

**Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Minutes**

March 19 - 20, 2015  
Office of the Chancellor

**Plenary – Thursday, March 19, 2015 – 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. – Dumke Auditorium**

Senate Social – Faculty Affairs Committee hosting  
5:15 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. – Munitz Lobby

**Plenary – Friday, March 20, 2015 – 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. – Dumke Auditorium**

**1. Call to order:** 8:10 a.m.

**2. Roll call**

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

**Guests:** William Blischke, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA) Liaison; Honora Chapman, Faculty Trustee Candidate (Fresno); Gerard Hanley, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Technology Services; Andrew Merrifield, CFA Liaison; J. Lawrence Norton, CSU Trustee; Ken O’Donnell, Senior Director – Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives and Partnerships; Sara Sanders, CSSA Liaison; Steven Stepanek, CSU Faculty Trustee; John Tarjan, Faculty Trustee Candidate (Bakersfield); Ron Vogel, Associate Vice Chancellor; Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor

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

**4. Approval of Minutes of January 22-23, 2015:** Approved.

**5. Announcements:**

Chair Filling welcomed back Ron Vogel who had been on medical leave.

## 6. Presentations/Introductions

Chair Steven Filling (Stanislaus) introduced Professor Ann Strahm.  
 Senator Thomas Norman (Dominguez Hills) introduced Senator Charles Thomas.  
 Senator Robert Collins (San Francisco) introduced Professor Nancy Gerber.

## 7. Reports

### 7.1 Chair

Chair Filling referred to his written report distributed via email. He asked if there were any questions on the report from the body. There were none.

### 7.2 Standing committees

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

Chair Eadie reported on the committee's having a lively meeting Wednesday during which they succeeded in addressing many agenda items. He reported on a time certain meeting between AA and the Executive Committee, at AA's request, to discuss how the ASCSU is handling its relationship with WICHE. This group has been working on the Passport project, involving standards for General Education courses; a passport is a package that can be transferred among institutions in the Western states. So far, CSU faculty are attending the meetings as observers. However, there is concern that CSU faculty's attendance may be misrepresented since the WICHE website refers to the ASCSU as a full participant in the process, whose ultimate goal is to create a "passport" of courses that any participating university in the Western states involved will accept for transfer automatically. Eadie said that he understood that the senate will hear from Ken O'Donnell later on during plenary about how the Chancellor's Office plans to respond to and correct this misrepresentation. Meanwhile, the committee has drafted a resolution on the matter.

AA discussed new graduate requirements for the M.A. degree. These involve proposals from the graduate deans that have been modified over time and eventually would necessitate a Title V change. Smaller campuses such as Humboldt have raised objections to some of these new policies; nothing has been settled at this point. The committee decided to take a different tack, that is, to define what a master's degree is in the CSU, that is, to put forward some general principles to distinguish the M.A. from the B.A. and Ph.D. The committee has done so in the past and is hoping to present a paper at the May plenary laying out the differences.

Regarding their discussion of the Chancellor's response to the BA pilot programs put forward by the community colleges: Eadie deferred to Senator Filling's report but also offered to answer questions from the body on this subject.

A group in AA is working on the issues of active learning and student success, and Eadie expects the work will result in a short white paper. In AA's ongoing work on assessment, Senator Collins is taking the lead and will present a resolution to the body on Friday.

The system-wide sustainability committee has been meeting regularly and has proposed a system-wide sustainability minor that campuses could adopt. Eadie yielded to Senator Aloisio to describe that plan and to answer questions:

Senator Aloisio reported that former senator Jim Postma, and current senators Yee-Melichar, Van Selst and himself have been discussing a sustainability minor and the need to leverage funding and resources—to apply for external funding, in fact—to implement it. There was initial concern that the CSU does not offer system-wide minors currently, but Aloisio noted that the minor would be housed on each campus and could be a different minor for each of the 23 campuses. What makes the proposal “system-wide” is the possibility of leveraging resources for such a minor across the system, maybe offering a summer institute, having campuses participating in a living lab, etc. The concept is not that the system itself would offer the minor.

Through GEAC, Eadie said, AA has come to understand that our community college colleagues, anticipating the need to offer GE upper division courses for the first time in their new baccalaureate programs, have been asking for CSU help in determining the nature of such courses. AA has drafted a resolution to provide help and guidance to these colleagues, and that resolution will be introduced in plenary as well.

