ASCSU Plenary Minutes
January 23-24, 2020
CSU Office of the Chancellor

Thursday, January 23, 2020 – 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium

Friday, January 24, 2020 - 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium

ROLL CALL

(CSU Bakersfield) Millar, Tarjan; (CSU Channel Islands) Grzegorczyk, Yudelson; (CSU Chico) Boyd, Ford; (CSU Dominguez Hills) Celly, Norman; (CSU East Bay) Glass; (CSU Fresno) Jenkins, Schlievert; (CSU Fullerton) Matz, Stambough, Stohs; (Humboldt State) Creadon, Zerbe; (CSU Long Beach) Janousek, Soni; (CSU Los Angeles) Bezdecny, Riggio; (CSU Maritime Academy) Browne; (CSU Monterey Bay) Lopez-Littleton, Waltz; (CSU Northridge) Ricks, Schutte, Sussman; (CSPU Pomona) Speak, Urey; (CSU Sacramento) Hamilton, Holl, Van Gaasbeck; (CSU San Bernardino) Steffel, Ullman; (San Diego State) Butler-Byrd, Csomay, Ornatowski; (San Francisco State) Collins, Sinha, Yee-Melichar; (San José State) Curry, Rodan, Van Selst; (CPSU San Luis Obispo) Laver, Rein; (CSU San Marcos) Barsky, Basu; (Sonoma State) Nelson, Ostroff; (CSU Stanislaus) Filling, Strahm

CALL TO ORDER

With a quorum being present, the meeting was called to order.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 14-15, 2019 MINUTES

Moved, Seconded and Approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There will be a social this evening, in the Wallace pre-function area, hosted by the Academic Preparation & Education Programs Committee
ASCSU Chair - Catherine Nelson

January 2020

- Welcome to the January 2020 ASCSU Plenary! I hope everyone had a restful winter break. This report updates you on events since our December Interim meetings.

Ethnic Studies

- At Assembly Member Shirley Weber’s invitation, Vice Chair Collins, Academic Affairs (AA) Committee Chair Schlievert, Fiscal & Governmental Affairs (FGA) Committee Chair Speak, Legislative Specialist Schutte and I met with Dr. Weber on January 14 about our AS-3403-19/AA (Rev) Recommended Implementation of a California State University (CSU) Ethnic Studies Requirement (several of us had spoken to Dr. Weber earlier in December to introduce her to our work). Dr. Weber indicated she thought our draft recommendation was inadequate and emphasized the importance of a 3-unit course as a cohesive requirement, as opposed to the more diffuse application of learning objectives over several courses. She also indicated that Ethnic Studies faculty should have the final say in courses that would meet the requirement. The bill will come out of the Senate Appropriations Committee this week (ask Jerry Schutte about that one). Dr. Weber indicated that while this bill is very important to her, it is not the most urgent matter on her plate so there is still time to “talk” or “negotiate” (she used both terms). AA will take up the revisions to AS-3403-19/AA (Rev) at their meeting tomorrow and have their final recommendation to us for our Thursday/Friday meeting. Also, the Extended Executive Committee in conjunction with Legislative Specialist Schutte is working on a letter to all State Senators in opposition to AB 1460 that emphasizes our work to create an alternative.

Quantitative Reasoning

- The proposal before the Board of Trustees next week regarding a 4th year of quantitative reasoning has changed. If approved, the Board would commit to the idea of a 4th year of quantitative reasoning for all students, and agree to consider such a requirement by spring 2022. The formal resolution from the Committee on Educational Policy agenda reads:

  **RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that:** The Board of Trustees seeks to have all incoming first year students complete, in addition to the current ‘a-g’ high school course requirements, a fourth year quantitative reasoning course, selecting from a wide range of courses as described in this agenda item, and will consider approving such a requirement and Title 5 change by spring 2022 to be effective fall 2027.

- The Chancellor shall submit to the Board a progress report in March 2021 and a final report by January 2022 that includes:
- a third-party independent analysis of the planned implementation and potential impact of the proposed requirement on high school students’ application to the CSU,
- the progress on doubling the number of Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics (STEM) qualified teachers annually prepared by the CSU,
- clarity of the charge, role and composition of a steering committee that reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs,
- clarity on exemptions for students whose public schools do not provide sufficient courses, and
- the progress on increasing outreach and awareness of the proposed requirement with schools, counselors, and families. (p. 27 of 27 of proposal).

