to Order**

With 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 (Benvides, Schlievert); Fullerton (Bruschke, Hoven Stohs, Meyer); Humboldt (Creadon, Eschker); Long Beach (Hood, Klink, Soni); Los Angeles (Baaske, Bodinger-deUriarte); Maritime (Browne, Trevisan); Monterey Bay (Davis, Nishita); Northridge (Chong, Schutte, Swenson); Pomona (Speak, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Groen (SUB), Steffel (Absent), Ullman); San Diego (Butler-Byrd, Eadie, Ornatowski); San Francisco (Collins, Ritter (Absent), Yee-Melichar); San Jose (Lee, Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Foroohar, LoCasio); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Reeder); Stanislaus (Filling, Strahm); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack).

**Guests:** Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor – Academic and Student Affairs; Kathleen Chavira, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Advocacy and State Relations; CSSA Liaison; Jennifer Eagan, CFA Liaison; Harold Goldwhite, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA) Liaison; Maulana Karenga, Africana Studies, CSU Long Beach; Michael Ratcliffe, CSSA Liaison; Steven Stepanek, CSU Faculty Trustee; Craig Stone, American Indian Studies, CSU Long Beach; John Wenzler, Chair of the Council of Library Directors [COLD]; Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor.

**Approval of Agenda**

The Agenda was approved.

### **Approval of May 19-20, 2016 minutes**

The minutes were approved.

### **Announcements**

Chair Miller announced that the practice of having senators make announcements on campus concerns would continue. The senator for San Bernardino announced that a new Provost has been hired; however, campus climate remains unchanged. The senator from Chico announced that a new president had been hired and the CFO has been lost. The campus senate has been crafting new avenues for shared governance and working through the challenges of getting used to a new administrator. This will be a process and the faculty is content. The senator from Humboldt announced that the campus senate was concerned about their Intellectual Property policy. The campus took a year to work on the policy and main points had much support. As a result, an agreement was hammered out and consensus seemed to have been reached. The new policy passed the senate but was returned in the fall from the campus president without signature. Legal council from the Chancellor's Office (CO) told the president not to sign, as the system was working on a policy. The campus has an existing policy. Does the current policy hold?

Further announcements included, the senator from San Marcos announcing that WASC reaffirmed their accreditation for ten years. The Senator from Stanislaus announced that their new president has adopted a new approach of engaging with the academic senate. Three vice presidents have departed. The California Faculty Association (CFA) has been consulted for new ideas on how to improve the campus community. National Public Radio (NPR) ranked Stanislaus #5 behind Harvard, MIT, UCLA, Stanford, and Irvine. Also Stanislaus was ranked #5 "Best bang for your buck". The senator from East Bay announced that they welcomed a new provost and the provost attended a full day retreat with the senate. Senator Fleming received the Sue Schafer Service Award for her long dedicated service to the campus and system-wide. The Senator from Sonoma announced that the campus welcomed a new president. Transparency has been a benefit and best practice of the new president and the faculty is looking forward to the new relationship. The senator from San Jose announced that the faculty welcomed a new president. The new president seems to have embraced the social justice culture of the campus and seeks to enable success. SJSU is seen as the Silicon Valley's public university and she seeks to embrace this notion. The senator from San Diego announced that a ten year accreditation had been received. Two suggested revisions to the curriculum were to look at General Education (GE) and rationalize the program. SDSU will form a task force to examine the GE curriculum and the team seeks advice for best practices. The Senator from San Francisco announced that Provost Rosser would serve as a consultant to the CO. Lastly, the senator from Channel Islands announced that Erica Beck has been welcomed.

### **Presentations/ Introductions**

Senator Ullman introduced Mark Groen as the substitute for Senator Steffel. Senator Hoven Stohs introduced Senator Meyer and Senator Bruske. Senator Fleming introduced Senator

Karplus as the substitute for Senator Gubernat. He is the first lecturer faculty member to serve as academic senate chair on their campus. Vice-Chair Nelson introduced Senator Reeder as the new senator from Sonoma.

## **Reports**

### ***Christine Miller, Chair***

ASCSU Chair Miller reported that it had been her privilege to represent the Academic Senate of the California State University since June 1, 2016. Chair Miller offered the following listing of her activities followed by summary and commentary on key issues that arose during that time.

## Meetings and Activities

### **May**

- Board of Trustees meeting

### **June**

- Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates meeting in Oakland
- Academic Council meeting at the Maritime Academy
- California State Student Association (CSSA) meeting in Monterey Bay
- Meetings with AVC Chris Mallon, Christian Osmena (Department of Finance Principal Budget Analyst), and Lark Park (Governor Brown's Senior Advisor for Policy)
- Graduation Initiative 2025 Advisory Committee in Long Beach
- Food and Housing Insecurity Conference in Long Beach
- ASCSU Executive Committee via Zoom
- Intersegmental Coordinating Committee in Sacramento

### **July**

- Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report meeting with EVC Blanchard in Long Beach
- ASCSU Executive Committee via Zoom
- Graduation Initiative 2025 Advisory Committee in Long Beach, twice
- Institute for Teaching and Learning Summer institute in Long Beach
- CSSA meeting in Long Beach
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Summer Institute in Portland, Oregon
- ASCSU Executive Committee retreat in Sacramento

### **August**

- Tenure Density Task Force faculty representatives via Zoom
- Academic Council via Zoom
- Provost Onboarding via Zoom
- California Faculty Association (CFA) Board of Directors meeting in Sacramento
- CSSA in San Bernardino
- Graduation Initiative 2025 Symposium Proposal Review meeting via Zoom

- Joint Leadership Retreat in Long Beach (ASCSU, Chancellor and Cabinet, CSSA, Trustees)
- Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee in Long Beach
- Alumni Council in Northridge
- Graduation Initiative 2025 Task Force via Zoom

### **September**

- Chico Campus Senate
- Elle Hoxworth (Legislative Assistant for Assembly Member Holden) in Sacramento
- Sacramento Campus Senate
- Jeanice Warden (Principal Consultant for the Assembly Committee on Higher Education) in Sacramento
- EVC Blanchard

### **Upcoming**, prior to next plenary session

- 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.
- Academic Council meeting in Long Beach
- Hearings on faculty diversity in San Jose
- San Bernardino Campus Senate
- Sonoma Campus Senate
- CFA Board of Director's meeting in Millbrae
- Agenda Setting meeting with Chancellor White in Long Beach
- Stanislaus Campus Senate
- Campus Senate Chair's meeting in Long Beach
- Fresno Campus Senate
- Channel Islands Campus Senate
- Cal Poly Pomona Campus Senate
- Bakersfield Campus Senate

### **Key Issues**

#### ***Graduation Initiative 2025 and Symposium***

Chair Miller also reported that having nearly met or surpassed the goals of its first Graduation Initiative, in June the CSU embarked on a new effort to set goals and strategies for improving 4- and 6-year graduation rates for native students and 2- and 4-year rates for transfer students.

Senators Ullman, Van Selst and she served on the Advisory Committee for this effort, along with 3 students, and two each of the following constituencies: trustees, presidents, provosts, vice presidents of student affairs, and assistant vice presidents for institutional research.