Senators had a number of questions and comments for Senator Aloisio. He was asked if his group would be recommending courses or pathways or criteria for the minor. He said that he expected there could be recommendations for core-learning objectives that could be modified by a campus, but not for courses or for a pathway. Modules and possibly articulation agreements could be developed but none of this is certain as of yet. The purpose is not to be prescriptive. In response to a question about campus autonomy over curriculum, he reiterated that each minor would be housed on a campus whose curriculum committee would have approved of it. The minor could fall under GE if not part of another program or department.

In response to Eadie’s earlier request that Chair Filling elaborate to the issue of the community college baccalaureate degree process, Filling reported as follows:

The Chancellor ultimately made the final decisions about what the CSU response was to the 15 pilot programs. And while the community colleges were mandated to consult with the CSU, they were not mandated to accept CSU’s advice. According to the Chancellor, the meaning of the very term “duplication” also seemed to be at issue, though Excom had believed we had come to an agreement about its meaning. There is inevitable duplication of GE at the lower division level, though the reviews did not focus on that. In reviewing the degrees, the Chancellor said he needed to see the net difference, and that he gave serious thought to what might challenge programs and finances at the CSU. He thought too, he said, about the political problems the CSU is faced with in the matter and that, ultimately, it would be untenable to say that all of the baccalaureate pilot programs duplicate what we do. The Board went forward with the nine to which there was no objection; four more would be reviewed for changes, and two would not proceed.

Going forward, the Chancellor suggested that if CSU programs contain unspecified credits that it would behoove us to think of how these are written and to both tighten requirements and specify a range of options. There will be students who will want to transfer to the CSU, and it will be important to provide them a pathway to do so. The Chancellor finally noted that he wanted to engage in an extensive conversation with the new Executive Vice Chancellor, the Executive Committee and others about how to best to limit any damage the process may have created; the Chancellor will appear later at the plenary and is willing to address the senate’s questions then.

Senator Nelson raised concerns about shared governance, in this instance in particular, and in general. What weight does our input have when administrative decisions are being made? Has the Executive Committee raised this with the Chancellor? What is the state of shared governance in the CSU if we have so little impact?

Chair Filling replied that yes, the issue of shared governance was raised and the fact that, in the matter of the baccalaureate pilot programs, consultation resulted in very little attention being paid to faculty and campus input. He said that he warned the Chancellor that it is going to be difficult in the future to ask faculty to take seriously the need for consultation and to undertake work that later will not be paid attention to. Other members of the Executive Committee had various responses to the concerns expressed about shared governance. It was noted that shared governance was indeed effective: there were processes in place for deliberation and consideration of the evidence gathered, and that shared governance does not mean a Chancellor will always accept faculty recommendations, which are advisory, not prescriptive. Other comments questioned whether shared governance was effective and whether, indeed, it has become weakened in this instance and over time.

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

Chair Fleming reported that the committee met yesterday with Ken O’Donnell to discuss the CSU graduation initiative, in particular, metrics in this second phase involving the 2025 six-year graduation rate as well as a metric for closing the gap for students of color. There are now four metrics: a two-year metric for transfers, a four-year metric for transfers, a four-year metric for freshmen and one for closing the gap for students from lower socioeconomic statuses.

IPEDs (Integrated Post-Secondary Education) are the primary entity and gold standard for collecting and analyzing data reporting. Currently they account for even a four-year plus a month graduation rate as falling into the six-year category, so O’Donnell is working to effect a change in how these data are reported to better reflect the reality of our students’ completion rates.

O’Donnell also reported to the committee on “linked learning pathways.” Site visits to community colleges will provide information on how they are organizing curriculum (in East L.A., for example) to ensure that students are ready for transfer and for the world of work at the same time.

Other matters discussed by the committee:

- Superintendent Torlakson’s letter of encouragement to opt in to Smarter Balanced for high school students considering community colleges and the CSU;
- Positions being filled on the Admissions Advisory Board by Presidents Castro and Hagen--two other positions, one for a campus admissions director and a student affairs representative are not yet been filled;
- A new statement on Area F, for which the committee plans to bring forth a resolution with a waiver at the May plenary.
- The current state of impaction among CSU campuses, with six campuses set to declare new impactions.

In response to a question about the status of Ed.D. programs, Fleming reported that there are 22 more students enrolled over last year’s count, making the total 412 participants, mostly in P-12, with a slight decrease in those preparing for community college teaching. There are a number of joint programs, and the degree programs, in general, appear to be money-makers, she said, for the campuses that offer the degree. There was a comment about the fact that in the case of Sonoma’s joint Ed.D. program with Davis, it is Davis collecting the fees and the FTES so that Sonoma may not, in fact, be the beneficiary.

