

**Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) DRAFT Minutes**

January 22–23, 2015  
Office of the Chancellor

**Plenary – Thursday, January 22, 2015 – 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. – Dumke Auditorium**

Senate Social – Academic Affairs Committee &  
Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee jointly hosting  
5:15 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. – Munitz Lobby

**Plenary – Friday, January 23, 2015 – 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. – Dumke Auditorium**

**1. Call to order:** 8:32 a.m.

**2. Roll call**

Senators Present: Bakersfield (Frye, Murphy); Channel Islands (Aloisio, Yudelson); Chico (Kaiser, Schulte); Dominguez Hills (Norman); East Bay (Fleming, Gubernat); Fresno (Benavides, Kensinger); Fullerton (Guerin, Jarvis, Walker); Humboldt (Creadon, Eschker); Long Beach (Hood, Klink, Soni); Los Angeles (Baaske, Riggio); Maritime (Chisholm, Kamdar); Monterey Bay (Davis, Nishita); Northridge (Chong, Schutte); Pomona (Neto, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Steffel, Ullman); San Diego (Eadie, Ornatowski, Wheeler); San Francisco (Collins, Yee-Melichar); San Jose (Heiden, Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Foroohar, LoCascio); San Marcos (Barsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Roberts); Stanislaus (Filling); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack)

**Guests:** William Blischke, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA) Liaison; Kristin Crellin, President – Alumni Council; Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Student Academic Support; Gerard Hanley, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Technology Services; Dean Kulju, Director – Financial Aid & Scholarship Programs; Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources; Christine Mallon, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Programs and Faculty Development; Margie Merryfield, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Human Resources; Aaron Moore, Director – Advancement; Miles Nevin, Executive Director, California State Students Association (CSSA); Kara Perkins, Director – Initiatives and Resource Management; Steven Stepanek, CSU Faculty Trustee; Ed Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Research & Resources; Lars Walton, Chief of Staff – Office of the Chancellor; Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor; Angela Williams, Project Manager for Intrasystem Enrollment

**3. Approval of Agenda:** Approved as revised.

**4. Approval of Minutes of November 6-7, 2014:** Approved as amended.

## 5. Announcements:

There was a reminder of the March 13 AAUP Centennial anniversary to be held at Cal State East Bay all day, followed by a dinner honoring the retirement of former ASCSU Senator Hank Reichman to which all are invited. Deadline to RSVP is March 5, 2015.

An update on Senator Frehlich's health included questions from senators asking what the possibilities were to contribute to a system-wide catastrophic leave donation for him. The possibility of such was still being pursued with Human Resources. Senators also questioned about donating unused funds from the senate's social account to Frehlich and his family. Chair Filling announced that so far senators themselves had donated over 1400 dollars but he was not amenable to redirecting funds collected and already earmarked for other purposes.

Other announcements: Provost Harry Hellenbrand (Northridge) will retire in June 2015. The Chancellor's State of the CSU address will be delivered on Tuesday at approximately 12:30 at the meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees and will be streaming live. The Wang awards will be presented at that meeting on Tuesday at 3:15. Senator Eschker (Humboldt) has been appointed to the position of Vice Chair of FGA.

## 6. Presentations/Introductions

Senator Baaske (Los Angeles) introduced Professor Heidi Riggio (Psychology).  
Senator Chisholm (Maritime) introduced Professor Nipoli Kandar (Economics).

## 7. Reports

### 7.1 Chair

Chair Filling referred to his written report, which would be going out via email later this morning.

He thanked Vice Chair Miller for her leadership in planning, organizing, and carrying out the **Academic Conference** in November. He also thanked the conference committee and the ASCSU staff members who worked so hard and under such difficult circumstances, given the move from the Hilton to the Chancellor's Office. Finally, he thanked Chancellor White for financial and other forms of support for the conference. He noted that the conference committee is currently analyzing the results of the surveys on the conference's effectiveness and will make them available soon.

The Chair reported that the system-wide task force on **Financial Sustainability** continues to meet regularly (including today between 9-12); the group is discussing SUGs, budget principles for the campuses, and is examining various financial models, some based on enrollment data, some on other considerations. He expects there will be a report on their findings in April and hopes to have information for the March plenary on how funds are allocated throughout the CSU.

He noted that in meeting with legislative staff recently, it was important for him and Vice Chair Miller to talk about **performance measures** that could better reflect what the CSU actually does; he asked senators to help provide examples of such measures going forward. He and Senators Swartz and Krabacher have also met with the CO's government relations staff and will continue to do so in February so that faculty can be influential in a more timely way as bills are being written.

He attended the meeting of the **Academic Council** last week where there was much conversation about RSCA funding, in particular, about ways to capture data on outcomes of the funding. The senate will need to collect information proving that the funds are being used well, especially as FA continues to advocate for more funding. At the 8<sup>th</sup> national meeting of the **Campaign for the Future of Higher Education**, which he also attended, the focus was on moves toward privatization of public higher education, on assessment measures, Title II regulations on teacher education, and performance-based funding models—and while the last may not be what is envisioned by the California legislature, it seems prudent to be aware of what is going on in other states.

There next was an extended discussion of the current state of the **California Community Colleges' baccalaureate pilot program** (per SB 850) when Chair Filling was joined by Assistant Vice Chancellor Mallon and Lars Walton, Chief of Staff:

Chair Filling acknowledged that the timing given to respond to the pilot programs was much too short and that the Executive Committee had spent many hours on emergency phone calls in an effort to determine how to do so in such short order. He reported that Mallon and Walton met with the Executive Committee yesterday to discuss a process by which the ASCSU can respond to whether or not the pilot programs duplicate degrees currently offered by the CSU. While the ASCSU might like to raise a number of issues, Filling cautioned that the only response available now is to duplication or lack thereof. And while the community colleges are required by the law (SB 850) to consult with the CSU, they are not required to act on the CSU's advice.