The ASCSU remains on record in support of a 4th year of quantitative reasoning admissions requirement and calling upon the Chancellor’s Office (CO) to act collaboratively with our partners in the implementation of the proposal in a way that respects and addresses the concerns raised by all stakeholders and at the same time maintains high standards for a university education that prepares our students for the workforce and to lead their communities, the state and the nation. Last week APEP Chair Sue Holl and I sent a letter to Board of Trustees (BOT) Chair Trustee Day, Education Policy Committee Chair Trustee Taylor, and Chancellor White, reiterating those themes.

**Transfer**
- After several months of sometimes intense conversation in the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS, the Executive Committees of the California Community Colleges [CCC], CSU and University of California [UC] statewide academic senates) and several iterations, the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (ASCCC) is exploring the possibility of creating a mechanism to allow students to be eligible for transfer from a CCC to both the CSU and the UC in a specific disciplines where transfer pathways exist from the CCC to both systems. The mechanism, called a “UC Transfer Pathway Within a TMC” would be a path through a Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) set up under SB 1440 (Padilla, 2009) to allow CCC students graduating with an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) at a community college to get priority admission to a CSU in a major similar to the area of emphasis (roughly translated as a major) in the ADT and a guarantee that they can finish their degree at the CSU within 60 units. CCCs have a separate agreement with UCs to create UC Transfer Pathways, similar to ADTs built around a TMC, but with none of the guarantees around admission or time-to-degree. The pathway through the TMC would be created in areas where the TMC and UC Transfer Pathways (UCTP) overlap. There are six disciplines in which the CCCs have determined that the dual eligibility pathway can be created without changes to
the TMC so there is no specific action required by the intersegmental review process created under SB 1440 to approve such changes. If pathways are created for the remaining disciplines where transfer pathways exist for both systems, any changes to the TMC needed would need to go through the review and approval process. More information about TMCs is available at [https://e-id.net/tmc](https://e-id.net/tmc).

- **AB 1930 (Medina) Public Postsecondary Education: University of California and California State University: Student Eligibility Policy.**
  
  o This is a brand new bill by Assembly Member Jose Medina (introduced January 15, 2020) that would require the CSU Trustees, and request the UC Regents, before making any change in student eligibility policy that adds eligibility requirements that impact students across its segment, to coordinate with the other segment to align their respective student eligibility policies and to commission an independent study by a third-party research organization to assess the impact of the change in student eligibility policy on the eligibility rates of the graduates of public secondary schools who are members of underrepresented student groups. If such a change in eligibility policy is made by either segment, the bill requires an implementation committee be convened to develop a multiyear plan for that segment to work with the public elementary and secondary school system, the California Community Colleges, and the governing body of the other segment to implement the change and would require annual progress reports to the Governor, the Legislature, and the governing body of the other segment. If such a change in student eligibility requirements is approved by either the trustees or the regents between January 1, 2020 and the operative date of this bill, the bill would additionally require the trustees or request the regents, as applicable, to commission an independent study by a third-party research organization to assess the actual impact of this change ([http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1930](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1930)). The bill would be considered “urgent,” and if passed, would take effect immediately. The bill is clearly targeted to the CSU and the proposed 4th year Quantitative Reasoning (QR) proposal currently before the Board of Trustees. I will ask the Executive Committee tomorrow to approve referral of the bill to FGA for their review and consideration for ASCSU action.

- **CSU 2020-2021 Operating Budget**
  
  o On January 10 Governor Newsom released his 2020-2021 budget proposal. The CSU 2020-2021 Operating Budget Plan calls for $648m in new resources. The Governor’s budget proposes a $199 unallocated increase in new recurring funding. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget Ryan Storm’s January 17 PowerPoint presentation to the Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee about the Governor’s budget proposal will be available in the ASCSU 2019-20 shared
files folder in dropbox in the next day or two. You can also find more information in the Board of Trustees Committee on Finance January agenda at https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/past-meetings/2020/Documents/jan-28-29-FIN.pdf.