Finally, Fleming reported there are efforts being made to establish BOARS member contacts, needed for both CSU and UC, beneficial to both for improved relationships and networking.

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

Chair Foroohar reported that the committee has been working on their tenure density resolution which requests that the Chancellor's Office, in consultation with ASCSU, draft a plan with targets for increasing tenure density; the resolution will come to the floor tomorrow.

Vice Chancellor of Human Resources Lori Lamb and Assistant Vice Chancellor Margie Merryfield reported to the committee on tenure-track searches: Currently there are 840 searches going on for 2015-16. Some campuses are already reporting their plans for the following year, and a more exact report can be anticipated for the May plenary.

The committee also discussed RSCA funding with Zed Mason, who is new to the office of Research Initiative and Partnerships, and emphasized the committee's commitment to continued advocacy for enhanced RSCA funding. There were brief reports from CFA liaison Andy Merrifield and from Leo Van Cleve as well as a helpful training session with Senator Benavides on using Zoom for future videoconferencing during interim sessions.

A question was raised about how representative, in fact, were these numbers for new hires when looking at the overall net of tenure-track faculty. Foroohar agreed and emphasized how important it is to look not only at plans for new hiring but to have access to separation and retirement figures. In fact, the net gain looks more like 124, and the record is one of depletion. Density is, in fact, going down, SFR is going up, while on many campuses there has been an increase in MPP hiring at the same time. While HR points to the fact that there are more faculty in the system than ever, those numbers account for lecturer faculty numbers, too, so the picture is skewed. It was also mentioned that there is difficulty in getting accurate numbers with respect to departures since the annual report does not account for last-minute separations and retirements. While data is available, it may not be timely. Meanwhile, at the current rate of replacement, it would take years to hire sufficient numbers of tenure-track faculty, so a multi-year hiring plan is critical.

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

Chair Krabacher reported that the committee is working to finalize their recommendations for senate positions to be taken on legislative bills. A draft version was sent out to all senators last Thursday with the expectation that they might become familiar with the relevant bills before voting on an omnibus resolution to be presented as a first reading with a waiver.

The committee will present at plenary a second reading of its resolution on Wiley's bundling of online articles and implications for library access. Some changes have been made to the original resolution in order to keep current with an evolving situation.

A third resolution due to be presented, again with a waiver, requests that legislators formally sign on to a CSU initiative to advocate for an augmentation in this year's budget. This is an initiative similar to last year's and comes from Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa's office; it gets all stakeholders in the CSU—ASCSU, CFA, CSUEU, CSSA—on the same page in requesting the augmentation, and is intended as a significant addition to person-to-person lobbying efforts.

Another potential resolution addresses lease arrangements of campus facilities and arises out of a situation at CSU Sacramento. Krabacher said that Vice Chair Miller will take the lead in presenting this resolution.

The committee also devoted time to Advocacy Day planning for April 14, again with a focus on budget augmentation. Lobbying will involve members of FGA, chairs of standing committees, and the Executive

Committee; those who will be lobbying are requested to attend a “nuts and bolts” orientation meeting tomorrow during lunch time in the Anacapa room.

Andy Merrifield, CFA liaison, met with FGA but was not yet able to present CFA positions on upcoming bills, which haven’t been finalized. In answer to a question from the floor, Krabacher said that there seems to be much congruence between CFA and CSU positions on bills. Meanwhile, CSSA is still working on theirs. The committee hopes to be in touch with CSUEU on their positions as well.

A question was raised about a bill referring to animal experimentation. Krabacher replied that his understanding was that the bill was directly mainly at UC and had little relevance for the CSU. Other questions involved the effect that the legal definition of “supplanting” might have on course offerings and why the oil tax and other sources of revenue are not on CSU’s advocacy agenda.

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

Trustee Stepanek referred to the report to the ASCSU sent out via email on Monday, and said that, in the interest of time, he would only mention highlights.

His recent campus visits were to San Francisco, San Marcos, and Pomona; a common theme to stress is the importance of meeting with students as well as with faculty and administrators. There were good conversations, phenomenal pride expressed on each of the local campuses—but a dearth of knowledge about the system itself. It would be important for senators to assist in getting the message of who we are as a system back to campuses.

When visiting, he likes campuses to demonstrate two or three things that are unique to their campus and that they are proud of; and he is particularly interested to learn of creative uses of technology. At Pomona, his visit was particularly well-timed, since the Board of Trustees will be receiving a report on the transfer of ownership to the CSU of the Lanterman state facility, a former state hospital, similar to the one at Camarillo that now is the site of the Channel Islands campus. There is a high probability that the Board will approve this, an exciting opportunity for Pomona. His next campus visit will be to Sonoma, April 16-17.