The community colleges had asked the CSU originally for a quick turnaround of only a few days to respond to minimal information (the degree title, college offering the degree, a 2-3 sentence description). After consulting with the Executive Committee, who objected to the timeline and the process, Chancellor White informed Chancellor Harris that the CSU would reply by the end of February. Meanwhile the community colleges' Board of Governors gave "conditional" approval to 15 proposals of degrees, stipulating that there would be further consultation with the CSU.

Filling noted that we are bound to consult with discipline faculty on campuses and will send all 15 proposals to all campus presidents and senate chairs with the request to have them reviewed not only by those in allied disciplines but also by those who have a general knowledge of curriculum, since it has been discovered already that the program titles don't necessarily reflect the nature of the degree. Campuses will be asked to respond by February 12, which is still a short timeline, in order to give the Executive Committee the opportunity for a system-wide overview, with the end of February deadline in mind. Because the community colleges are not bound to accept the CSU's evaluations, however, there will likely be a negotiation process going forward, and should two or three be found duplicative, there could be additional programs substituted for those in order to reach the maximum number of 15.

Mallon thanked the Executive Committee for their work on this; she noted that, as a background, it had been frustrating to see the misdirection of state investment this way rather than through investing in further enrollments for the CSU, where degrees can be produced more efficiently. The CSU is not interested in technical or vocational degrees like dental hygiene or mortuary science. But it was important to ensure against duplication, and especially if a community college were to use a different title for a degree to get around the law.

Filling emphasized that the community college senate itself has not be in favor of this pilot program of baccalaureate degrees. Senator Van Selst added that in GEAC, members of the community college senate

have been seeking help as to how to define their upper-division GE since they've never developed such curriculum before. There is some concern about the transferability of upper-division GE as well.

In answer to a question about the process, it was noted that the campus reports will be sent to both the ASCSU and the Chancellor's Office. Both faculty and administrators on campuses will be asked to provide their responses; and it is important that duplication is not seen only as a regional matter. Faculty are asked to take not only a campus-based, but a system-wide, perspective. Duplication is to be seen if only one campus within the CSU offers a program.

Filling noted that there could be problems with a "2 +2" scenario, whereby an associate's degree could be being filled out with a general business degree laid on top of it. Another problem that has already arisen, seemingly in violation of SB 850, is that there are multi-campus offerings of the same program.

Senators expressed concerns about employers' claiming that there are needs for business degrees in their regions where not enough are available because of CSU impaction; how will the CSU counter the attractiveness of these degrees in terms of affordability and access? How does this play out with accreditation? The answer given to the latter is that "WASC Junior" is ready to review and to accredit the programs, and this is seen already, according to Mallon, as a "feather in their cap."

In response to senators' questions about how to go about making the determinations of duplication, Filling noted that a joint letter from the ASCSU and the Chancellor's Office will be issued soon to give as much guidance as possible in the process.

On another matter: when Filling asked if there were questions about the entirety of his report, Vice Chair Miller asked if the note-takers from the Academic Conference sessions could please submit their notes to be downloaded to a flash drive; so far, only half the notes have been received, and it will be important to have a full set when doing the evaluation of the conference.

## **7.2 Standing committees**

### ***Academic Affairs (AA) – Bill Eadie, Chair***

Eadie began by saying that SB 850/the community college baccalaureate pilot programs was a topic of much discussion, but many of the questions that AA raised were answered by this plenary's previous discussion.

The committee members are working on a number of projects involving Access to Excellence, assessment, active learning and high-impact practices. The assessment project is focusing on ILOs and on algebra. The committee is grateful for the report on the Ethnic Studies Task Force by Senator Kensinger and will continue to follow its progress, with an eye toward further committee work, as needed.

In reviewing the Chancellor's Office responses to the last plenary's resolutions, the committee was concerned that there was no need expressed for a task force on the academic sustainability initiatives, as had been requested; Eadie said that he was glad to hear that there are conversations going on about performance measures with members of the legislature.

The committee discussed with their liaison from the CO, Assistant Vice Chancellor Mallon, how master's degrees are defined within the CSU, particularly in relation to the recent developments per graduate school deans. Smaller campuses are registering concern about how new requirements limiting how many

baccalaureate courses can count toward a graduate degree, could have an impact on the viability of their graduate programs.

***Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) – Denise Fleming, Chair***

Fleming reported that the committee has learned that the Bechtel-funded initiative, “Preparing a New Generation of Educators for California” has awarded 16-month awards in the amount of \$230K to eight programs: Long Beach, Northridge, Stanislaus, Fullerton, Fresno, Channel Islands, Cal Poly SLO, and CAL State Teach.

The committee heard from Eric Forbes of an increase of conditionally exempt and non-exempt students entering the CSU; the expectation is that the process will become stable over time and faculty are asked to be responsive to those students seeking exempt status. Ed Sullivan presented an overview of Early Start data in Fall 2014, aggregated by campus and by target area. APEP will study this data set and send out information about it, and is grateful for this welcome step forward in collaboration with the Chancellor’s Office in such data-sharing. Fleming also announced that the committee would be bringing forward a new resolution on teacher preparation and would be asking for a waiver of the first reading, due to the timeliness of the issue.

Senators asked for further clarification of what the Bechtel grants are targeting and for a sense of the current health of the recently rolled-out Ed.D. programs in the CSU. Fleming deferred the first question to Senator Chong, who explained that the Bechtel grants were looking at innovations in teacher preparation in math and sciences using online software and pedagogy; some projects focus on integration of special ed into regular education, and expansion of collaboration between K-12 and community colleges. About the doctorate in education: Fleming referred to a recent presentation at the Board of Trustees, which showed positive data, overall. She agreed that this would be a good question to take up at the next meeting.

***Faculty Affairs (FA) – Manzar Foroohar, Chair***

Foroohar reported that the majority of the committee’s time had been devoted to perfecting the two resolutions to be brought to the floor during plenary for second reading and a vote: one on the need for a comprehensive system-wide policy on academic freedom; the other on the role of non tenure-track faculty in shared governance.