- **Chancellor’s Search Committee**
  - A reminder that Vice Chair Collins and I are on the Stakeholders Advisory Committee to the Trustees Search Committee that will choose a new Chancellor. If you have any questions or comments, you can contact us directly or visit the search website at https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/chancellor/chancellor-search.
  - Finally, as this report indicates we are currently working our way through several major issues all at once. A special thanks to the Executive and Extended Executive Committees, General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) Chair Van Selst, Legislative Specialist Schutte, Senator Tarjan and CSU Associate Director for Undergraduate Transfer Programs and Policy, Karen Simpson-Alisca for their assistance in charting a path through what have been (and one must assume will continue to be) at times choppy waters.

**Standing committees**

- **Academic Affairs (AA) – Susan Schlievert, Chair**
  - Academic Affairs had a two-page Agenda.
    - That became an aspiration—a wish-list—because all of our efforts were directed towards Ethnic Studies.
    - Our committee held honest, frank conversations. We’ve had extra Zoom meetings, we listened to Ethnic Studies Council members, we reviewed campus comments, we listened to our FGA colleagues, I participated in a Zoom conference with Dr. Weber, and our perspectives evolved.
    - What would we bring to the Plenary that recognized everyone’s feelings that acknowledged the current legislative bill, and was ultimately good for student success and for campus flexibility?
    - What you will see later is not a quick fix; rather, it represents hours—days—of consideration.
    - Our Committee was wonderful throughout. Madame Chair that concludes my report.

- **Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP) – Susan L. Holl, Chair**
  - APEP has been busy since the last Plenary. The members of APEP are very hard-working and dedicated. I am very grateful to them for their efforts at the meeting and throughout the time between meetings. Their contributions make us all stronger.
We spent much of December and early January soliciting letters to the Board of Trustees in support of the Quantitative Reasoning (QR) proposal before the Board of Trustees in January 2020. During our meeting we heard from our CO liaisons, Marquita Grenot-Scheyer and Ed Sullivan, about the adjustments that have been made to the proposal. These adjustments add an external review of the CSU data and a report on our success in developing Science Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics (STEM) High School (HS) teachers and outreach to HS districts, but does NOT change the final implementation date of fall 2027.

AB 1930 (Medina) was just proposed and it attempts to change the authority of the Board of Trustees over admission policy. We have developed two first reading items regarding this item – one in support of the current processes we use in creating policy with the Board of Trustees, and one in opposition to AB 1930. These items are co-sponsored by FGA.

Affirming the Role of the CSU Board of Trustees in Adopting Rules, Regulations and Policies Governing the University

Opposition to AB 1930 – CSU/UC Admission Policy

We discussed how to help ensure our students pre-matriculation preparation and developed a resolution to address advising in the HS to ensure all students have authentic access to all majors by advising them to take a quantitative reasoning course in their senior year of HS.

Advising High School Juniors Intending to Enroll in the CSU to Enroll in a Mathematics-Reinforcing Course in Their Senior Year

We also spent much time over January learning about the details of the Course Identification (C-ID) process to address an ask regarding TMC/ADTs from the CCCs. The focus of the ask, changed which prompted a revision of our resolutions. We have three first-reading resolutions regarding this topic.

Exploring common pathways for transfer to the CSU and UC

Resources to Support CSU Faculty Participation in the Course-Identification Numbering System (C-ID) Process

Endorsement of Criteria for Chemistry and Physics Model Curricula (MC) for Transfer to Receive the same Admission Advantage as for Transfer Model Curricula

Faculty Affairs (FA) - Steven Filling, Chair

Faculty Affairs had a productive meeting discussing a variety of issues and crafting a variety of resolutions. The breadth of our committee’s sphere of interest, Faculty Affairs, is reflected in the panoply of topics addressed by those documents.
Our resolution calling for improved communication about tenure track faculty openings has been revised and returns to the plenary agenda, as does our resolution directing attention toward developing a more humane environment on our campuses.

Mindful of the much discussed need for public conversation about the value of higher education, we were impressed by the recently published the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) Statement on Knowledge and Higher Education and we have a first reading item asking ASCSU to formally endorse that statement.

