

**ASCSU CHAIR'S REPORT**  
**June 1 - September 3, 2018**  
**Catherine Nelson**

Welcome to the 2018-19 Academic Senate CSU! This report provides an update on select events over the summer as we embark on what promises to be another interesting year.

**Committee Appointments**

This summer the Executive Committee completed committee appointments to ASCSU standing committees and systemwide committees and task forces. My thanks to all Senators and to our new committee Chairs and Vice Chairs for their willingness to serve.

**ASCSU Retreat**

Every August the ASCSU Extended Executive Committee meets with the Chancellor and the CO leadership team and the CSSA leadership and student trustees to build relationships, share priorities and discuss the challenges facing us. The Extended Executive Committee organized the retreat around the theme, "Student Success: Centering the Student Learning Experience." Using the ASCSU White Paper on Student Success to frame the discussion, the goal was to center the student learning experience in the classroom in our conversations about student success. The opening panel was a conversation around the question, "How does your definition of student success track or not with the definition in the White Paper?" After the panel, small groups engaged in a more in depth discussion of the meaning of student success, what we do well in that regard, what we can do better and what one specific goal we might pursue together. While we did not end up with a specific goal, we did identify several general areas where we can potentially agree. Those include:

1. It takes a village - every member of the CSU community is responsible for student success and needs to understand their role/responsibility for that success. Specific mention was made of the complementary roles of the academic and student affairs areas of the university.
2. Our intellectual/educational community needs to be equity minded and a community of care.
3. Completion matters, but must be consistent with academic achievement and success. Neither is sufficient by itself.
4. We need to make education relevant for students.
5. Faculty (we ran out of time at this point, so consider these points rough draft) – we need:

**CSU Campuses**

Bakersfield  
Channel Islands  
Chico  
Dominguez Hills  
East Bay

Fresno  
Fullerton  
Humboldt  
Long Beach  
Los Angeles  
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay  
Northridge  
Pomona  
Sacramento  
San Bernardino  
San Diego

San Francisco  
San José  
San Luis Obispo  
San Marcos  
Sonoma  
Stanislaus

- sufficient faculty (appropriately circumstanced) to support student success;
- sufficient structural resources for advising and a personal/ mentor relationship;
- culturally competent faculty;
- to honor faculty responsibilities for service.

I personally had two take-aways from the retreat. First, everyone in the room has a profound commitment to student success even if we don't always agree on the best way to get there. Second, that commitment from faculty should be accompanied by a continued critical evaluation of CSU initiatives to support student success. In order for the complementary relationship between the academic and student affairs missions of the university to be successful, we need to make sure the relationship stays in balance.

### **The Master Plan**

Two hearings related to California's Master Plan for Higher Education were held in Sacramento this summer. The first on July 9 was the Stakeholder Forum on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California organized by the governor's office. Overall, 30 participants representing K-12, California public higher education (including yours truly) and associated groups (the California Acceleration Project and WICHE among them) discussed the history of the Master Plan, preparing students for higher education, whether institutions of higher education are prepared for 21<sup>st</sup> century students and higher education and the 21<sup>st</sup> century workforce. Major themes that emerged included:

1. The Master Plan (MP) is outdated – it was crafted in a different time when higher education was a force for social mobility primarily geared toward white males.
2. The Master Plan was genius at “industrial sorting” for the types of education/training needed for a mid-20<sup>th</sup> century workforce, but isn't adequate for the drastic changes in the economy brought about by the rapid pace of technological development.
3. There are more “lanes” in higher education than there used to be (CCCs, CSU and UC were the 3 lanes under the Master Plan).
4. How does a public system of higher education adapt when students have more options, including proprietary educational institutions and micro-certification (training for skill sets in specific technical areas, receive a certificate upon completion of training; much less time and expense involved than in the traditional 4 yr. residential model)?
5. How do we attend to diversity, and extend higher education to all CA citizens on an equitable basis?