At its first two meetings, the group discussed research presented by Hans Johnson (Director of the Public Policy Institute of California's Higher Education Center) and Lande Ajose (Executive Director of California Competes), then began the process of reviewing methodology for benchmarking of campus and system graduation rates based upon comparison to other institutions. Refining the benchmarking process extended into the third meeting as well, because it is on the basis of comparison institutions that campus and system goals are established. Therefore, multiple methods were considered during the Advisory Committee's extensive deliberations regarding benchmarking.

The time frame for accomplishing the task of recalibrating the Graduation Initiative to set stretch goals to 2025 was ambitious, and rendered more urgent by a provision in the state budget requiring a system plan and campus plans for improving graduation rates to be adopted by the Board of Trustees and submitted to the Department of Finance by September 30, 2016. If this deadline is met, the CSU will receive an augmentation to this year's budget of \$35,000,000.

It is important to note that the \$35,000,000 is a one-time allocation, not an increase to the base budget of the CSU. At each Graduation Initiative Advisory Committee meeting, participants emphasized that one-time funding will *not* improve graduation rates over the long run. It will take additional resources, and lots of them, to have the sustained impact necessary to achieve the recalibrated graduation targets for the campuses and the system. Resources are particularly important when it comes to targeting specific groups, i.e., underrepresented, low-income and first-generation students, all of whom are referenced in the budget bill.

At the final meeting of the Advisory Committee, Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard presented for the group's consideration and feedback a set of recommendations that are to be presented to the Board of Trustees. Chair Miller further reported that she frankly lost track of how many times the goals were called "audacious," and would have to agree with that label. EVC Blanchard will be discussing the 2025 Graduation Initiative with the ASCSU, so more information about the entire effort will be presented at that time. She also encouraged senators to watch the Board of Trustees meeting next week when even more detail will be presented.

After the Board meeting, a Graduation Initiative Symposium will take place wherein several campuses will showcase exemplars of student success efforts. These exemplars were chosen not because they represent "boutique" programs influencing small numbers of students, but because they have (or can have, with adequate resources) an impact at an all-campus level. The presenters will highlight data to show the success and fidelity of their approach, and those from other campuses can assess whether a similar approach could work for the students on their campus. Senators Van Selst, Ullman and Chair Miller, along with the ASCSU Executive Committee, will attend this Symposium.

### **General Education**

Chair Miller further reported that the past few weeks have been eventful on the GE front. First, she learned of questions raised at high levels about GE requirements, which were confusing on a particular campus. The campus worked to resolve the situation, but in the

meantime, Chancellor White requested a systemwide survey of GE requirements, which resulted in Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-19: *General Education Requirements Survey*. 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 get a baseline understanding of GE curricula in the CSU. The survey, it was explained, will allow the Chancellor to see similarities and differences across campuses (e.g., some campuses are "being more innovative"), and therefore to understand *why* the curricula look different. She was told concerns have also been raised about the size of GE programs, upper division GE, assessment of GE curricula, clarity of requirements listed on websites, and other issues as well. Clearly, the conversations about GE in various quarters have been robust, and thus it is hoped that the survey can provide data to the Chancellor on these and other matters related to general education.

Chair Miller also believes that just as the survey can provide data to the Chancellor, so, too, can it provide data to the faculty. General Education is a set of curricula, and curricula are the purview of the faculty. Asking a campus senate chair to sign a spreadsheet certifying that the information on a survey is accurate is an administrative act, it is not the involvement of faculty in curricular review, nor is it shared governance just because the provost also signs the same piece of paper. Chair Miller confessed disappointment that neither ASCSU nor GEAC partnered with the Chancellor's Office on this survey when it was initiated, but at the Joint Leadership Retreat in August, the Executive Committee was assured by EVC Blanchard that ASCSU would be supplied with the raw campus data and would be involved if the results of the survey yield information worthy of follow-up. Moreover, in a conversation she had with EVC Blanchard late in the afternoon on September 13, 2016, he reinforced his pledge that the information from the survey would be shared, and discussed faculty taking the lead on analysis of the data and potential recommendations that might result. On behalf of faculty, Chair Miller looks forward to receiving this data, and pledged that the faculty stands ready at any time to engage curricular inquiries.

Last month Chair Miller found out that there were curricular inquiries about GE on the legislative front too, but discovered it only after the fact. Unbeknownst to ASCSU, *Assembly Concurrent Resolution Number 158—Relative to public postsecondary education (Holden)* raised questions about general education and transfer. In response, Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-18 (*Clarification of Policies on General Education Transfer*) was issued by EVC Blanchard, asking campuses to ensure that all CSU policies related to GE and transfer are being followed. In the meantime, Steven Filling, Tom Krabacher and Chair Miller have had discussions with folks in Sacramento about ACR 158, and the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee likely will have more to say about it at this plenary meeting. Again, whether the inquiries come from legislators or others, faculty welcome the opportunity to discuss our curricula, how it meets the needs of our students and the citizenry, and how we endeavor to ensure it attains the highest quality possible.

## **Task Forces**

*Quantitative Reasoning*. Also discussed by Chair Miller was the work of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force, which concluded its deliberations over the summer in the spirit of true

shared governance. The Task Force came about as a result of a resolution from the statewide Senate and it's been chaired by Drs. Filling and Stevenson and drafted by members of the ASCSU. The outcome is that the Task Force reached agreement on four recommendations: 1) the need for an updated definition of quantitative reasoning, 2) the need to revise quantitative reasoning requirements in the CSU, 3) the need to adopt policies that advance quantitative reasoning skills, and 4) the need to create a CSU Center for Math Instruction. The overall purpose of the Task Force was to promote excellence in math education, and ASCSU will be asked to take action on the Final Report when the Executive Committee introduces a resolution on the matter this week. In addition, the CSU Math Council will consider the report at its meeting next month. GEAC discussed the report at its September meeting today, and the outcome of their discussion will be revealed when Chair Mary Ann Creadon presents her report at the plenary meeting.

*Tenure Density.* On this subject, Chair Miller had hoped that meetings of this task force could commence over the summer, but the non-faculty membership was not finalized until recently. However, in August the ASCSU and CFA faculty representatives met virtually to discuss the charge and the data required to fulfill it. The first meeting of the task force will take place next Monday (September 19, 2016). In addition, a legislative hearing on faculty diversity is slated to take place on October 6, 2016 at San Jose State University, and faculty representing ASCSU as well as CFA will participate.

*Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property.* Using the same model of engaging in discussion as was navigated with the Tenure Density Task Force, CFA Chair Jennifer Eagan and Chair Miller proposed to EVC Blanchard that three faculty members each from ASCSU and CFA join with the Chancellor's Office to discuss drafts of policy revisions that have been generated on both academic freedom and intellectual property. EVC Blanchard noted today (September 13, 2016) that he could not honor the request for an academic freedom task force until CFA agrees that such discussions would satisfy bargaining obligations. Additionally, he indicated that recommended policy changes on intellectual property aren't ready for review, but should be in a few months. Academic freedom and intellectual property policies will remain a focal point of faculty interest, and until such time as systemwide discussion of these issues is possible, it seems reasonable to presume that campus discussions and actions will not be impeded, even if such discussions and actions will need to be revisited once systemwide efforts conclude.

### **Academic Conference**

Late last week, Chair Miller was informed that the venue for the Academic Conference (scheduled for February 9-10) must change. The Conference Planning Team is discussing how to adjust to these circumstances, and further information will be provided during our plenary meeting. Despite this challenge, she was gratified that the event continues to be supported by Chancellor White and his staff, both in word and in deed.