Senator Swartz noted that over the years several trustees have visited his campus (Pomona) and there is great benefit to such visits, not the least of which is that we discover things we didn’t know about ourselves and learn about what’s going on right in our own backyards.

### **7.4 Other committees and committee liaisons**

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

GEAC Chair Van Selst referred senators to the March 17 report he had sent out via email. He highlighted the following in that report:

There are two pilot projects which could establish GE competency outside normal patterns: one project is on online oral communication and the other is Statway. In the case of the latter, BOARS says it meets the IGETC requirement until the fall 2016 expiration date. Both pilot projects could eventually influence SB 1440 degree templates.

EO 1100, the new Executive Order for GE, is now out but does not account for the community colleges’ stated intention to offer upper-division GE, so is self-contradictory.

AP Seminar was awarded three units of university credit but the credits are not associated with a particular GE area. No decision has been made about awarding credit to AP Research.

Other agenda items included: the new arrangement replacing a transient faculty appointment in ITL with a permanent MPP position; the final meeting of Give Students a Compass in February; a system-wide sustainability minor; an AAC&U faculty collaborative project involving both CSU and CCC faculty; and discussion of CSU participation in WICHE (to be discussed in terms of an AA resolution later).

GEAC members will discuss an exemption request from San Bernardino that was on the agenda, but was not addressed during the meeting to due to time constraints, via email.

**Miller:** Had concerns about conducting the request for an exemption over email. Given that the discussion of a similar request from Long Beach that ultimately involved a subtle and very nuanced response, it is worrisome that a decision so weighty would be arrived at via email.

**LoCascio:** Cal Poly had a waiver of A3 20 years ago, and recently two departments, economics and health science came to the senate asking for exemptions. When asked how they would evaluate critical thinking the answer was through a written exam. This is ridiculous; more needs to be done on assessment.

**Walker:** What happens if GEAC doesn't recommend or get to respond to a request for an exemption?

**Van Selst:** GEAC advises the Chancellor; the matter would be deferred to others, but GEAC may have some influence.

**Locascio:** The problem is that they still want everyone to get down to 180/120 units, a horror.

**Baaske:** Noted that a report on the STAR Act, authored by Senator Nishita, Jim Postma, and Baaske was sent out today. He said what's fairly clear in the report is that we are in the implementation stages of the transfer degrees. The first programs are now having faculty review groups look at the TMCs to see if there are tweaks that are desirable; any significant change would result in having to revisit the degrees.

### ***Ethnic Studies Task Force – Loretta Kensinger, Liaison***

The task force hopes to complete a draft to be presented to the Chancellor's Office in April; it will then be distributed to various stakeholders, including the ASCSU. The task force is trying to take into account the date of the May plenary. Its general outline is taking shape. The data seems to show so far that there has been an excellent response rate from Ethnic Studies units, with only one declining to participate. There is a meeting of the task force from 11-2 today.

## 7.5 Faculty Trustee Candidates

**7.5.1. Presentations; Question and answer period.** The final candidates were directed to make an opening statement, answer questions and, time permitting, make a closing statement. They did so in the following order:

- a) **Sue Holl (Sacramento)**
- b) **John Tarjan (Bakersfield)**
- c) **Honora Chapman (Fresno)**
- d) **Steven Stepanek (Northridge)**

Before hearing from the candidates, there was some discussion of whether or not the senate should go into closed session for this portion of the plenary. It was ultimately decided to remain in open session, as this was not a “personnel” matter, nothing was deemed confidential, and the role of faculty trustee being such a public role that it was important that the process itself be public. Those in attendance who were not faculty were reminded that they did not have a vote.

Each candidate was presented, gave opening remarks, and each was asked to answer the following six questions, posed by members of the Faculty Trustee Nomination Committee (Senators Baaske, Chong, Collins, Davis, Murphy, Pasternack) :

1. What do you see as the two most pressing unresolved issues facing the CSU over the next few years and how would you, as Faculty Trustee, go about calling the Board’s attention to these concerns?
2. In your opinion, are there any current CSU policies working against the university making the best use of its limited resources and if so, what are these policies and how would you propose to investigate change as the Faculty Trustee?
3. What is your understanding of the difference in the role of the union and the senate and how would this inform your role as Faculty Trustee? Do you think there is a role for the Faculty Trustee to interface with the faculty union and how would you propose to do that?
4. Given the fact that some of the CSUs are now up to 70% non-tenure-track faculty, how would you propose to represent the need of these faculty in matters that may come before the Board of Trustees and what do you propose to do to change this ratio throughout the CSU without adversely impacting the existing non-tenure-track faculty's already-precarious status?
5. What unique qualifications to this position do you bring to the Faculty Trustee position and where would you have the most to learn?
6. How would you handle a situation when you are among the minority, or perhaps the only person, who has a perspective or data on an issue that falls under the Trustee's aegis, but about which they have incomplete and or inaccurate information with which to make a major decision?

