

ASCSU Chair's Report
September Plenary to November Plenary 2016
Christine M. Miller

It has been my privilege to represent the Academic Senate of the California State University between our last plenary meeting and the present one. I offer the following listing of my activities followed by summary and commentary on key issues that arose during that time.

Meetings and Activities

September, post-plenary

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

October

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

Upcoming

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

Key Issues

Graduation Initiative 2025

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

General Education

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

I received that survey data four days ago, on October 28, 2016. It was also provided to the chair of GEAC, as well as the chairs of two of ASCSU's committees: Academic Affairs (AA) and Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP). In addition, minutes before the start of GEAC's November 1, 2016 meeting, AVC Mallon sent to me and to the Chair and Vice Chair of GEAC a request for assistance from that committee. She asked that GEAC examine the

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

Task Forces

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

In addition, on October 29, 2016 AVC Mallon sent me an invitation for ASCSU to participate in a “Quantitative Reasoning Shared Governance Communication Group” situated within an organizational chart that she also shared. I forwarded the information to the Executive Committee, who will meet with AVC Mallon on November 2 to discuss the approach. Once again, more information will be provided in committee meetings and at the plenary.

Finally, I believe it’s important to note that the CSU Math Council took up the QRTF report at its meeting this month. The Council passed a resolution endorsing the findings and recommendations of the report and requesting inclusion in its implementation. Clearly, discussions regarding the QRTF report will continue.

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

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

Academic Conference

It’s a long story, but . . . the venue for Academic Conference has changed to San Diego State University. The dates (February 9-10) remain the same, as does the theme (closing the achievement gap). We look forward to seeing you there!

Shared Governance

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

been discussing this report, and I have linked it to the Graduation Initiative. I have argued that achieving the audacious goals of the Graduation Initiative will require a similarly audacious commitment to shared governance. More specifically, I believe it will be impossible to achieve the goals of the Graduation Initiative without healthy and robust shared governance on both the campus and the system levels. Okay is not good enough.

Perhaps serendipitously, Chancellor White emailed me on October 26 to let me know that the AGB has asked the CSU to participate in the next phase of its shared governance study: the collection of twelve case studies in shared governance to provide a sense of how it functions in various institutions. Thus, according to Chancellor White, the AGB thinks it would be productive if its members heard about “the real experiences of those actively working to improve or maintain healthy shared governance.” He accepted the invitation to participate, which means that the lead investigator, Drake University President Emeritus David Maxwell, will be contacting Chancellor White, Board Chair Eisen and me to participate in long-form phone interviews soliciting our perceptions. If you have feedback for me on what to share in my interview, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine M. Miller