Another much discussed topic is the increasing role of contingent faculty in higher education. While we continue to believe firmly that increasing the number of tenure track faculty in the CSU is critical, we also firmly believe that we need to ensure that our non-tenure track colleagues are included in our conversations and deliberations. We are therefore bringing a resolution to this body calling for the establishment of dedicated seats on this body for full-time contingent faculty. Our campus senates have shown us the benefits of doing so, it is time for ASCSU to find a way to make that happen as well.

Our CO colleague Assistant Vice Chancellor Ganesh Raman gave us an overview of his impending presentation to the Board on research in the CSU which started a long conversation about faculty workload, facilities for research on our campuses, and the use of external funds to provide much needed resources for research projects. As in any large organization, collecting complete and accurate data about activities is a challenge. Our resolution in support of the Open Researcher and Contributor ID System (ORCID) asks that CSU actively support the integration of ORCID as a mechanism for improving our data about research activities and outcomes in the CSU.

As Chair Nelson’s report evidences, our work on transfer with our colleagues in the CCC and UC systems continues. We are all aware of the challenges inherent to developing intersegmental curricular agreements. We are also all aware that California’s Master Plan for higher education requires that we develop those agreements. The C-ID system (the Course Identification system) is intended to provide an intersegmental lingua franca for curriculum. In recent years, the incessant calls for C-ID course reviewers have made apparent the reality that faculty are not compensated adequately to engage in that work. Since this obviously impacts faculty workload and control over curriculum, we are bringing a resolution forward asking that the ASCSU Executive Committee work with the senate executive committees of the other segments to rethink the processes by which that intersegmental work is done with an eye toward reshaping those processes to fit our current environment.

We continued our exploration of diversity and inclusion in the faculty of the CSU and on our campuses more generally. We note that ASCSU has made a variety of statements and recommendations about matters related to diversity,
inclusion and campus climate. We also note that while those statements and recommendations are timely and considered expressions of our aspirations, as all organizations we could and should do more in terms of taking actions toward those goals. We believe that we are starting to make progress, but more attention and work is required. We encourage all our female senators to consider attending the organizational Women’s Caucus meeting at lunch tomorrow, and to take an active role in working toward our aspirations of a more diverse and inclusive environment - our students and our communities will benefit.

- **Fiscal & Governmental Affairs (FGA) - David Speak, Chair**
  - As you know, members of the FGA have been busy since our last plenary. Three trips to Sacramento, on December 10, December 19, 2019 and January 14, 2020, plus visits to local legislative offices. Emails and phone calls. We have been energetic in raising the visibility of the ASCSU’s legislative advocacy, and particularly in efforts to support the ASCSU’s opposition to Assembly Bill 1460. Working without paid staff in Sacramento, and without Political Action Committee (PAC) money to smooth access, we’ve relied on what academics have always relied on: the strength of our reasoned arguments and the law itself. The success of these efforts cannot be measured solely by the Secretary of State’s chapter book entering new legislation. And even there, success may sometimes reside in The Dog that Doesn’t Bark. But I’m confident that the long-term impact of ASCSU’s efforts has been heightened by what we’ve been doing. The committee is grateful to the Chair and the Vice Chair for their participation in many of these efforts.
  - AB 1460 still walks the earth, though technically only active status was (will be) bestowed later (earlier) this morning. Part of our meeting yesterday was spent in conference with California Faculty Association (CFA) representative Kevin Wehr concerning the possibility that our efforts in advancing a systemwide ethnic studies requirement may persuade the author or sponsors of the legislation to let it die, avoiding the destructive legislative precedent of direct, specific intrusion into the curriculum.
  - We discussed the governor’s budget proposal and decided not to offer a resolution concerning it at this time. Recall that the ASCSU is on record with a resolution supporting the BOT budget request. I only note here that the governor’s proposal is not as robust as the one preceding it. That was a very good year. Although the governor’s budget proposal does not specify the use of the $190 Million in additional money, that number conveniently but not
propitiously matches mandated costs and potential new costs from contract negotiations. No identifiable money for enrollment increases. The full scope of support for the CSU rests importantly with the success of the bond issue before the voters.