She noted that in a report from Human Resources, the committee was made aware of the fact that while the number of tenure-track hires (742 this year) and the number of searches continue to go up—with 900 new searches planned for next year—the numbers for tenure density in the system are going down. And while the new searches and hires are welcome, the committee believes that the administration needs to have a plan to increase tenure density, which stands today at 56.3%. ACR 73 had been such a plan, developed in collaboration between the ASCSU, the Board of Trustees, and the CFA, with the goal of increasing tenure density to 75%. But during the budget crisis, the plan was shelved and now appears to have been discontinued. In their conversations with Vice Chancellor of Human Resources Lori Lamb and Assistant Vice Chancellor Margie Merryfield, the committee has made their concerns about tenure-track hiring and tenure density known. FAC looks forward to further dialogue on these matters.

FAC also discussed a new coded memo (RM 2014-01) that involves faculty travel to high-hazard regions. Now such travel need not be approved any longer by the CO; the approval process has been decentralized and the authority given to campus presidents. While such campus autonomy is a welcome change, it

could also lead to decisions about such travel that are inconsistent campus to campus. The committee will try to inform campus faculty about this new policy and would like to see an appeal process instituted in the case of a denial by a campus president.

The committee is considering revising the RSCA formula; based on the old formula, the current RSCA pool should have been 14.5 M for the year, whereas this year it was only 2.5M. FAC is discussing ways to make the administration more aware of the discrepancy and the need for a revised formula, perhaps insured by a line item in the CSU budget.

In response to the FAC report, senators expressed their concern about the tenure deficit on their own campuses, and the fact that, as FERPs continue to retire, the situation will become even more dire (FERP faculty being counted in the 56.3% figure). Campuses no longer “replace” faculty, and new modes of hiring that involve “cluster” hiring may make the situation worse. Foroohar further remarked that not only is density going down but also class sizes, system-wide, are going up—meaning that faculty workload is increasing, which is the opposite of what ACR 73 intended. Faced with these numbers, the system needs a long-term t/t hiring plan.

***Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA) – Thomas Krabacher, Chair***

The committee is working on two resolutions: one commending those involved in the passage of the faculty trustee legislation (SB 2324), which will carry a waiver of the first reading; the other on the discontinuance of the Wiley contract, a first reading.

In meetings with Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advocacy and State Relations, committee members are getting briefed on the current legislative landscape and what to expect from a new legislature this year. It will be important to prevail upon new leadership in the California Senate and in the Assembly to augment the proposed budget for the CSU. Krabacher will participate Friday in the advocacy group meeting that Yelverton-Zamarripa is convening. FGA also heard from Nathan Evans, Director of Enrollment Management, that impaction and lack of resources are the main reasons that eligibles were denied access this year to the CSU. The committee asked for more campus data and will be working with APEP to follow up on this issue.

The committee also heard a report from Lori Redfearn, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Advancement, on policies and guidelines governing campus foundations. This was a general overview and a written report will be forthcoming to the ASCSU. More specifics can be provided, as needed.

The committee also discussed the Governor’s budget with members of the Department of Finance, who elaborated only on the key points. Prop 30 provides four-year sustainability for the 4% increase of 119M. In addition, there will be 25M in incentive grants to be awarded for time to degree and completion, available only to the CSU, not to the other segments; and there will also be 25M for deferred maintenance.

Senators wondered if the 4% increase was tied in any way to enrollment growth since the Governor himself has cautioned that increased funding should be devoted to infrastructure needs instead. Other questions were about why there is no push for an oil severance tax or pressure to increase corporate revenues through real estate tax (Prop 13) reform.

Krabacher answered that there may only be six or eight bills related to higher education introduced, and that those will be introduced late. In general, he noted that there seems to be more optimism in Sacramento, a sense that the arguments for better funding of higher education are being made. He referred

to the recent editorial contrasting the leadership style of Chancellor White and that of President Napolitano as an example of an awareness that the CSU needs to become more aggressive in seeking funding. Meanwhile, however, everyone feels their needs are paramount; higher education is in competition with health and social services.

Krabacher deferred to Kara Perkins, Director – Initiatives and Resource Management, a question about how the current process for the incentive funding for improved time to graduation was going to work. Perkins said that the proposals, due on January 9, are now being reviewed. Fifty-seven applications were received. Decisions will be made ultimately on recommendations from the Department of Finance. There was concern from faculty about a potentially myopic perception that might award money only for online teaching, or to merely moving people through quickly. Senators asked if the rubrics for judging these incentive grants would be made public? Yes, and it seems clear, according to Perkins, that results cannot be shown in a single calendar year; that would be based on false assumptions. The interest is in a four-year time to degree. And not all programs applying for funds are about technology or online delivery; for example, there are the “promise” programs at Long Beach, San Diego, etc. But at this point it is difficult to know what was considered innovative.

Senators made further comments about denied eligibles; it seemed that it was difficult to disaggregate the enrollment duplications. Some campuses, it was said, are admitting higher percentages of out-of-state residents because they pay more, and this will have a negative effect, ultimately, on the alumni base.

As a final note to the discussion of the CSU budget, Chair Filling paraphrased Northridge Provost Harry Hellenbrand’s question: If we want more money, why do we keep going back with the same budget request?

### **7.3 Other committees and committee liaisons**

#### ***General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) – Mark Van Selst, Chair***

Van Selst directed senators to his written report distributed to the ASCSU via email and summarized it here. The main points are these:

GEAC has been asked by community colleges for advice on upper-division GE. In response, a sub-group has been established to review Title 5 expectations for upper-division GE, the Executive Order and guiding notes, as well as to take a look at CSU campus approaches. The Executive Order expects “transferability.” (The few private institutions that participate in CSU GE also can, it was learned, certify lower-division GE completion.)