### **ASCSU Priorities and Theme**

Each of the chairs of ASCSU's standing committees, along with the Executive Committee, established priorities to guide their efforts during this academic year. Those

priorities were shared at the Joint Leadership Retreat mentioned above, and Chair Miller believes each of the committee chairs have also shared them with their committee, or will do so tomorrow. For its part, the Executive Committee articulated the following:

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the California State University seeks to promote academic quality in the CSU by strengthening:

- Shared governance
- Faculty advocacy and governmental relations
- The ASCSU relationship with campus senates

In addition, the Executive Committee, after consultation with the chairs of the standing committees, established the following as a theme to guide the Academic Senate this year: “Finding the Balance.” This theme recognizes the need to examine competing demands within the academy and tradeoffs that occur when one set of interests eclipses others. It also features the assumption of agency by the ASCSU, which puts us in a proactive rather than a reactive posture. Chair Miller also stated that she looks forward to seeing how this Senate, each of the committees, and indeed each of the senators engages this theme as the academic year progresses.

Chair Miller briefly discussed the ExCom business. Central in this discussion were the following points:

- a. Attending the state council meeting of ERFA between now and the next plenary.
- b. Visiting SDSU, Cal Poly SLO, and Humboldt State.
- c. Having lunch with Chico State’s academic senate and extending the invitation for campus visit to all senators for a campus visit and regularly see the agenda of the Executive Committee on the Academic Senate webpage.
- d. New Senator Orientation
- e. Appointments to Student Response Systems or Clickers and attendees to the legislative hearings on faculty diversity.
- f. Potential invitees to the Nov. plenary.
- g. The ASCSU budget.
- h. Work performed on the QRTF.
- i. Preparations for the upcoming ICAS meeting next Friday and discussion of the following big ticket items: GE, Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property.
- j. Meetings with EVC Blanchard .
- k. The Faculty-to-Faculty newsletter.
- l. Discussions of Intellectual Property and the Tenure Density Task Force.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Is it possible to collaborate with the CO on the drafting of the current Academic Senate policy?

2. For many years, local senates have been drafting policies on Academic Freedom. What is the difference between CFA and local purviews? Why is the CFA not being asked to waive their rights to bargaining?
3. Has the CO ever explained why they see the ASCSU is being separate from the California State University (CSU)? Why are we being treated as an alternative bargaining group? The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) does not sit outside of the CSU?
4. It is important not to force a senator to defend the position of the administration. There is a fear that what is said in a meeting between the ASCSU and CFA may be used during bargaining.
5. It is not the case that the administration sees the ASCSU as separate from the CSU. Higher Education Employer- Employee Relations Act (HEERA) and shared governance are behind the reasoning for the approach being taken by the CO. It is important to know that working conditions – like Intellectual Property - fall within the scope of Collective Bargaining.
6. It is important to reinforce that Chair Miller pressed very hard on the Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property issues. It is important to pay attention to the General Council's influence over academic matters. It is also important to pay attention to the potential “divide and conquer” image that current practices suggest.
7. During last year's senate, it was discussed that past precedent ensured regular meetings between the Executive Committee and Chancellor White. Will these meetings continue?
8. Chair Filling and Chancellor White have collaborated to ensure that face time will occur every month between the Executive Committee and the Chancellor. These meetings will focus on actions such as agenda setting, finding common ground, etc.
9. Is it possible to give senators a heads-up on two or three items that will be of concern for campus senates?
10. On the subject of tenure density, the 20:1 ration is now 50:1 and graduate students are teaching foundation courses. We are on a steady decline. Small GE classes only make sense if they are perceived as important. Classes that are three hundred students in size classes are not given the same concern. It is important to fix SUGS. The education committee is not the place to go. There is a representative on the committee that went to CSU. It seems that this committee is more concerned with K-12. It is important to fully fund the university.
11. Are faculty really precluded from serving on committees formed by the CO? It is important to have faculty members on committees during the creation of policy.
12. The senate should be involved in the discussion; however, the debate is about when that involvement should begin. All three (i.e., ASCSU, CFA, and CO) have to agree to sit at the table. There is no policy that will be implemented without further consultation. Academic Freedom is at the heart of the university (i.e., inquiry, teaching and learning, etc.).
13. It is important to understand the preamble of the current bargaining agreement.

14. It seems that one of the problems we have is that we confuse two different issues: the policy of academic freedom and negotiation of academic freedom. Is it possible to talk about the principle of academic freedom?
15. When will the policy be finished so that members of the university can examine it?
16. It is important to examine this culture of risk-management as a barrier to moving forward.
17. Humboldt: Our campus president may have underestimated how long the policy would take. Our faculty does not believe that we have a policy in place. Why can't we use the interim policy before the CO decides to do something?
18. Reflecting on what makes organizations great, it might be important for the Executive Committee to send a copy of teamwork-based best practices forward. It seems that the current administration is splitting the people into us versus them. Can we meet as the ASCSU and CO, and CFA and CO, except in different rooms?
19. It is important to pay attention to the power play and bargaining ploys at issue. We can have an interim policy and no one has to give up bargaining rights. The fundamental principle of the academy is academic freedom.
20. Is it possible to engage in the work of producing what we think would be an Academic Freedom policy and Intellectual Property policy which will express our concerns?

### ***Standing Committees***

*Academic Affairs (AA)* AA Chair Ullman reported that the committee discussed First Reading Resolutions on "Grading in the Golden 4" and "Establishment of an ASCSU Faculty Workgroup to Study General Education". AA is interested in feedback on both. Chair Ullman also reported that AA met with AVC Mallon to discuss EO 1071, IPEDS and possible consequences. The committee will compile feedback and discuss it with Chair Miller. Lastly, Chair Ullman reported that Pat O'Rourke met with AA and engaged in discussion of veterans received credit for prior work. AA will continue to make "finding the balance" a committee goal.

*Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)* APEP Chair Fleming reported that the committee would bring forward two resolutions: "Implementation of Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Items Previously Approve by the Academic Senate CSU" and "Endorsement of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations". Chair Fleming also reported that APEP met with Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, Carolina Cardenas, AVC Eric Forbes, Director Ken O'Donnell, and James Minor, CSU Senior Strategist for Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence, and AVC Ed Sullivan. Central in this meeting were discussions of what collaborations, interactions with constituencies, and implementation will look like. Subject matter for credentialing was also discussed. Lastly, Chair Fleming reported that the avenue for the course work waiver program has been restored and new standards will be forthcoming. Candidates had a five year window to move forward; however, this has been extended to 10 years.

*Faculty Affairs (FA)* FA Chair Norman reported that the committee accomplished the “Commendation for Lori Lamb – Vice Chancellor, Human Resources” for her service to the CSU. Chair Norman also reported that FA would be exploring alternative job descriptions for lecturers, and academic freedom as it related to slander and libel. FA also met with AVC Van Cleve and discussed Academic Freedom, tenure density, and ongoing concerns regarding the Background Check Policy.

*Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA)* FGA Chair Soni reported that the committee welcomed two new members and met with AVC Ed Sullivan from the CO. Finding the balance was a guiding principle behind the work engaged by the committee. FGA discussed the pros and cons of local vs. statewide advocacy efforts and decided that both practices should be engaged this year. Chair Soni also reported that the committee discussed the nature of local advocacy and FGA members will take the initiative on their campuses. Presidents of ASI, senate chairs, and campus advocates will be consulted. This will occur after the elections have been held. Senator Swartz volunteered to develop an action plan. Lastly, Chair Soni reported that FGA also discussed tenure density, online education, and short term and long term goals. AVC of Budget, Ryan Storm, offered a report on the budget request for 2017-18.

*General Education Advisory Council (GEAC)* GEAC Chair Creadon reported that the committee discussed the report from AVC Mallon on coded memos, response to ACR 158, and the streamlining of GE transfer. There have been requests of campus presidents to facilitate the process. The coded memo came with a response to Andrew Martinez, Senior Legislative Advocate, explaining why there are few or no problems with GE transfer. Chair Creadon also reported that GEAC heard a report from Kate Stevenson of the QRTF and discussed the use of “C” as the minimum grade in the Golden Four. A report on online oral communications course and upper division GE and expectations of and for it will be forthcoming.

### ***Academic Conference Planning Team***

Chair Soni reported on the history of the conferences and the current speaker search. Two speakers, Diane Ravitch, known for work on student success, and Tia Brown, known for work on closing the achievement gaps, have been selected as potential keynotes. The venue has been changed from CSU Maritime to CSU Sacramento. The committee is working to finalize logistics. All of the BoT, Presidents, Provosts, etc., are invited and senators are expected to attend.

**Mental Health:** Senator Locasio said nasty letters to students with depression will be changed.

**CID Committee:** Senator Van Selst pulling intermediate requirement pulls the program from the CC. Changes in 1440 programs need to be voted on by the programs.

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

Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported on his activities since the May 2016 ASCSU Plenary. He had the privilege of participating in 18 commencement ceremonies at 9 distinct CSU sites during the months of May and June. He

attended commencements at CSU Long Beach, CSU Northridge, CSU Stanislaus, San José State University, CSU Bakersfield, CSU Los Angeles, Cal Poly Pomona, CSU San Bernardino, and the Palm Desert facility of CSU San Bernardino. On May 26, 2016 Faculty Trustee Stepanek performed a one-day trustee visit to Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, meeting with faculty leadership, student leadership and administration executives, and received an extensive tour of the campus' facilities. On June 3<sup>rd</sup>, Faculty Trustee Stepanek attended an Integrated Curriculum Intersegmental Discussion meeting called by Ken O'Donnell and hosted by Cal Poly Pomona. The participants came from both 2-year and 4-year higher education institutions to discuss meta-majors and integrated courses of study as part of the preparation for a grant proposal by the CSU that later received funding. The next meeting of interested parties was recently announced as a pre-event to the annual national meeting of the AAC&U in late January 2017. More information on this project can be found at: <http://calstate.edu/engage/integrated-courses.shtml>. Faculty Trustee also reported that he participated in ASCSU Executive Committee meetings and retreats on June 23, July 14, July 27 and August 22, 2016. On June 23, 2016, the Faculty Trustee attended the farewell dinner and concert at Sonoma State University honoring Dr. Armiñana upon his retirement as Sonoma's President. The Faculty Trustee also visited the TS Golden Bear during the ship's stop at the Port of Los Angeles. The Chancellor's Office is current arranging trustee visits for the fall period. It was recently confirmed that Trustee Jane Carney and Faculty Trustee Stepanek would visit CSU Sacramento on October 10, 2016 and visit San Diego State University on November 17, 2016. Lastly, Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported on the planning stages for potential fall visits to CSU East Bay and CSU Monterey Bay. On October 9, 2016, the Faculty Trustee would be attending the Fleet Day activities at CSU Maritime Academy and attending the CSU Graduation Initiative event in Long Beach at the close of the BoT. The Faculty Trustee reminded senators that the agenda for the September 20-21, 2016 Board of Trustees meeting can be viewed at: <http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/>. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. The term recession was used on campuses. Is this a term used by the Board of Trustees (BoT)?
2. It is important to remind your colleagues on the Board that happy employees are productive employees. It is important to ask for more money and develop a campaign for sustainable general education.
3. Would the discussion of the report by the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) be of interest to the BoT?
4. There needs to be an outreach effort to the BoT, the roles that it plays, and how it can address the needs of different campuses. This can be very educational for the BoT.
5. It seems that GE is being resituated as something not vital to student education. Any effort that you can make to address the integrity of GE would be helpful. It is important to resituate GE back to the important role that it plays in the education of our students.
6. Our own colleagues and advisors need to be informed also.
7. GE should be the avenue for engineering students learning how to write. The movement towards multiple choices exams is not sufficient. We don't have the faculty because we don't have the money. We don't have the money because we are missing \$750 million dollars due to SUGS. It is time to tell the truth and fix this issue.
8. It is vital to stress the importance of GE in making well-rounded engineers.
9. We appreciate diversity in many areas. The diversity of curriculum is to be celebrated and expected. Anything that you can do to encourage all to understand that the diversity of ideas is what makes a university a university would be greatly appreciated.
10. It is important for the BoT to take the time see what the faculty are doing in general education and recognize the talent. We need to help the trustees know that we need to

- celebrate the wonderful array of what we have in the state and let the faculty do their job. It is important to not jam students into the GE courses. Many course are way overloaded.
11. It is important to reach out to the Trustees and invite them to your campus. This will enable them to be educated about campus cultures. The Trustee Secretariat is currently scheduling campus visits. This is a great opportunity for the campus senate and president to reach out to the Trustees.
  12. Efficiency is not a dirty word. As a large system, we do not do much to take into consideration the commonalities we have. This discussion will enable the faculty to guard against micro-management.
  13. Trustee Eisen will be visiting our campus and GE will be under discussion.
  14. At our campus, where we have a 40% tenure density, Lecturers teach all of our GE courses. The tenured faculty must do curriculum development.
  15. Is it possible to change GE (General Education) to NE (Necessary Education). There must be a distinction made between training and education. We are in the education business. We must reconsider what we need to do to produce the students needed for the future of the State of California.
  16. It is important to look at who your most outstanding students are and read their bios. They usually are first generation students, they did not know their major, and may have even floundered. These stories must be shared.
  17. We are running out of classrooms for our courses. People are being encouraged to teach more online. The word efficiency is frightening, as it suggests the possibility of moving GE course online. It is important to stress that GE should not become an online endeavor.
  18. There are a lot of efficiencies that can be done in the system that we could address (i.e., buy software at bargain price, system wide application process, etc.). This must be conveyed to the Trustees and explained in terms of what students need and what they don't need.
  19. What is the Trustee's understanding of the one time \$35 million that may come to the CSU? What might happen if we do not meet the stated outcomes?
  20. A report will be given to the Department of Finance. This report will shape whether or not the CSU get the \$35million.
  21. These questions will be followed up on at a future meeting.
  22. It is important to understand why a program fails.
  23. It is important to understand whether or not students are ready to take an online course and have the necessary time management skills.
  24. K-12 is now offering more online courses. Do you think that this will enable students to be more prepared to take online courses?
  25. Much of these issues are course design issues. It is important to build in accountability in course design and scaffold courses to enable student success.
  26. Pedagogical concerns should guide the discussions of online education.
  27. It is important to use the Academic Conference as a platform for explaining educational issues to the BoT.
  28. It is important to extend an invitation to the BoT and stress the importance of their attendance at the Academic Conference.