- We also talked about and consulted with APEP on their resolutions concerning AB 1930, transparently aimed at the QR proposal.
- Yesterday we began what is ordinarily the heaviest lift for the committee, which is scouting out, monitoring, and evaluating bills in order to make recommendations to the whole body in March. Once again we are struck by the drastic ‘asynchrony’ between the legislative calendar and the academic calendar to which we adhere.
- We bring no new resolutions to the floor this plenary session, and are still in consultation about co-sponsoring legislatively oriented resolutions with APEP.
- This concludes our report.

Romey Sabalius – CSU Faculty Trustee

Good morning Senators! Happy New Year!

- An eventful and challenging year is ahead of us, which will culminate with the presidential election. But before that, California will hold a possibly more consequential election in March. Prop. 13 proposes $15 Billion for higher education facilities of which the CSU could receive $2 Billion. The distribution of funds will be contingent on campuses proving that they made affordable student housing available for students in need. But before, the measure has to be approved by the voters. And as much as we would like to spread the word on this worthy cause, I want to remind you that as state employees, we are not allowed to use state resources in promoting a yes vote on this proposition. You should also not advocate for the passage of this measure in class or by using your university email address. By all means, you can privately encourage all your family and friends to support higher education in this election.

- Governor’s Budget Proposal:
  - Talking about money, let's take a look at the Governor's budget proposal that came out earlier this month. Other that last year, when the CSU received generous allocation without much of a struggle, this year's budget proposal is quite disappointing. This is surprising, because the economy is still strong, the budget is solid, and the reserves are larger than ever. And yet, of the approximate $700 Million requested as an augmentation by the trustees, so far the Governor has allocated only $200 Million in recurring funds and a minimal amount in one-time funds. This – obviously – falls much short of the Board's request and – more disturbingly – of our essential needs. And all that in a year, when contract negotiations with all of our larger bargaining units are coming up.
  - Now, the Governor states that his envisioned allocation to the CSU constitutes an increase of 5%. However, the state contributes a little over one half to our
operating budget, and with the Governor's and the legislators concern over college affordability and access, there is a clear expectation that the CSU will not raise tuition. With our current operating budget of $7.2 billion, the $200m increase amounts to only approximately 2.75%.

- We all know that construction costs are going through the roof and so are the costs for material and labor for the maintenance of our facilities. Then there are the usual high increases in our health care benefits, and --as mentioned before--salary increases will inevitably be negotiated. Without a significant augmentation by the legislator, the CSU would be in a budget crisis and forced to cut back in many areas -- and that when the state has record surpluses and the economy is strong. That does not make sense, and I am --I guess we all are--surprised and disappointed by the Governor's proposal. It will require an intense lobbying effort by the staff of the Chancellor's Office, the faculty and staff labor representatives, the student leadership, and ideally also the general public to convince the legislators and the Governor that this is the right time for a substantial investment in higher education to strongly position the state and its citizens for more difficult years that will surely come eventually.

- (My ideas how to accommodate our spending obligations with the proposed funding allocation)

  - Graduation Initiative (GI) 2025: forsake $30 Million that we were short last year / hope that legislators will fund the 4th year in the full amount of $75 Million.
  - Almost all of the Governor proposed $199 Million will have to go to salary and benefits and mandatory costs.
  - The $15 Million for student basic needs will continue to come from the GI money and the operating fund in general. During the last BOT meeting, Chancellor White made clear that - while there was a line item for Basic Needs Partnerships of $15 Million - the CSU already spends far more on student basic needs annually. That money will continue to flow, but there might not be an augmentation to the contribution the student basic needs.
  - Money for facilities was neither granted in on-going, nor in one-time funds. I assume that was with the expectation that Proposition 13 will pass and the CSU will receive a generous, but much needed allocation of $2 Billion to address our facility and infrastructure needs. If it indeed passes, then we will be fine. If not, then I am certain that the Governor and the legislators will agree on the need to augment our budget to at least address our more urgent deferred maintenance needs.