And on August 24 the Assembly Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California held a hearing that addressed the budget process and higher education finance challenges, and financing student aid in California. Major themes included the possibility of multi year budgets, the optimum degree of legislative oversight over those budgets and the need to simplify financial aid and make sure it is adequate to meet students' needs.

### **Other Activities**

Over the course of the summer I kept up a robust schedule of liaison visits with the Academic Council, CFA, CSSA and the CSU Alumni Association. I also met in person with Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard, our Academic and Student Affairs Liaison Leo Van Cleve, CFA Statewide President Jen Eagan, CSSA Executive Director Rob Shorette and ERFSA President Bill Blischke. I look forward to working with all our partners as we face the challenges and promise of the coming academic year.

### **Budgets**

The ASCSU base budget is essentially flat for 2018-19. We expect additional one-time funds added to our travel and assigned time line to meet our obligations for the year. AVC Van Cleve says that as context most departments in the Chancellor's Office are seeing flat or reduced base budgets for the academic year.

With regard to the CSU's 2018019 final budget, recall that \$25m in Graduation Initiative funds is allocated for faculty hiring. When I sent out the links to the coded memos about the final budget, I mentioned that at least on the surface there appeared to be a disconnect between the state budget language and the CSU memo. The state budget specifies that \$25m of the \$75m GI allocation shall be used to increase the number of tenure-track faculty in the CSU. In the CSU coded memo, the \$25m is 1/3 of the GI funds allocated to campuses, but not spelled out are each campus' share of the \$25m and the formula used to determine that share. Nor does the memo direct campuses to spend that portion of the GI allocation specifically on tenure track hiring. I followed up with EVC Blanchard, who said that the \$25m must be spent on faculty hiring. He also indicated that those funds were allocated based upon where campuses are on tenure density. Those campuses with higher tenure density received a smaller allocation; those with lower tenure density received a larger allocation. For example, Sonoma is third highest in tenure density in the CSU, so our campus received a smaller allocation.

I also received a little more detail on the \$1.2m allocation to the UC for UC/CSU anti-bias training. My counterpart for the statewide UC Academic Senate Robert May, got in touch with Yvette Gullatt, Vice Provost for Diversity and Engagement and Chief Outreach Officer for the University of California system. According to VP Gullatt, the funds are one-time for a pilot program for both CSU and UC. The allocation was made at the request of the Anti-Defamation League with support from the Jewish Caucus. It's a two-year pilot, but one-time funds, so the funding must be fully encumbered by June 30, 2019. Gullatt indicated that the UC is working through CSU's governmental relations office to identify CSU representatives to join them to plan for this (including identifying work that is already done on campuses and at the system level), and will begin soon to do the same for UC. Gullatt emphasized that because it involves faculty, the Senates are critical in helping shape a future request for proposal (the legislation specifies a contract). She planned to discuss the issue when met with the UC Senate in September.

### **Office Move**

Our offices have moved to our temporary location on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor. Our space consists of cubicles for Tracy and Reem and an office for the Chair. Entry is by key card only and there is no space for us to gather for coffee, computer use and the like as we did in our old offices.

Instead, during the plenary Tracy and Reem will be set up at tables outside the Wallace Room. Reem has worked her magic to make sure we have our usual coffee/hot water set up and an arrangement for printing hard copies is in the works. The move to our new permanent offices on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is currently scheduled for mid-December. In the meantime, with patience and good humor we'll all make it through the temporary inconvenience in one piece.

In conclusion, my thanks to the Executive and Extended Executive Committees for their work this summer (without compensation I might add), and to Tracy Butler and Reem Osman for their hard work and grace as they helped a new chair learn the ropes, handled the details to make the retreat happen and made the move to their temporary quarters on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor, all at the same time. I'd also like to give a special shout out to Immediate Past Chair Miller and Past Chair Filling for their counsel, and to Vice Chair Collins for standing in for me at the July Board of Trustees meeting. Finally thanks to all of you for your work on behalf of our students and the CSU.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Nelson