The COMPASS project concludes with a conference entitled “New Paradigms and Pathways in General Education” on Feb 12-14, 2015. There will be ongoing participation in the AAC&U Faculty Collaboratives project as well as the WICHE Passport project in defining what expectations for GE objectives might look like across states.

At a recent meeting of the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), the UC system has allowed STATWAY to count towards IGETC completion. At present, the CSU is still conducting a pilot on STATWAY.

Finally, the CSU has avoided giving GE credit for technique-focused courses (in the arts, for example) but will reconsider doing so if such courses can demonstrate that they also integrate GE objectives with skill-based learning.

Senators brought up the tension that already exists between campus autonomy and transferability (now potentially between CSUs and CCCs as well) in designing upper-division GE curricula. It was suggested that attention should also be paid to pathways when EO 1065 is being revised. A concern raised is that community colleges may look at upper-division GE differently from the way the CSU does, as evidenced by one proposal from a community college to classify internships as granting upper-division GE credit.

### **Other reports**

Senator Guerin reported that the search for a Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) was not successful. She also announced that the Wang awards will be announced on Tuesday at the Board of Trustees meeting and that there were a number of impressive faculty in competition.

Senator Baaske reported on the SB 1440 (the STAR Act) work group that also includes Senator Nishita and former Senator Postma. He referred to Postma's written report forwarded to the senators by Chair Filling. There are currently 33 disciplines in the chart of transfer model curricula (TMCs). Model curricula are being worked on in Public Health Science, and while there is not enough for a 120-unit TMC in Engineering and Nursing, areas of emphasis are being worked on. TMCs are being developed in environmental science, graphic arts/design, hospitality and social work, among others. No data on how many are pursuing TMCs in the community college have been made available as yet; the findings may be too preliminary. Part of the problem is that there hasn't been enough money for advising about and marketing of the degrees. A concern was raised about whether or not the requirement to admit students with a TMC degree would eventually limit the number of first-year students that campuses could accommodate.

Senator Yee-Melichar reported that the search for an Assistant Vice Chancellor in Academic Affairs was not successful. She also reported that the Interim Faculty Director of ITL is Emily Magruder.

The question was asked if anyone is tracking failed administrative searches in the CSU, both on campuses and at the system level. It is a matter of concern.

### **7.4 Steven Stepanek, CSU Faculty Trustee**

Trustee Stepanek referred to his written report. He noted the following highlights from that report: He visited the San Jose campus in December where he had excellent conversations with faculty and students. The system's Financial Sustainability Task Force on which he sits continues to meet, but he cannot say much about their findings at this point. He has participated in the deliberations over the Wang award and found the choices difficult as there were so many excellent applicants to choose from. He encouraged senators to ask that a formal invitation to visit their campuses be extended to him; during campus visits he'd like to be able to attend Executive Committee meetings and a senate meeting, if at all possible. He requested that during campus visits senators show him evidence of a few things that make the campus outstanding; he is particularly interested in creative uses of technology. Stepanek asked senators to review the Board of Trustees agenda ahead of time in order to speak with him about it. Something he noted that he had not included in his report is his participation in Super Sunday events in

February. And he noted that his own experience recently with a skin-cancer scare has made him want to urge everyone to be sure to have suspicious spots checked out by a doctor.

Senator Sabalius inquired if, since he had recently visited SJSU, Trustee Stepanek might have been aware of how the Chancellor had changed the pattern of presidential reviews to be two-year, less formal ones. Is this a permanent institutional change, and is there any way to provide feedback on the change away from a more extensive five-year review of a president?

The answer is that there will be a little of both, according to Stepanek, that is, both formal and informal reviewing for an indefinite period of time. Some of the changes involve reviewing the campus presidents' success in fundraising, issues of curriculum and student success within a two-year period. The plan is that every two years presidents will be brought before the Board of Trustees to report on their achievement in terms of certain performance measures. There will still be the longer, more formal 5-6 year reviews involving focus groups, surveys, interviews—a more comprehensive report. Stepanek said to “stay tuned” for an announcement of when SJSU will see a more formal review occurring.

Senator Heiden asked about whether Super Sundays were expected to occur on every campus, since the feedback at SJSU has been that the churches attract mostly the elderly to services and not those of college age, and she questioned whether such recruitment efforts were really paying off.

Stepanek answered that the primary foci for Super Sundays were Oakland and South Central Los Angeles, and that he would take her comment about reaching the appropriate population back. But at the same time, reaching parents and grandparents about the importance of college is also key in recruitment efforts.

Senator Foroohar inquired if the two-year plans for the presidents were public, and can faculty see them, and if not, why not?

Stepanek responded that that document is supposed to be developed with proper and widespread consultation on campus, including with students and faculty governance, not just with administrators. He suggested senators inquire about the process on their own campuses.

Senator Soni asked if, when he visits individual campuses, does the Faculty Trustee ask about what improvements may be needed? Stepanek answered that these tend to get identified down the line and can involve personnel issues, buildings, etc.; he said that he doesn't always have to ask: the issues are revealed in time.

## **7.5 Trustee Nomination Process**

Senator Pasternack, Chair of the Trustee Nomination Committee, thanked his committee for their hard work; he reported that from among seven candidates, the following finalists were chosen:

Honora Chapman (Fresno)  
Susan Holl (Sacramento)  
Steven Stepanek (Northridge)  
John Tarjan (Bakersfield)

Pasternack noted that the selection process will be similar to that followed in the past. The senators will be solicited for questions from which a final group of questions will be chosen. During the March

plenary, each candidate will have the opportunity for an opening statement, and then each candidate will answer each of the questions.

Senators then asked how much time will be allocated during the plenary for this process, and would the candidates be questioned individually or in a panel (the answer is in a panel format), and could there be questions from the floor, besides those previously selected by the committee, as had been done in the past. The committee will now take up these questions, as well as the possibility of making the candidates' files available digitally (while insuring their confidentiality), not only in paper-based form.