- BOT meeting next week
  - Budget
  - 4th Year of Quantitative Reasoning as an Admission Requirement to the CSU
• **Campus Visits:**
  - Between now and the next ASCSU meeting, I plan to visit San Francisco State University on February 3 (that is very soon) and on February 28, I plan to be at the Maritime Academy again. I say again because I have been there on several occasions, but not yet on a structured campus visit. There will be more campus visits in the spring, and I envision to cover the few campuses that I had not visited yet and a full campus visit (May 1: San Luis Obispo).

**Other committees and committee liaisons**

• **General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) - Mark Van Selst, Chair**
  - CSU GE review: appeals processes were discussed (continuing);
  - College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Spanish with writing is now posted on the credit by exam list (as recommended by GEAC in November);
  - Ethnic Studies: the impact of the possible addition of an ethnic studies requirement to lower division GE on the community colleges was discussed. The impact will be a large one;
  - student preparation and support;
    - Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF): changes to the BOT item were discussed
    - AB 705 (community college placement into courses and self-placement processes, guided pathways)
  - defining flexibility in GE: revision of EO 1100 FAQ about what types of variations are permissible within GE (normalizing the process);
  - discussion of how ADT/UC Pathways possible actions may impact GE (IGETC or CSU GE is required within each ADT).
  - Senator Kelly Janousek, CSU Long Beach, liaison to Council of Library Directors (COLD) reported several items.
    - Library of Congress with Dartmouth College felt that cataloging of “illegal aliens” was inappropriate. The House of Representative ordered the Library of Congress not to change this subject heading.
    - BUT, COLD has made a change our system wide library catalog, OneSearch, as of January 2020. All subject headings of:
      - Aliens will change to Noncitizens; and Illegal Aliens will change to Undocumented Immigrants.
    - Hence, the outcome is COLD has been awarded by Central Coast Coalition for Undocumented Students Success (CCC-USS) for racial change makers for those who challenge anti-immigrant and oppressive ideologies, institutional practices and everyday actions that threaten undocumented and historically marginalized communities.
Scholarly Communications is an emerging area for faculty publications. CSU Sacramento has been awarded a workshop on scholarly communications by the national Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). Worth attending, if given the chance.

Our contract with publisher Elsevier (ScienceDirect database) is up for renewal. COLD is reviewing the contract to make sure that Faculty who publish with this publisher keep their article rights for Open Access publishing. Currently, faculty do not have these rights and the University of California did not renew their contract, causing an earthquake in libraryland. Open Access right is important for any faculty member who is publishing under federal or state research funding – they must distribute their results to the public. The system is working on finishing on getting all campuses their own campus ScholarWorks up and running. This software allows open access publishing. (Described below)

ScholarWorks suite of open-source systems for managing, preserving, and providing access to the unique digital collections of the CSU includes:

- electronic theses and dissertations
- faculty research publications
- open educational resources
- digitized historical materials
- tools to support scholarly publishing, including open access journals

**SPEAKERS**

**Kevin Wehr - California Faculty Association (CFA) Liaison Report** (Time Approximate: Thursday, 9:15 a.m.)
- Concerns that state budget is not sufficient
- Oppose quantitative reasoning admission requirement
- Intent to open negotiations
- Increase tenure-density

**Timothy P. White – CSU Chancellor** (Time Certain: Thursday, 11:00 a.m.)
- Governor's budget is not sufficient and the CSU has a "heavy lift" to advocate for additional funding
- Asked to serve on NCAA Task Force for name/image/likeness
  - How do you do a national competition for a sport if different states have different rules about making money or name/image/likeness?
    - Need for unified rules
  - If can’t solve issues will have larger implications for overall athletics revenues
- Advocacy for bond issues
  - Many trade groups in support
Many editorial boards in support

- Actively trying to increase tenure-track density with a multitude of strategies
- What might you recommend to your successor on role of faculty in analyzing data related to decision-making?
  - Sufficient but not endless discussion, eventually have to make decision and can correct direction as needed
- ASCSU has instituted a Womxn’s Caucus
- Thoughts on legislative interest in the CSU and best way to advocate to the legislature
  - California has a finite budget and money spent on one item means it can’t be spent on another item
  - CSU is a discretionary item in the budget
    - Have to be very careful about encumbering funds that can’t be reapportioned during a recession
- Ways to allow voting on campuses, getting people registered to vote, and encouraging participation in the census
- Please provide revenue implications at a future meeting.
- Students are recruited as athletes but aren’t appropriately-supported, how can we help underwrite and support student-athletes?
  - Conflict between student/employee
  - Conflict with anti-trust law
- State law supercedes CSU policy
- There is only one Chancellor and at a time, and they would sign a relevant Executive Order (EO).