### 7.5.2. Election of candidates for Faculty Trustee

Results: **Sue Holl (Sacramento)** and **Steven Stepanek (Northridge)**. Their names will be forwarded to Governor Brown, who will decide between them in making the appointment to a two-year term.

## 7.6 CSU Trustee J. Lawrence Norton

Trustee Norton said that he'd like to first share some of his concerns for the CSU, going forward, and then answer questions:

In the realm faculty salaries, Norton said that the CSU is beginning to come out of a long dry spell, though perhaps drought now is not a good analogy; he meant it as more of a metaphysical one.

He said he was happy to see the CSU beginning to rebuild tenure and tenure-track faculty through 900 active searches. This he said, is all to the good, because, as an individual, his view is that it is the long-term faculty who have the responsibility of carrying forward the university's mission. Others—administrators, students, members of the Board of Trustees— come and go.

He expressed concern about the current backload of deferred maintenance, a bill amounting to over 2 billion dollars and that he saw the need for some new financing arrangements.

Another major concern was access for all qualified students; "it's why we are here." He admitted to being dismayed at the roll-back in Federal aid, for example in freezing Pell grants for 10 years. In the 1970s, he said, Pell paid 80%; now only 30%. Ultimately, he questioned, where will this all end up?

Norton said that the Board's ongoing task is telling the CSU story to legislators, business leaders, and the public, in general. Many are surprised at the impact the CSU has on the economy. We're the starter of the engine of the economy in California; nothing else will work if we don't.

Finally, he shared his "favorite gripe": in brief, for-profit colleges.

Trustee Norton then entertained the following questions and comments from the floor:

**LoCascio:** Expressed concern about the lack of males in higher education, referring to an article on the subject that appeared in *The Economist* on March 7. He asked what might a trustee do about getting more young men involved in higher education? There are lots of grants for women in STEM; there is a need to attract men to K-12 teaching careers.

**Norton:** No ready answer to the question. In Finland, it is more competitive to get into a teacher credentialing program than it is to get into law or medical school. The social prestige that comes with teaching there outranks what we regard as the apex of professional development here in this country. As a society, we need to address this; he welcomed ideas on the matter.

**Guerin:** How can we help the Board of Trustees advance the mission of the CSU? What are projects that we can work on together?

**Norton:** As an example, noted a month or two ago that there was a call for the need to update the CSU policy on academic freedom. What were the particular circumstances or events that brought that concern forward?

**Guerin:** Yielded to the Chair of Faculty Affairs, who has spoken eloquently and passionately on the issue, to answer. For one thing, the original language is glaringly sexist.

**Foroohar (FA Chair):** We have a two to three sentence policy that, while it refers to the classic 1940 AAUP statement, doesn't include all that is contained in the statement. CSU's policy doesn't even cover what most of universities have used in their policies. Since 1971, when the CSU policy was adopted, the

whole structure has changed: Faculty have become public intellectuals, responsible not just for our own research. Though the largest system, The CSU has no structure for reporting violations of academic freedom; there is nothing in collective bargaining, nothing in CSU policies, so that when academic freedom is violated on a campus, there is nowhere to go. Such a situation can result in self-censorship. The CSU needs a more comprehensive, 21<sup>st</sup> century policy and we are hoping that the Board of Trustees would support beginning a conversation and use the different talents within the CSU to do so. As a leader in higher education, the CSU needs to support academic freedom as a core value in the university.

**Norton:** Glad to know that there was no dramatic violation that brought this issue to the fore. Given the fact that the world looks very different than when he was three years old, it is important to bring this issue forward in a collaborative fashion with the Board—especially now that there is more emphasis on collaborative efforts than in the past, and the trustees are ready to listen and proceed.

**Guerin:** Thanks for the Board’s help in getting the faculty trustee legislation passed.

**Yudelson:** Thanks for his efforts and his recent visit to Channel Islands campus. When discussing hiring new faculty we need to look at net increase: even if we hire 900 we are losing 600 annually. A related issue is access—but it’s important not to rely on large online classes for that because there is a tradeoff—access for quality. Finally, when is California going to introduce an oil extraction tax that can increase funding for higher education?