#### **7.6 Gerard Hanley, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Technology Services and Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Research and Resources**

Forbes introduced Angela Williams, Project Manager for CourseMatch. A Powerpoint description of CourseMatch was presented. Forbes noted that CourseMatch, the progenitor for SB 386 (which requires that all online courses will be posted ultimately) currently enables students to take a questionnaire to see what online courses are available in the CSU and provides an assessment mechanism for them to determine if they are ready to take a course on-line through answering five questions of eligibility. Students will see how a course will transfer back to their home campus, information for such being provided by articulation officers. After determining eligibility, the student is sent to a self-service portal on their campus where a welcome page, prerequisites, deadlines, etc. are posted. This is, according to Forbes, essentially an elimination of what was formerly a paper-based process to register for an online course on another campus.

Senators raised questions about whether ineligible students themselves can enter the system and register, and what registrars could control. The answer is that hecking a GPA requirement, for example, would be up to the campus registrar, as would screening for a prerequisite. The earlier Executive Order on cross-campus enrollment was also cited as establishing certain precedents for such enrollment.

Forbes also said that the next wave of CourseMatch would not count against the campus's FTES; campuses do not have to set up reserve capacity—if there are available seats, then students can enroll.

Faculty expressed concern, nonetheless, about the ability to enforce prerequisites and to maintain a program's high quality, as well as about a growing faculty workload in response to intrasystem enrollment demand, and the complicated issue of insuring student identity in online classes when taken across the system. Forbes answered that every department (that is, the department chair) controls capacity--the system, he said, does not; 386 enrollments are "left-over" enrollments. The law requires the CSU to publish the existence of open seats; down the line whether or not there is a growing demand for particular classes could then be studied. Self-reported information could be required to be provided at the beginning of a class, and "welcome letters" can detail what the course requires of a student.

Gerry Hanley spoke next about support for faculty moving courses online. He reported that within the last seven months over 600 faculty have been involved through faculty development in Quality Matters or training in QOLT and that these are campus-based and voluntary. The goal, according to Hanley, is to build a community of faculty sharing best practices while developing a library of rubrics for both hybrid and online courses.

Senators had questions and comments about the relationships between these system-wide efforts and local control over RTP. And would there continue to be money to support them? Hanley responded that the

intent is to sustain the program as a permanent one and to continue to advocate for more funding. He said there is a plan to put out another RFP in 2015-16.

Another issue raised was the decision to cancel the e-journal contract with Wiley. Hanley said the problem was that as the prices have been going up the small campuses, in particular, are challenged by such increases; meanwhile we are being forced to pay for more than we use. He noted that this loss of such a large contract was publicly noted, in *Library Journal*, for example; it's time to let things percolate, he said, and see what Wiley returns to the table with. Hanley recommended that all of us bring pressure on the content providers to get what is needed for students and faculty.

### **7.7 Miles Nevin, CSSA Executive Director – Liaison report**

Nevin read the report in place of Sara Sanders, the CSSA student liaison who was unable to be present. The CSSA thanked the ASCSU for the November Academic Conference; the students had a great time. At their first meeting this year on the San Marcos campus, the CSSA offered a white paper on Ethnic Studies, which requests a diversity component in GE. They will vote on this in March. The CSSA has a number of online community projects to support student groups including veterans, victims of sexual assault, and foster students.

Given that the Governor's budget falls short by 97M asked for by the Board of Trustees, the CSSA would like to work with faculty in the ASCSU and the CFA to advocate for more funding for next year.

Finally, the CSSA proposal for a new, opt-out fee of four dollars per student to support their work in increasing student involvement and representation is coming to the Board of Trustees next week for their action. When questioned about the inconsistency of charging even such a small fee, given the push-back against student success fees, Nevin emphasized that, while there was no mechanism for every campus to vote, the vote was strongly in the majority from among campus representatives; CSSA concluded there had been due diligence in the making the decision to propose this fee.

### **7.8 William Blischke, CSU ERFA Liaison**

Blischke reminded senators that their dues to join ERFA upon retirement can be taken automatically out of CalPERS checks; a lifetime membership is \$1,000. There is an ERFA recruitment person on each campus.

ERFA is attempting to schedule a meeting with Chancellor White to discuss what the organization can do to help the system. They would like to have the Chancellor as a major speaker at an upcoming meeting. ERFA meetings in the future are scheduled in Torrance on February 14; Long Beach on April 25, and Fullerton on October 17.

### **7.9 Ed Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Research & Resources**

Sullivan reported on outcomes from CourseMatch, so far. The courses initially vetted had to have a high success rate, with grading outcomes either similar to, or better than, face-to-face offerings. Campuses were asked to reserve seats, but intra-system students could only enroll later than natives, so at times there were only native students in some sections. Of the 2,150 students in these CourseMatch sections in Fall 2013, 147 registered through CourseMatch, with a net completion by 136 students. The data set is especially small, so little can be said thus far about the results. Of those taking the class concurrently 90.5% had grades ranging from A+ to C, including credit. 5.4% finished with F, I, WU, or no credit. In

Winter 2014, 8 students out of 800 did not fare as well; three were in the A-C range; five below. In Spring 2014, controls were not as strictly adhered to: 159 of 1,581 students took a class via CourseMatch, with a net of 146 students. 74% had passing grades whereas 20% did poorly, 10% with a WU, 7.5% with an F. Sullivan suggested that this might have had to do with the course itself, a particular math course from which people were not sure how to withdraw and, as a result, received the WU.

Senators had questions about the registration windows for CourseMatch classes, how many seats were reserved for CourseMatch students, what the distribution of grades was in the groups that had passing grades (how many A's, B's, etc.), and whether, in fact, this small data set really could be said to reveal much about the program at this point.