29. Is it possible to have a member of GEAC attend the conference?
30. It is important to monitor the conflict between the BoT campus visits and plenary.
31. It is important to remind the BoT that when they visit campuses and there is an absence of faculty, this should be seen as a red flag.
32. It is crucial for campus senate chairs to stress the importance of visiting with the Trustees.

*Election of the CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee – Sepehr Sobhani of CSU Fullerton*

With a time certain reached, the ACSCU elected the CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee. As per ASCSU rules, the first elected member of the committee will serve as chair. The following senators were elected in order:

- Senator Soni (Cal State Long Beach), Chair
- Senator Chong (CSU Northridge)
- Senator Ornatowski (CSU San Diego)
- Senator Davis (CSU Monterey Bay)
- Senator Pasternack (CSU ERFA)

*Random Draw of 2 Campus to solicit for final two members*

The following campuses will be solicited for members: CSU East Bay and Cal Poly SLO.

*John Wenzler, Chair of the Council of Library Directors [COLD]*

Dr. Wenzler reported on what is COLD. Central in this report was a thank you to Senator Gubernat for her many years of service on the council and an explanation of the council's structure and meeting schedule (i.e., four times per year). The following stats were presented:

- a. 800, 000 visits to the libraries occur.
- b. 21 million full textbook leads are part of the collection.
- c. One million books are in circulation.
- d. Librarians perform 9300 Information Literacy visits.

Dr. Wenzler also reported that COLD Initiatives include the following:

- a. Creation of Electronic Core Collections
- b. Efficiency with the \$5,000,000 per year for purchases system-wide. Doing more with no increase in budget (i.e., maintaining JSTOR and MLA, etc.).
- c. System-wide library subscription license.
  - a. These are centrally negotiated but not centrally purchased.
  - b. CSU Libraries gain leverage with vendors by negotiating centrally.
  - c. Efforts save \$12million per year.
- d. Unified Library Management System (UMS)

- a. Move towards next generation digital platform.
- e. Scholar Works
  - a. Shared system for archiving digital campus resources.
  - b. Faculty publications.
  - c. Student theses.
  - d. Archives.
- f. Challenges.
  - a. Inflation occurred between 2007-2013, while the budget remains at \$5million (2006-2016).
  - b. Consequences of Lexis-Nexis
    - i. Cut from ECC in 2016
    - ii. Lexis-Nexus
    - iii. There will need to be additional removal of resources if the budget remains flat.
  - c. Wiley Online Journals
    - i. Publishes 2837 academic journals.
    - ii. Reduced access as a result of unsuccessful negotiation.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. How might COLD and ASCSU collaborate to achieve our common goals?
2. How do we continue the dialogue?
3. Is a resolution in support of a larger COLD budget necessary?
4. Is it possible to obtain a copy of the PowerPoint slides?
5. It is important to have to COLD Chair regularly visit the ASCSU.
6. The next Chair will be Dr. Curt Ascher of CSU Bakersfield.
7. You mentioned that the price of journals is skyrocketing, how has COLD dealt with Open Access Journals? A Resolution is being worked on in support of Open Access Journals.
8. From experience in working with my library, there seems to be an effort to reduce the numbers of books in house. What are your thoughts on this course of action?
9. Each campus “reads” the stacks at the own discretion.
10. Will COLD work with administrations of campuses to see which journals are important for tenure and promotion?
11. Just because a journal is Open Access does not mean that it is not peer-reviewed and this is important to remember for tenure and promotion.
12. Since we are asking for more RSCA funds, it makes no sense not to ask for more library funding.

13. It is important to revisit the Jan 2015 Resolution on Open Source materials.
14. It is important to keep open channels of communication.
15. Lexis-Nexis has been a real loss. Is it possible to get it back? How does COLD react to the research on the Internet and digital books not having an impact on reading comprehension?
16. As an RTP committee chair, I am concerned with predatory journals. How do faculty discern between the two?
17. It is not just predatory journals that charge a fee, it is also science journals that will ask for payment for publication fees. It is important to investigate the journals and stay aware of how faculty can consult with the librarians.

***Steven Filling, ASCSU Immediate Past Chair & Kate Stevenson: Quantitative Reasoning Task Force***

Immediate Past Chair Filling and Dr. Kate Stevenson of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) reported that the task force was driven by GEAC's review of the pilot for math instruction. Their findings suggested that not all students were treated the same. The guiding principle of the QRTF was that there must be balance in access and opportunities to achieve equity. The task force included representation from the ASCSU, Department of Education, California Community Colleges (CCC) Office of the President, etc. All agreed upon the importance of maintaining access and quality in math instruction. The task force also consulted outside the field of math, among several was the field of Criminal Justice. The task force recommendations included the following samples (See PowerPoint shared by Immediate Past Chair Filling and Dr. Stevenson for more details.):

Recommendation I: Students should be able to read, reason, use, and recognize the strengths and limitations of quantitative methods.

Recommendation II (Implementation): Intermediate Algebra as a pre-requisite must be questioned, as statistics, general math, etc. can be rich and valuable experiences.

Recommendation II A: It is important to move away from the pre-requisite language. Changing the nature of this discourse allowed for a move away from the language on intermediate algebra.

Recommendation IIB: it is important to define BA level quantitative reasoning, as students enabled to do the following:

- i. Develop and demonstrate a proficient ability to reason quantitatively.
- ii. Develop an understanding of quantitative reasoning in a range of disciplines.
- iii. Develop and understanding of quantitative reasoning in a specialized area.

Recommendation IIC: It is important for students to be proficient in K-9 math, including algebra and integrated math.

Recommendation III: It is important to address equity.

Recommendation IIIA: It is important to promote equity, access, and opportunity.

Recommendation IIIB: It is important to phase in overtime the four years of high school quantitative reasoning as per ASCSU AAS-3244-16/APEP. Central in this recommendation was the follow: How we can build a bridge and create deeper learning in high schools?

Recommendation IV: It is important to have a Center for Math Instruction.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. There are many interconnected parts. These four recommendations need to stand together.
- b. It is important to examine support structures.
- c. Is the access issue really about high schools not having four years of math?
- d. This is a crisis that affords us an opportunity. Access is related to the entry-level math. The CCC test to intermediate algebra.
- e. How do we help students?
- f. One way we are helping is that we are asking them to take the math that they need.
- g. We are not lowering the amount of math that students need to know. We are asking the following: What is the math that students need to know?
- h. It is important to understand that math has been a one size fits all. The range of math application is also important.
- i. It is important to pay attention to the rationales in IIIA.
- j. It is important to consider the ability to use quantitative reasoning to solve qualitative problems.
- k. It is important to also look at upper division general education. Did the Task Force come up with any ideas that are not in the report that can suggest what all students should take?
- l. Is this something that the ASCSU should take up?
- m. What did the opposition have to say about the report?
- n. Consensus was achieved on all recommendations. The Task Force works very hard and listened to everyone.
- o. There was disagreement around getting rid of a specific course.
- p. It is important to pay attention to preparation and underrepresented populations.

***Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor - Academic and Student Affairs Graduations Initiative 2025 (Time Certain: 1:00p.m. Thursday).***

Joined by Jeff Gold, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Success Strategic Initiatives, Ed Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research and Resources, and Leo Van Cleve, Assistant Vice Chancellor, International and off-Campus Programs, Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Blanchard and his team reported on the student success and faculty excellence initiatives and his plans to visit the campuses that he did not get to visit during his first year with CSU. EVC Blanchard introduced Dr. James Minor, Senior Strategist for Academic Success and Academic Excellence. Dr. Minor comes from Washington, D.C. and served as Deputy Secretary of Education for the Department of Education (DOE). EVC Blanchard also reported that our graduation rates in the CSU now stand higher than before. There has been work done by faculty in collaboration with staff and students to increase opportunities and the integrity of the degrees that enabled students to move into the work force. These continued efforts will enable students to become both leaders within their fields and communities. This year was a year of reflection. The CSU exceeded the actual goal that had been in place. The ultimate 2025 goal was 60% and we are over 50%. It was important to examine the CSU goal of eliminating all achievement gaps. It is equally important to not compromise quality. The graduation initiative advisory committee worked over the summer, campus plans were developed, and a vision was developed on how to move forward with long term plans. EVC Blanchard thanked Chair Miller, AA Chair Ullman, and Senator Van Selst for their candid input and service on the advisory committee, as they encouraged all to think about what is occurring on the ground.

***Jeff Gold, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Success Strategic Initiatives***

AVC Gold reported that the success of the students is on the backs of the faculty and discussed the current graduation rate of 57% and the achievement gaps. URM was defined as underrepresented minority (African American, Latino, and Native Americans). There is an 11% point gap for URM and 8% for all Pell eligible students. The CSU is at an all time high for graduation rates. Between 1995- 2000 there was real movement in graduation rates. Examining data from 2005, one finds that there is a flat line of 50%. Thereafter, progress can be seen. For transfer students, all groups have risen in 2,3,4 year rates. AVC Gold further reported that all populations by gender, ethnicity, Pell, etc. have made marked improvement. There was a cross-representative group, including student representation, which informed the committee. The guiding principles of the committee included the following audacious and ambitious points:

- a. Set goals high but based on reality.
- b. Sustain a high level of academic rigor.
- c. Provide access to opportunity.
- d. Meet our students where they are while and help them graduate in a timely manner.
- e. Understand that goals will require increased resources, intention and innovation, and a relentless focus on student success.

The philosophy also included an examination of data over time and how rates have changed. Where are similar – and dissimilar - institutions within and outside of California on their graduation initiatives? By the years 2025 and 2030, the State of California will need a million more degrees to meet the needs of the state and degree completion efforts should map to this

need. A chart was developed with student characteristics that showed what was done during their completion of degree, including the following:

- a. 30 or more units completed.
- b. High School GPA.
- c. College readiness.
- d. At least one parent with a baccalaureate.
- e. Not Pell Eligible.
- f. 4-year graduation.

The data revealed a 49% graduation rate among first-time time. The focus by the California government has been on the 4-year graduation rate; however, other data reveals what is necessary for BA completion. The first goal was to look at IPEDS data. Central in this examination was what do these data reveal: the need to look at campus data and aggregate up from the system perspective. College Results online data was customized. These data offered 4-year and 6-year graduation rate data for campuses. The algorithm looks at 12 data points: size, location, HSI, commute time, etc. This examination enabled an understanding that the 6-year rate is fine and the 4-year rate needs work. Actual numbers will be shared at next week's BoT meeting. 6-year rates were 65-70%, 4-year rates were 35-40%, transfer 4-year rates were 80-85%, and transfer 2-year rates were 40-45%.

What do these data mean? AVC Gold asserted that these data would position the CSU as the national flagship among peers and meets the state's need for baccalaureate degree graduates. How will we get there? The 4.5 year graduation rate is 27% and the 4-year graduate rate is 10%. 4, 157 students just miss this goal. Eight percentage points of improvement would change the rate. This demonstrated the intentionality of the initiative. Can we pay for their summer school, winter intersession, etc.? Another goal will be to become more strategic on advising. Math pathways, QRTE, etc., will be informative to CSU notions of student success. Lastly, AVC Gold reported that one issue that faculty needed to pay attention to was the major level information. The Student Success dashboard has been created to disaggregated data from the major level. AVC Gold discussed the new dashboard and the type of data revealed. Faculty can focus on upper division and lower division student data. The goal is to empower faculty to find the data for student success. Preplanning for 2025 has begun. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. It is important to understand that our students lead complex lives. The problems can be solved by providing more classes, improving tenure density, and providing students with financial resources. How are we to reconcile that fact that classes in winter are self-paid, rather than supported by financial aid? What are you doing to push back on the state to acquire these resources?
2. We see the two as working in tandem with one another and completely agree with your sentiments.

3. We must be careful to not use state support, summer school, and intercessions, etc., as excuses for not moving forward. It is important for us to work through these.
4. APEP has been looking for more data behind decisions and the work done this summer delivered.
5. Last week, there was a discussion of the spending of \$2.4 million. One suggestion that came up was having students in the winter and summer. Yet, summer is said not to count. Does the summer of 2020 count in the graduation rate? What is the consequence of spending the \$2.4 million and not achieving the outcome? What is the consequence of not spending the \$2.4 million?
6. It would not be wise to not spend the money that we are confident we will get. The short term – incentives for students – could set precedent for asking for more funding in the future.
7. We are also looking at 2025; we are working hard to ensure that the campuses achieve visible outcomes.
8. It is important to consider making the first four years of tuition free and charge students for every year staying past that. Yes, our cost increases, but we also have a greater budget. Only 19% of our student graduate in 4years. The state wants to tie funding to performance. When we do perform, why don't we ask the state to increase funding in support of our good performance? The legislature is expecting magic: they are cutting us and expecting us to do the job faster. Who are we as the university? Are we not the ones who should be giving the directions and not just received? We are the ones who educated the future businessmen? The impossible is being asked of us and we do not ask for better outcome for our students. Where is the long-term vision to turn this around for our students?
9. We have been working on sustained funding for our students. This includes getting the faculty and number of classes needed to ensure their success. It is important to look at the FTE costs. This recognizes that not all students come in on the same level or will meet the requirements in the same way. Looking at our comparators will enable us to have a base- line for funding requests and ask for funding to ensure student success and not have to build a case annually for more funding. This will also be a goal in preparing for 2017-18. It is important to remember how low tuition costs in California is compared to the rest of the country. Students may think that this low cost may not encourage a rush to complete a degree. Financial literacy needs to be built to ensure competence. The California Community College (CCC) tried two-year of free tuition, and the needle did not move.

10. It is important that lecturer retention is tied to good evaluations and evaluations are evident of teaching effectiveness. One way that student success achieved is through research, one way to enable this is to increase the library budget.