**Norton:** Wished there was an answer to the last question. On the matter of access: somewhat relieved that “MOOC mania” is on the wane. The research now is pretty clear that the students who are least prepared have the greatest need for personal interaction with a teacher in a classroom. A question often raised is how receptive are faculty to new technology? While the general perception was resistance, this has not been Norton’s experience: he has encountered many faculty open to technology, to exploring what works and what doesn’t. He postulated that perhaps this is a generational issue.

**Walker:** Having been asked to develop policies on timely graduation, and gotten data (such as data revealing that those with second majors graduate at a higher rate), it is important for this body and the Board to think about our views on timely graduation and choices of majors and minors. To limit student options can create adverse effects.

**Norton:** Thanks for that.

**Baaske:** If you make other campus visits, it will be apparent that faculty are indeed exploring online delivery in a variety of ways. But if faculty can be resistant to any new initiative that they have not been provided evidence about, only reassurance that change is a good thing. And too often, without supporting evidence, an unfunded, unproven mandate becomes a system-wide endeavor.

**Roberts:** Was encouraged hearing about the Trustee’s priorities; as the only nurse in the ASCSU, would welcome further conversation about nursing in California.

**Strahm:** To return to technology: Also need to remember when making decisions to implement or advocate technological solutions that a significant portion of the student body comes from a working-class background. CSU students are often first-generation generation, marginalized, under-served, on the wrong side of the digital divide. They have no Internet at home, maybe only a cell phone. Many of our own students are starting out from the analogue part of the world.

**Norton:** We learned that lesson hard way with at San Jose State, and to that campus’s credit, backed away from the experiment.

**Frye:** Wanted to echo comments on the four-year graduation rates. While a primary purpose is graduating students and giving them skills to enter the workforce, a secondary purpose is to make them citizens, to enhance the public good, and to prepare them to make contributions to society and culture.

**Norton:** Agreed that there is more to a college education than having fun on weekends or skills that can sell at one's first job interview. Yet there is so much emphasis on job preparation in society. As an example, he has been asked by a legislator during his confirmation: Wasn't it immoral to be offering programs in fields where students couldn't get jobs? A former Barnard president once noted that you want to be sure that your mind is an interesting place to spend the rest of your life. So we are caught in the tension between current cultural demands—to turn out broadly educated citizens and those who can succeed in the workplace.

### **7.7 Ken O'Donnell – Senior Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives and Partnerships**

O'Donnell said that he was at plenary to address questions and concerns about WICHE that have arisen at a variety of meetings; he has found the critical attention paid to this issue to be "priceless." The question is what commitment the faculty are prepared to make to this initiative. The idea behind the interstate passport is that it would solve particular transfer problems across state lines. A major distinction in this initiative is that while articulation is generally course to course and credit to credit, WICHE Passport wants to look at learning outcomes. We need to do a better job of this. Where WICHE ran afoul of shared governance is that in publicizing the CSU's involvement they were not very careful in publications and on their website about the fact that we have been involved in conversations only; instead, they have said that the statewide senate had endorsed the passport, which is not the case.

**Baaske:** This has been presented as completing GE. But can a student do just one course? Is it all or nothing? The golden four?

**O'Donnell:** It is ours to do with as we please.

**Van Selst:** Passport is conceived as a whole: you have it or you don't.

**Miller:** One of my understandings is about competency-based credit vs. our own GE packages. Competency-based credit can be troubling.

**O'Donnell:** It is appropriate to see it in that light; that is, in demonstrating proficiency there is always the prospect of awarding competency-based units. That doesn't mean we have to go down that road. What is done later is up to the receiving institution.

**Nelson:** Wanted to join Senators Miller and Gubernat who have raised concerns here and elsewhere about going down that road, which could be a slippery slope.

**Gubernat:** Why, in fact, is the CSU so interested in interstate transfer since so few of our transfers come from out of state? Why are major foundations (Gates, Lumina) so interested in funding these alternative pathways to classroom instruction in the CSU? What are their motives? Who benefits?

**O'Donnell:** These conversations in WICHE seem to be time well spent; the alternative is a parochialism that would ill serve us. About the mega foundations' interest: they would really like to see more graduates, given enrollment numbers. There is a belief that this could solve the problem of unused units when crossing state lines. This is not a problem here in California, where articulation is vigorous.

**VanSelst:** We have a resolution that suggests our participation in WICHE is not to be taken as endorsing it or being a signatory to it. Do you see any negative consequences to this for you?