### **7.10 Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources**

Vice Chancellor Lamb said she was pleased to be able to address the body and hoped to work on areas of mutual interest with the senate. In assuming her role recently, she said that she quickly learned how understaffed they were in HR, and having heard legends about Margie Merryfield's needing to be "cloned," she soon learned that the stories were true. She has promoted Dr. Merryfield to Assistant Vice Chancellor and will fill another position for a senior director working with her as soon as possible. She asked for the senators' help in recruiting the right person for this position.

Her leadership team is working on a number of initiatives including

- Leadership development: creating a pipeline within the CSU for future leaders including department chairs, supervisors, deans, vice presidents all the way up to the presidential level;
- Using data more effectively, finding correlations among data;
- Exploring how Human Resources technologies can be leveraged to get work done more effectively;
- Process improvement, that is, making things more streamlined and effective;
- Building HR capacity, using resources as effectively as possible in their own professional development, in training opportunities (HR on campuses is lean and needs to be empowered with the right tools);
- Improving communication between campuses and the CO.

Lamb said that in the four and a half months she has been in her position, she has felt lucky to be here, and has recognized the difficulties all faced during a terrible recession when throughout the system morale suffered. She said she hopes now to start a positive momentum. She thinks highly of the CSU, the commitment and dedication of its faculty, the senate, the staff, and all campus employees. She said she has been speaking with Chair Filling to speak of how best to partner, to work together, with the mission of the CSU in mind.

Senators had a number of questions, paraphrased here:

Pasternack: Given that there are searches that are failing, is there any plan to examine such on campuses and/or in the system? Emeriti could be called upon to take on necessary "acting" positions, including on a volunteer basis.

LL: The second suggestion is a welcome one. As to why searches are failing: currently the CSU has a data challenge. There are anecdotal explanations that cite salary, geography, etc. Exit surveys and surveys of applicants would be helpful, and she will look into piloting these on campuses.

Nelson: There are meetings for department chairs in southern California; could that also be extended to northern campuses? This is part of a larger issue of where meetings of committees and task forces tend to be held (south vs. north), and the issue grows more pressing as budget conditions worsen.

LL: Is acutely aware of the north/south issue. Will try in future to arrange for more airport and alternate locations to Long Beach for meetings. (Merryfield added that, having done the department chair training for 18 years, she has found it has been difficult to get critical mass in other locations, but perhaps it is time to revisit the issue.)

Miller: Re: donating catastrophic leave across campuses: The current situation of a statewide senator for whom others would like to do this could be a good test case, yet we've been told that the systems on campuses do not allow for such. Yet, given the Chancellor's expressed interest in forging relationships and in communication throughout the system, wouldn't this be a good way to express good faith in such ideals? Does the limitation of technology have to stop us from doing this?

LL: Appreciate the artful framing. Sometimes we let technology be a reason for not doing things. Will continue to explore the possibilities here, and without promising an outcome, will see what can be done in this instance as a work-around.

Schulte: Chico has experienced another student death this weekend. How might we better support counselors on campuses?

LL: Has talked about the situation with President Zingg and they have decided to bring the issue up to the Council of Presidents. Has also reached out to Ray Murillo; there is a need to examine resources. Employee assistance exists, but may not be enough. The CSU has to act as a family in these situations and take care of one another. Was unaware that part-time counselors are replacing full-time across the system and wants to explore this further.

Soni: Impressed with the number of task forces and groups being created in HR. Are faculty members being asked to serve on these? The ASCSU could help in this regard.

LL: Yes, and one in particular on leadership development will involve faculty, with hope that there will be more.

LoCascio: Being on a committee for mental health issues is aware that the number one issue is depression. Students have passed a fee and gotten more counseling staff, yet what about the requirements for counselors to also publish?

LL: This is a conversation in partnership involving HR, the contract, and Academic Affairs. Has seen this in other systems, that is, the complicated balancing act between academic requirements and the need for counselor contact hours.

Gubernat: Do faculty know enough about their responsibilities under Title IX, for example, the mandatory reporting requirements?

LL: Yes, faculty are mandatory reporters, and the policy was developed before [my] time, and came out with some training. But there wasn't the necessary meet and confer. In order to meet requirements, the emphasis had been on getting it rolled out and not on the training itself. Those who have taken it like the

training, but more communication is needed once the EO is revised. These are critical issues and it is important to foster a safe working and learning environment.

Ullman: To continue the dialogue about mental health concerns: More and more of our students are coming with unaddressed mental health needs. Funding is an issue: there are limits to how many counselors can be hired on the basis of special student fees. There is a collision too regarding the differences between PhD and MD practitioners within the tenure process itself, which doesn't mesh with all the degree requirements for counselors. All the UCs have AP accreditation while we have only three; that's the gold standard and can pay off quite a bit—you get interns, the ability to meet with more clients; the standard of care gets raised.

LL: You all see this as fairly significant. Both student affairs and academic affairs professionals need to join in this conversation since there is an overlap of issues. Maybe there is a possibility of talking with the ASCSU Chair to make this happen. The caveat is that we cannot tell people how to run clinics. Couldn't be more in agreement with the concerns voiced here.

Holl: Can the Chancellor help campuses hire more tenure-track faculty, given the declining ratio? T/t faculty are the folks who hold everything together, advise students, design curriculum, but currently we are not replacing lost faculty; many are FERPing/retiring and this is a loss to our institutional family and culture. Perhaps if the Chancellor could encourage campuses to do more hiring, it would have some effect.

LL: The Chancellor has said that he is dedicated to more t/t hiring and that message went out in the support budget last year and this year. There will a conversation at the Council of Presidents on this very topic. The ASCSU Chair and I have had discussions on this, and perhaps there is need for a work group on the subject. But it must be done in a "plan-ful" way. More data is needed about projections of those retiring, resigning; we must account for what's going out not just coming in. The tenure density issue is interesting: how does that look in terms of the number of students served?