***CSU Chancellor Timothy P. White***

Chancellor White reported that the CO would meet with the BoT and present the graduation initiative. Of central discussion will be reductions in the graduation rates and a four-way partnership. The partnership will include the following: Sacramento, CSU (inclusive of all elements of the CSU community to ensure student success), K-14 system (inclusive of college preparedness), students and their families (inclusive of doing the work necessary for college). This collaboration will encourage all to up their game and ensure that we meet the needs of the State of California. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Is it possible to obtain help with reconciling our campus-based need for an Intellectual Property Policy and the campus president's lack of desire to sign the senate approved policy?
2. It is important to understand that Humboldt State is not alone. Many campuses have expressed a desire to change their Intellectual Property policy and are being told not to make changes or that a campus president would not sign the new document.
3. It is important to clarify the process of Academic Freedom. Has the CFA waived it's bargaining rights on local campuses and not statewide?
4. Chair Miller will be given information on these concerns.
5. When can we approximately expect a response on this matter?
6. If we implement changes in standards and do not include all of the supports necessary, then we may reduce the quantitative reasoning abilities of our students. Thank you and EVC Blanchard for your work on Quantitative Reasoning Task Force.
7. I am concerned about the notion that students need to take responsibility for their experiences. Significant portions of CSU students do not come from a background that prepares them for college. To what extent is this reflective of our students' experiences?
8. Our students are not one monolith. I fully concur. It is important to consider how to get all of our students through in a certain amount of time; however, we must meet students where they are. Encourage those that can and embrace those that can't. It is important to have students understand the problematic of entitlement. It is important to talk about shared responsibility in the State of California.

9. How does a higher graduation rate lead to more graduates? It is important to increase the total graduation rate.
10. It has to be a combination of both. We can add faculty, course sections, academic support, etc. Our share of the one million students will be about one-half million.
11. It is important to continue supporting faculty as we add them by having a robust support of research.
12. It is important that we not forget where we are in education. We must be grateful for faculty that can perform as they would at an R1. What should be respected are the high impact practices where students work with faculty on research. Such experiences enable students to learn how to manage ambiguity. It is important to celebrate this, as students can see new relationships. Tying our research to the graduation initiative is something that we can do better than the R1.
13. The legislature recognizes that joint decision-making is essential to the performing of the mission of universities. Currently, the CO team seems to have decided that faculty voices do not need to be heard when understanding certain academic matters. This is disturbing and current practice runs counter to Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). Why are we in this situation now that the CO team has decided that the senate voice is not respected?
14. A summary of where things stand will be given to Chair Miller.
15. On the graduation initiative, there have been very collaborative and robust conversations that can move us forward. As we move forward, three things will be very important: continued education and advocacy efforts, examination of evolving ways of doing business through collaboration, and we need to have courageous exploration into areas of disconnect. This will enable a redefinition of student supports.
16. Looking at new campus-based policies, they seem to run counter to the graduation initiatives. Faculty was told that students that can't meet their financial aid deadline would be disenrolled. Past precedent allows students to stay in the class. This will no longer be possible and will result in a "W" on the students' transcript. This will make it harder for them to graduate. Is it possible to examine the counter intuitive policies that run contrary to the graduation initiative?

***Kathleen Chavira, Assistant Vice-Chancellor of Advocacy and State Relations*** AVC Chavira reported on her bio and the role of the AVC for Advocacy and State Relations within the CSU.

Originally from Madera, CA, her experiences include working for the UC, CSU, and on K-12 education policy, particularly for English language learners. AVC Chavira has traveled throughout the CSU system and these experiences have inspired her advocacy role. On Sunday and Monday, AVC Chavira will visit CSU Channel Islands and a visit to the Cal Maritime Academy will follow. AVC Chavira reported that everyday is a learning opportunity. Her future presentation at the BoT will include discussion of legislation relevant to the CSU and ASCSU. The legislative session ended on August 31, 2016. The following of interest to the CSU:

- a. SB 1412 Block: Expanded the investment authority of the CSU for a potential higher return. These returns are ear marked for building construction and deferred maintenance, which was normally covered by bond measure.
- b. AB 2215: Small technical changes to the distribution of Lottery funds.
- c. AB 1747 (Weber): Addresses higher education food insecurity under CalFresh. The CO has issued a letter of support.
- d. AB 1359: Addresses required course material.
- e. AB 2317 (Mullon): CSU can offer a Doctorate of Audiology degree.
- f. SB 412 (Glazer): California Promise. This bill has not been signed and AVC Chavira is working with Academic Affairs to tie language to the CSU graduation initiative.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. What implications might this election cycle have for effective communication with the CSU? What might be the consequences of ACR 158?
2. There will be changes due to Liu, Block, and others either terming out or not returning. It is not clear who will be in the running for the chairmanship. Change will also occur in the assembly. The main issue is moderate vs. progressive democrat. This new group operates under the new term limits and this has implications for advocacy. The highlighting of internal CSU policies will be necessary to address the transfer concerns in ACR 158.
3. It is important for us to be proactive, and when something comes up that might impact curriculum and Academic Freedom, may we have an early heads-up? How can we be trained on what is effective lobbying in Sacramento?
4. Is it possible for you to explain what you know about SUGS, the cost to the State of California, and the implication they hold for CSU funding levels?
5. Are you having or planning to have similar conversations with the BoT? They have many connections in Sacramento and, yet, have been reluctant to engage in advocacy. Have you given this some thought?
6. Not all lobbying is the same. There is mass lobbying and more strategic levels of lobbying. The Trustees do strategic lobbying (i.e., making a phone call.). Their roles are much more nuanced. Strategic lobbying would be a better way of using Trustee time, rather than walking the halls.
7. What implications might testimony on academic senates hold for our working relationship with Sacramento?

8. It is important to understand the nature of political posturing.
9. The focus on the graduation rate may be trying to get us to fix what we have already fixed. We have huge quality issues. We have pressure to teach larger sections with more students. Is it possible for you to carry this message forward?
10. Given current funding levels, it will take us 63 years to deal with our backlog. What is unfortunate is that we do not get the money, because we did not ask for it. Anything that you can do to help convey this information would be appreciated.
11. Regarding ACR 178, how do we stop the legislature from legislating from anecdote? Any advice on how we can combat this?
12. All politics are local. It is the nature of members to respond to constituents. When we are working with CO, liaison staff, or the ASCSU, it is important to have the information that reflects the reality of the situation. This will help mitigate any long-term issues. The first line of defense is addressing the issue locally.

**Harold Goldwhite – ERFA Liaison Report** CSU ERFA Liaison, Harold Goldwhite reported that the meeting of the State Council of CSU ERFA would take place on October 22, 2016, at Cal. Poly Pomona’s Kellogg West Center. The September 2016 issue of The Reporter, CSU ERFA’s regular publication, would be distributed this week and is also posted on the CSU ERFA website (csuerfa.org). Articles include health benefits matters; long term care plans; and legislative matters. CSU ERFA Liaison Goldwhite also reported that the CSU ERFA legislative Committee, led by Alan Wade, and Leni Cook, had recommended that CSU ERFA not take a position on any of the propositions on the November ballot, with the possible exception of #61 that could impose price controls on drug purchases by State agencies. This would be taken up by State Council. The Association may initiate an on-line electronic magazine (in addition to The Reporter) that would be accessible only to members. CSU ERFA Liaison Goldwhite further reported that after a pilot study at CSU Dominguez Hills in Spring Term 2016, the Executive Committee of CSU ERFA has agreed to expand the Soles 4 Souls program, involving the collection of unwanted shoes to distribute to those in need both in the U.S. and abroad, to all campuses. Planning is underway in the Fall Term 2016, with collection beginning in Spring Term 2017. The long service of CSU ERFA’s archivist has concluded with Judd Grenier’s retirement from the position. The new archivist is Joanna Dunkley, also from CSUDH. Lastly, CSU ERFA Liaison Goldwhite reported that Don Cameron has retired from the position of Executive Director of CSU ERFA after more than 8 years of dedicated and effective service. The CSU ERFA office remains at CSU Northridge. The new Executive Director is Harold Goldwhite (CSU Los Angeles) who also continues as CSU ERFA liaison to the ASCSU.