**O'Donnell:** No. A resolution like that is not negative but beneficial. When we participate in national dialogue, and get faculty's help we agree that it is about intellectual exploration; otherwise it's misleading.

**Creadon:** Standardized outcomes across states could well lead to standardized materials across states that could then be commercialized for profit. Do you sense any interest in that?

**O'Donnell:** A good question and a well-founded concern. The K-12 universe came out not much better than it went in vis a vis excessive standardization. With the interstate passport we want some agreement as to consistency across state lines. So far, shared understanding has not led to pressure to come up with standardized instruments. But ask that question twice a year.

**Nelson:** As a follow-up: There is need to be mindful of what Senators Creadon and Gubernat raise about foundation involvement; we cannot separate motives from money. Is it possible that before the CSU commits to engagement in such an initiative that there be consultation with the senate's Executive Committee formally, given the concerns in this body especially? There are national trends to be cautious about.

**O'Donnell:** Sure. On GEAC, this came up three or four year ago when WICHE started pitching foundations for funding. Will let the senate know when different backers come to the table.

**Strahm:** Also echoing Senator Creadon's concern and adding to that a worry that other state legislatures are having an impact, too, on faculty's intellectual pursuits. In Tennessee, for example, there have been complaints about sociology of religion classes where creationism is at issue.

**O'Donnell:** There are certainly other state standards to which we don't aspire. As long as CSU faculty are the "elephant in the room" we can know this is going in the right direction.

**Guerin:** Is it better to participate in WICHE Passport as voices of concern or to boycott the project? They clearly misrepresented our involvement, but what's the impact of the CSU's refusing to participate?

**O'Donnell:** We ask ourselves that all the time. It would be disappointing if the governance organization says no. But clearly in this case, WICHE has misrepresented our involvement in a list of organizations that is context-free. Could it be construed as endorsing? That may be more than they should have said.

**Filling:** In other documentation WICHE says what participants will and will not do, including outcomes of these conversations. This is not what we intended.

**Baaske:** Have updated my own WICHE bio and picture because I participated, but I did not represent the CSU.

**Kaiser:** We have not yet had any WICHE resolutions on this matter. As the elephant in the room, we shouldn't back off; either make a contribution or blow the whistle. Was not infatuated with the WICHE conversation. Is there a way you can think of to mark success in a student's progress without having black and white measures of four-year and six-year degree attainment—such as study abroad, internships, some extension of our academic credentials? We are far more trapped underwater by these definitions of graduation rates than by something WICHE might do.

**O'Donnell:** The CSU does offer an awful lot beyond the diploma and what a transcript tracks by traditional credit hours. If we can get clearer about that, Passport could be a way in that direction. There is a tension there, but we open up the door to getting that learning by other means. That is why it is worth taking this risk.

**Gubernat:** There is already an ICAS statement on competency-based assessment worth paying attention to because faculty leaders from all three segments have signed off on it. It is a one-pager on the ICAS website.

**Yudelson:** Would always recommend engagement vs. boycott. What is scary, though, when Lumina is involved is when a production mentality takes over, and it's not quality being measured but numbers. Urging engagement because if we are not at the table, who will slow down the freight train?

**Ken:** Slow down the train and also, we could help them build a smarter freight train. The object is not just more degrees by 2020, as Lumina would have it, but to agree to more high-quality degrees. They need to be educated about what that means.

## 7.8 Andrew Merrifield – CFA Liaison

Merrifield first noted that CFA is in complete agreement with CSU management and with the ASCSU that the amount proposed in the budget for next year is inadequate. (Meanwhile, the Governor shows an inability to understand how technological gimmicks may enrich 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendors but not do much for the CSU, as when he waved a cell phone around and claimed eventually this would be used in teaching English 101). CFA plans on a lobby day of its own and hopes to continue to join with students, faculty, and all the CSU to advocate for more funding.

Kevin Wehr from Sacramento State testifying before the Higher Ed subcommittee was met with lots of shrugged shoulders about how to get to increased access and get a million more college-trained graduates into the work force. It's going to cost money, and it requires more tenure-track faculty. Policies for converting fully-qualified lecturers to tenure-track positions, for example, need to be explored.

As mentioned in his report to FGA yesterday, CFA can agree about the budget but CFA is not yet ready to release its positions on individual bills. There are going to be extensive conversations with lobbyists. A CFA principle is that the executive board decides to recommend final versions of positions, which then go out to the membership.