Heiden: There is a need to clarify mandatory reporting, which is in direct contrast to what is required of psychologists; it involves minors only. Other concerns are about the safety of the environment (when, for example, an active shooter is on a campus). It is important to communicate with a department about who may be under threat in a given situation and how to deal with it; there is confusion about who has the right to certain information, and this could use a lot more attention system-wide. The Red Folder doesn't comprise all that is needed in an acute emergency.

LL: Will double check on the Executive Order and who can/must report. Will also take the comment about safety to Steve Relyea and see what is being done.

Kensinger: Thanks for the system's concerns about sexual assault and sexual violence on campuses as serious issues. The ASCSU resolution we passed called for all relevant committees to include staff and faculty. How are we going to use faculty expertise to create a more supportive climate, not just through training but in all aspects of such situations?

LL: Will go back and see which committees are working on the issue and if there is faculty representation. Safety is a collective responsibility.

Swartz: On the topic of FERPs, retirees, retired annuitants and their contributions to institutional memory; many still want to serve the CSU in some capacity. Could we take a hard look at a system-level program to enable them to do so?

LL: Not sure what the barriers might be to such service but will investigate.

### **7.11 Dean Kulju, Director – Financial Aid & Scholarship Program**

Director Kulju presented a Powerpoint slide presentation entitled “Sustainable Financial Model: SUG overview & review of other models,” comprising a number of statistics about those students receiving financial aid. State programs in Maryland and Texas were compared with those for both the UC and CSU. The “CSU Approach” as one slide outlines it, is “Grants first, loans last,” including SUGs, given to those eligible, in contrast to the “UC Approach” of “Loans/work before UC grant.” He presented data from a sample financial aid package for a Cal B recipient, broken down by a budget for a student living either as a commuter (at home) or as a resident (either on- or off-campus). In discussing SUG recipients, he noted that 95% have an EFC (expected family contribution) of less than \$4,000. The average income for dependent students in the system is \$20,235; for independent students: \$13,981. 60% of the students are living off-campus; over 62% do not receive any family contribution. He noted that more families are applying as people are migrating downward economically in what is, in his words, “a perfect storm.”

Regarding the SUG funding requirement, his presentation quoted SB 97, chaptered into law 9/26/13, related to the Middle Class Scholarship: “CSU shall maintain their funding for institutional need-based grants (SUG) at a level that, at a minimum, is equal to the level maintained for undergraduates during the 2013-14 academic year.” Preliminary data show that there was SUG funding of approximately \$550M for undergraduates; \$82.5M for credential/grad students.

Faculty had a number of questions, including the following, paraphrased below:

Aren't SUGs really foregone income for the CSU? Shouldn't the state be paying? Kulju agreed that the SUGs represent over 650M in tuition discounts, but also noted that there is a commitment to access, diversity, and affordability in the CSU: what balance would be needed to maintain that commitment and to preserve salaries?

SUGs have increased when tuition has increased. Is there a set of criteria being followed, or are more and more people eligible? The answer was that nothing has changed: there is a 1/3 set-aside, and it is not determined by how many apply. The money exists and must be distributed.

On the matters of family assets and the responsibility to pay back financial aid should a student be forced to withdraw before completing a semester: home equity on a principal residence is not included in the determination. When a student withdraws, the CSU is required by federal regulation, by a prescriptive formula, to calculate what portion of the aid needs to be returned. Academic progress, attempted units, completed units—all have to be monitored, and the general advice is for a student to discuss his/her situation with a financial aid counselor before withdrawing.

When students are living independently but in difficult conditions (four to a bedroom; three in a studio) to what extent is that taken under consideration when making financial aid awards?

Kudju's answer was that the professional judgment of an aid administrator can be involved, but usually in cases involving childcare or medical/dental expenses. A catastrophic situation might justify more aid than what the campus usually awards for room and board.

#### **7.12 Kristin Crellin, President – Alumni Council and Aaron Moore, Director – Advancement**

Crellin and Moore reported on the “Class of 3 Million” alumni project. A system website [<https://classof3million.calstate.edu>], which drives back to campuses, has been established, as has an online “yearbook” for people to register in, with many opportunities for alumni networking and a \$10,000 scholarship. Crellin noted that alums are in industry, are astronauts, health care workers, entrepreneurs—they present a strong picture of what the CSU provides for the workforce of California. “Badges” are being established to honor service. Lapel pins and wristbands will be distributed to all 2015 graduates honoring them as part of the Class of 3 Million. Senators are asked to help get the word out about this program. Dr. Blischke remarked that ERFA's newsletter would welcome an article on the subject since so many of its 2,500 members have taught these alums. Senator Yudelsohn suggested that alumni might help current students by providing them with internships, and that highlighting famous alumni (Kevin Costner went to Fullerton, for example) could be useful in raising awareness of the campaign.

#### **7.13 Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor**

Chancellor White welcomed senators back to a new calendar year, hoping that their Decembers, though filled with grading and manuscripts, also had provided some good family time.

He noted that the upcoming week was an important one: There would be a retreat for the Board of Trustees on Monday, followed by their meeting, when four Wang awards for faculty, chosen from among 80 nominees, would be given. He said that Trustee Lillian Kimball had recently sent him a note about the Wang applicants, acknowledging that she was absolutely blown away by the quality of the work, its breadth and importance, that so many faculty are doing across the 23 campuses. The Chancellor added that it is important for the “new guard” on the Board to come to such realizations; he has been encouraging trustees to make campus visits in order to better understand their fiduciary responsibilities in the light of what faculty, staff, and students are achieving. It is important that all recognize why the CSU provides the kind of support to students that it does. During the retreat, he also mentioned, there would be attention paid to of the legal responsibility for open communication among Board members, particularly in light of the Bagley-Keene Act.

The Chancellor then invited individual questions from the floor; questions and answers are paraphrased below.

LoCascio: Are SUGs now out of the way? Not so happy about the 198 request not being supported. We seem to be spending as much money on athletics as on academics. Since his provost had mentioned that philanthropic donations drive the budget, could a letter go out to a particularly successful alum in Mechanical Engineering asking for help in augmenting a faculty member's salary?