Jacquelyn Acosta, CSSA Liaison Report (Time Approximate: Friday, 9:30 a.m.)
- Questions on how Ethnic Studies requirements would affect course loads

CSU Trustee Jane W. Carney (Time Certain: Friday, 10:00 a.m.)
- Issues to consider in the future
  - Food insecurity
  - Housing costs
  - Multi-year budgeting
  - Ability for BoT to exchange and discuss ideas with faculty
  - Request from Trustee Carney for ASCSU to take up issue of housing costs for faculty
  - Public comment at BOT meeting
  - Consider how next Chancellor views Shared governance
  - Faculty/Admin make decisions together
  - Distributed decision making to various constituencies
  - Consultative mode of decision-making where admin decides
• Effect of Artificial Intelligence on Higher Education
• Continue to consider sustainability and climate change
• BOT selects Chancellors and Presidents
  o Pay attention to how Chancellor or President will create a functional, healthy environment and climate

Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs (Time Certain: Friday, 11:00 a.m.)
  • Thank you for your work on Ethnic Studies
    o CO is still in opposition to AB1460 because of legislative intrusion and because of the narrow focus of the bill
  • 3 items for BOT Educational Policy
    o Occupational Therapy Doctoral degree (CSU Dominguez Hills and San Jose State University) – information item
    o Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities (RSCA) Report
    o Student who would be impacted by Quantitative Reasoning proposal

Susan L. Holl, ASCSU Senator (CSU Sacramento) for Barry Pasternack, President of the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Student Association (CSU ERFSA) - CSU-ERFSA Report
  • Bob Girling (Sonoma State University) agreed to take over as Chair of the Legislative Committee from Alan Wade, who served for many years in this position. Bob attended the December 2019 meeting of the CalPERS Board and has an article in the upcoming edition of the Reporter on the meeting as well as a ‘THOUGHT AND ACTION’ piece on the possible impacts on fire safety due to the Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) bankruptcy

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Notification of Tenure-track Openings to Incumbent Contingent Faculty, Librarians, Coaches & Counselors AS-3393-19/FA (Rev) Second Reading
Approved Without Dissent

Recommended Implementation of a California State University (CSU) Ethnic Studies Requirement AS-3403-19/AA (Rev) Second Reading
Approved

Creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to Advance Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Within the Academic Senate CSU AS-3404-19/EX (Rev) Second Reading
Approved Unanimously

Creating a Holistic and Humane Educational Environment in the California State University (CSU) AS-3405-19/FA (Rev) Second Reading
Referred to Committee
The California State University
Office of the Chancellor

Apportionment of Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Seats
Approved Unanimously

Approved Unanimously

First Reading/Waiver

THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS WERE INTRODUCED FOR FIRST READING CONSIDERATION:

Affirming the Role of the CSU Board of Trustees in Adopting Rules, Regulations and Policies Governing the University

Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Endorsement of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement “In Defense of Knowledge and Higher Education”

Opposition to AB 1930 – CSU/UC Admission Policy

Addition of Dedicated Contingent Faculty Senate Members

Advising High School Juniors Intending to Enroll in the California State University (CSU) to Enroll in a Mathematics-Reinforcing Course in Their Senior Year

Resolution in Support of ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) for the California State University (CSU)

Importance of Seamless Transfer Patterns for Students from California Community Colleges (CCC) to the California State University (CSU)

Resources to Support California State University (CSU) Faculty Participation in the Course-Identification Numbering System (C-ID) Process

Endorsement of Criteria for Chemistry and Physics Model Curricula (MC) for Transfer to Receive the Same Admission Advantage as for Transfer Model Curricula (TMC)

Request for Review and Update of Intersegmental Curricular Processes

ADJOURNMENT