**Jennifer Eagan – CFA Liaison Report** CFA Liaison Eagan reported that we have a great opportunity this year to work with the CO, particularly on Prop 55, and to lobby more effectively to get additional funding for the CSU. On the subject of Prop 55, members were precinct walking on September 10, 2016. The funding that Prop 55 would bring goes to K-14; however, it is important for the CSU and UC to be aware of the competition that funding creates. The CSU’s cut proportionately is approximately \$250 million. CFA will be working very hard to pass Prop 55. There is a new cool medium where members can make phone calls from home to get the

word out about Prop 55. Campuses are holding membership meetings before Election Day. The goal of these meeting is to remind all that the CFA is going back to the bargaining table. It is important to start thinking about what is desired in the successor contract. An online survey – compiled by the bargaining team - will be sent in mid-October. In the spring, CFA will present the results of the survey on campuses. Please email ideas for the successor contract to [bargainingideas@ calfac.org](mailto:bargainingideas@calfac.org). CFA Liaison Eagan also reported that several conversations have been had with Chancellor White. The task forces on Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property were discussed. The CFA’s position on the task forces is that the ASCSU can do what it wants. Academic Senates address the concerns of faculty. The CFA is not preventing the Task Forces. The ASCSU can proceed on its own. Article 39 on Intellectual Property has been in the contract for some time. CFA counsel does not see any reason why a conversation cannot be had. It is important to consider the following: if the CO does not want to meet in a tripartite consultation, then perhaps the ASCSU and CFA can meet separately to discuss the issues. It is also possible to present panels at the AAUP and invite the CO to attend discussions on Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Has CSU counsel be in contact with CFA counsel or vice versa?
2. There seems to be similarities with the tenure density task force. How is it that we can meet on matters that have financial implications and not on Academic Freedom?
3. Academic Freedom is a bargaining matter.
4. If counsel spoke with counsel, is it possible that the differentiation could be made between goals and policy? Can a middle ground be found?
5. The best example of a best practice that can enable the move forward is Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP).
6. There seems to be a misunderstanding of what is Prop 55. It seeks to extend the current tax rate on the wealthiest Californians (i.e., over \$250,000 individual or \$500,000 collective household.). There are residual benefits for the CSU, specifically ear marked funds from the general fund that can come to the CSU. Senator Lee will be proposing a resolution in support of the proposition.
7. FA Chair Norman invited President Eagan to the virtual FA meeting in October.
8. On SJSU campus, we are having trouble getting new faculty and this is impacting our programs. The median income is \$90,000 and the median home price is a million dollar. Is it possible that the CFA can insist that faculty living in high cost areas get a boost to address housing insecurity?
9. The campus based equity provision is in the current contract and CFA is working to address it. Compression and inversion is also being examined. It is important for campus stakeholders to work together.
10. Is it possible to invite Hank Reichman to come back and visit with the ASCSU? It is important to remind the administration of the collaborations that have preceded this impasse.
11. Will an Academic Freedom Policy and Intellectual Property Policy need to be subjected to bargaining?
12. No. It is important to read Article 39.
13. It is important to pay attention to the many ways in which suppression occurs.

14. It has been discussed that pay differentials according to zip was being investigated. It is important that this continues to be investigated.

**Michael Ratcliffe – CSSA Liaison Report** CSSA Liaison Ratcliffe reported that his goal is to communicate student concerns to the ASCSU. The CSSA will be finalizing the agenda for the coming year. Their goals are as follows:

1. Shared governance and CSSA autonomy: The goal is to build the relationship between the CSSA and ASCSU and redefine shared governance to ensure collaboration. This will be discussed at the next CSSA meeting. Efforts will include the following:
  - a. Campaign on interrelatedness of student success and faculty support.
  - b. Examine best practices on student outreach on campuses.
  - c. Student Trustee outreach.
2. University Affairs: These efforts will center on increasing student involvement and better service for the students of the CSU. Focus will be on the following:
  - a. Dream Resource Centers.
  - b. Food Pantries on campuses.
  - c. Veterans concerns.
3. The CSSA president will be presenting at the BoT.
4. The CSSA will support Prop 55.
5. The CSSA will review system-wide committee appointments
6. The CSSA will focus on civic engagement and voter registration.

The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Due to the lack of a systemwide policy on Academic Freedom, and a lack of training for campus administrators, each individual has his or her own interpretation. Some have even taken harassment from outside organizations as Freedom of Speech. Does the CSSA have ways of dealing with such actions?
2. This is a topic to continue discussing collaboratively.
3. Academic Affairs spoke with the Veteran Affairs and there are centers being created. There is an opportunity for greater faculty involvement. What would students think about this?
4. This is a strategy in our policy agenda to be discussed at the meeting this weekend.
5. It seems like students are spending much money on clickers. It is important to discuss that phones can be used in the same manner.
6. It is important to continue pointing out student hunger and homeless. Is it possible for the CSSA to help CSU Stanislaus with the creation of a viable food pantry that seems to be stalled? Is it possible to deal with these issues as part of a systemwide campaign?

*Craig Stone – American Indian Studies, CSU Long Beach & Maulana Karenga – Africana Studies CSU Long Beach: Ethnic Studies Task Force.* Professors Stone and Karenga, members of the Ethnic Studies Task Force, reported on the concerns and recommendations raised in the ETHS report. Particular attention was paid to issues of advising and the need for collegial awareness of what campus budgets, climates, and tenure densities are like for Ethnic Studies faculty. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. There needs to be models for collaborating with Ethnic Studies.
2. How do I explain to my colleagues that are teaching similar courses that they cannot teach a class?
3. It is important to redefine teaching realities pedagogically.
4. It is important to find common ground.
5. Are there disciplinary differences that shape campus climate?
6. It is important to openly discuss the policies, measures, and programmatic changes that occur for all programs.
7. Ethnic Studies must be a priority this CSU hallmark.
8. It is important for the university to make Ethnic Studies a priority and interdisciplinary collaboration with Ethnic Studies should be a component of moving forward.
9. It is important to look at small program successes.
10. It is important to see the collaborative possibilities before us.

### **Committee Recommendations**

Action Items:

<i>Receipt of Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report</i>	<u>AS-3264-16/EX</u>
<u>Unanimously Approved</u>	First Reading/Waiver
<i>Implementation of Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report Items</i>	<u>AS-3265-16/APEP</u>
<u>Previously Approved by the Academic Senate CSU</u>	First Reading/Waiver Approved
<i>Commendation for Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources</i>	<u>AS-3266-16/FA</u>
<u>Approved by Acclamation</u>	First
<i>Support for Proposition 55 on the November 2016 Ballot: Tax Extension to Fund Education and Healthcare.</i>	<u>AS-3267-16/FGA</u>
<u>Unanimously Approved</u>	First Reading/Waiver
<i>Response to ACR 158 (Holden): Postsecondary Education: Transfers</i>	<u>AS-3268-16/FGA</u>
	First Reading

*Course Grading in the Golden Four*  
16/AA

AS-3269-

First Reading

*Endorsement of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations*

AS-3270-16/APEP

First Reading

Establishment of an ASCSU Faculty Workgroup to Study General Education

AS-3271-16/AA

First Reading

Adjournment

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

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