White: Point not lost on me. We need to be better at connecting alumni with faculty, especially through departmental efforts. Had seen an example of such while at Oregon State where an alumna in Corvallis donated 27M in recognition of a faculty member's saving her horse's life. The CSU has had its best year in fundraising this year; this is a credit to faculty, in particular. And SLO is having uncommon success in fundraising right now.

Foroohar: Grateful for your office's response to our resolution on academic freedom. But what is troubling is the reference to our current CSU policy on academic freedom, which is only a statement written in 1971. As the largest public university system, why are we still looking at such an incomplete statement? We have another resolution on the need for a comprehensive policy on academic freedom; while you may not have the time for the details of such, could you make an exception in this case and tell us what you really think about the issue of academic freedom and how to go about framing a policy for the CSU?

White: Wants to be part of the conversation since academic freedom drives to the core of what it is to be an American university and is tied up with First Amendment rights. There is a need for such an intellectual discussion. Policy decisions need not have unintended consequences.

Sabalius: San Jose State has participated in a program in Salzburg on global citizenship to help infuse the curriculum with a global perspective. Over 100 have been involved and now would like some guidance on how the Chancellor's Office can help disseminate the expertise that has been developed in this area.

White: At the Council of Presidents would like to present a summary of these points of contact. "Global" doesn't necessarily mean that our students need to leave the country; maybe going to South Central LA would be as expanding for them as a trip to the Philippines, for example. But please get the information about the program to us.

Ornatowski: Has noticed a trend of small RFPs from the Chancellor's Office asking that campuses compete for funding for various projects. Is there not enough money in the system to award all 23 campuses, or is there a deliberate strategy to such competition?

White: We are under-resourced, of course, but at times the very best efforts found in competition could be scaled-up. Will look into this.

Guerin: Appreciate the comments on the Wang awards, which bring a lot of awareness of the quality of our great faculty; so it's important to attract more of such faculty to the CSU. This is related to tenure-track hiring: campus allocations for such mean we won't be hiring enough to even replace those going into retirement. In hiring scenarios on her campus, candidates have been turning down job offers. At the same time, the 1.6% raise and the rising costs of health care seem out of sync with the state budget. And only 2% is planned for next year. What plans do you have for turning this situation around? And for increasing tenure density?

White: This is worrisome, that is, the ratio of t/t faculty to total faculty. It would be helpful to know why capable candidates for t/t positions are turning offers down. There is a need for exit interviews to arrive at honest conversations. Maybe campuses need to adopt a different practice in hiring, to think as a group in interdisciplinary ways to ensure a permanent professoriate for the good of the institution.

In terms of compensation: we've pursued this strategically with a three-year compensation concept of 3%, 2%, and 2%, and the pools were negotiated with the CFA. Will reopen on the salary piece going forward and hope to get that done sooner rather than later. A practical concern in the bargaining environment is that though the money was available in July, you haven't yet seen it in your paychecks. So there is some advantage to a long-term agreement so that things can move forward. As a community, we need to encourage ourselves and those at the bargaining table to see that long, arduous conversations may not be in everyone's best interests.

There is a fellow in his eighth decade who needs to put away his blue pencil. We were not at the top of the list last year in resources. We need advocates like Atkins and DeLeon; Atkins will be at the Board of Trustees meeting and it will be important to commend her for her past support of the CSU.

Holl: Wanted to reiterate the comments about hiring more tenure-track faculty as replacements for those retiring while even more students are being enrolled. We don't allocate lines for replacement. Could a system-wide initiative be led by the Chancellor to do so since it is about building a strong foundation and continuity for our endeavor? Can the Chancellor go one-on-one with the Governor as President Napolitano has been doing?

White: The needs in the CSU are as comparable in real dollars as those in the other system. We have taken the position of restraint, but our Board of Trustees have supported a budget above the Governor's, and we are trying to get those in Finance to understand why.

Ink in the *Sacramento Bee* says we will be admitting less than a 1% increase. We are in fact turning away not 20,000 but 30,000. We cannot admit them then not serve them, and have had to leave them at the door, as hard as that is. It is important to try to tie these numbers to the degree deficit; the State of the CSU speech really points out what a crisis this is. But the trouble is that this doesn't look like a crisis when visiting a campus. So how do we get elected officials to realize that if we don't act now? If we are committing to 100,000 more graduates, the state of California will have to step up. And soon our Board of Trustees may have to behave like the Regents, to say, after the March Board meeting that enough is enough, and we could have to start raising tuition in the next couple of years. What we do requires resources; and we are receiving 8,000 dollars less per degree from the state over the past decade. This doesn't work for getting graduates into the economy, and while this is a compelling story in D.C., it's not being recognized in the state. Will need more lobbying in Sacramento and from students as well, more individual conversations.

**7.14 CFA Liaison:** no report

## **8. Committee Recommendations**

### **Action Items:**

- 8.1 The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom: (AS-3197-14/FA (Rev)). Second Reading. Approved.
- 8.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance in the California State University: A Call to Campus Senates: (AS-3199-14/FA (Rev)). Second Reading. Approved unanimously.
- 8.3 Appreciation of Support for Passage of AB 2324 (Williams) *Trustees of the California State University: Faculty Member of the Board* (AS-3200-15/FGA). First Reading/Waiver. Approved unanimously.
- 8.4 Call for Withdrawal of the Proposed 2015 Teacher Preparation Regulations Under Title II of the Higher Education Act (AS-3201-15/APEP). First Reading/Waiver. Approved unanimously.

- 8.6 Commendation of the CSU Academic Conference 2014 (AS-3203-15/AA). First Reading/Waiver. Approved without dissent.

**First-reading Item**

- 8.5 Opposition to Publisher Bundling of Online Journals (AS-3202-15/FGA)

**9. Adjournment** at 2:45 p.m.