There are two pieces of legislation about which CFA and FGA in its omnibus resolution disagree: AB 42 regarding student fees; and AB 1317 on executive compensation. Areas of agreement include the definition of supplanting language in AB 716; the CFA originally thought that there was agreement with the CSU on this matter last year, but in the final stages the CSU inexplicably pulled its support. Now the point is to go back to the original intent of the bill, and the senate agrees. Both CFA and the senate want more transparency in student success fees. Both bodies support legislation for "Dream" students and for work-study programs. There are a number of bills that help veterans and CFA supports those. This is not a political matter. Whether or not these bills are introduced and/or supported also by Republicans is not the issue: they are good for students.

CFA would like to see clearer definitions of what bonds can be spent for in order to rebuild the infrastructure of the CSU. CFA also has registered concerns about SB 15 (Block)'s dismantling of the middle-class scholarship program on the basis that it is not working. But it seems wrong to dismantle a

pilot project that has existed for a single year, to destroy legislation before it is known whether it works or not. A final issue is to watch the legislation that would authorize a 24<sup>th</sup> campus study in Stockton.

CFA shares the senate's concern about the need to update the CSU's policy on academic freedom. And while CFA agrees with the office of the General Counsel that CFA has to be involved in any revision, that does not mean that nothing can be done on this matter until the completion of successor bargaining. Here there is a slight whiff of foot-dragging. There is concern about extramural as well as classroom utterance, caving in to outsiders' political pressure. There has also been a systematic reduction of shared governance, a la the "Shock Doctrine," that also has implications for academic freedom.

What also remains undefined is a new concept of "civility" as a way to suppress academic freedom. Merrifield referred to an excellent presentation on civility, as a new watchword, a suppression of unpopular ideas, by Dr. Joan Wallach Scott at the AAUP's 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary conference at East Bay recently. He alluded to an analogy credited to Bette Davis: when a man speaks his mind, he is respected, when a woman does, she is a bitch. So, when management speak their minds, it is civil, but when employees do so, it's uncivil. He referred to the Salaita case and added that if "civility" were to have been used as a measure of employment, at least one person at this table would not have gotten tenure. No one, he said, should be disciplined for the work they are supposed to do.

On the matter of article 24.23 implementation, that is, the transfer of sick leave credits, as this body well knows, a more important issue is in play, and CFA has negotiated with management to have this made available through an MOU.

Finally, in the matter of the upcoming reopening bargaining: The current three-year agreement is tentative; there are re-openers, including the benefit package for those in extended education. CFA agreed to the contract because of assurances that the CSU would do right to make it a better place to work, and to address compression and inversion issues. That led the agreement to go through without a statutory process. At this point, though, it has been taking too long to implement salary adjustments. There have been a number of miscalculations, misclassifications, etc.

Regarding 20.37 (compensation for extraordinary service): CFA believes that the Chancellor's Office should be doing more so that this can be implemented more smoothly statewide on the campuses.

With the exception of SDSU, campus equity planning has gone badly. There are mixed messages. Campus presidents are saying that they cannot implement equity because it is the Chancellor who must decide or that he has objected to a president wanting to spent too much on equity. When CFA has questioned the delays in adopting equity plans they have been told that the necessary information to do so was not available. CFA believes all should be working harder to ensure that the campuses honor the agreement. No one should be putting up roadblocks to the process.

**Kaiser:** Didn't enjoy the fact that Chico has become the poster child for bad news on the salary front. Excuses for the delay in getting paid have ranged from it will be in the March paycheck to it's taking the state more time to do the processing to blaming it on having so many lecturers. Meanwhile, Chico had a lecturer who didn't live to see it; he died recently, and literally on the job, after serving many years without range elevation or a pay increase. Everyone's wringing their hands, saying that the accounting involves so much work. And when there is an increase, there is only a tiny portion of release time for severely overworked people.

**Merrifield:** The CBA includes compensation for "extraordinary" service, money we didn't have before, and it's certainly better than nothing. Faculty in the CSU, in general, are overworked, and this is a

recognition of the fact. Some campuses have more problems implementing these awards than others. It should not be so complicated.

**Eschker:** Some things are beyond our control, for example, the governor's proposal for us to be more efficient with the resources we have. Others we do to ourselves. Faculty on many campuses are utterly dismayed that CFA does not represent senior faculty, who, after many years of frozen salaries are receiving only a 1.6% raise. It is senior faculty who have lost the most. Meanwhile assistant professors are, in fact, doing better; they have outpaced inflation. Will compression and inversion ultimately be tied to retention of seasoned faculty? Will that be a priority coming up in the next phases of bargaining?

**Merrifield:** Campus-based equity programs can address compression and inversion. In the first year of the contract, CFA's goal was to alleviate problems at the bottom ranks. In years two and three there will be more attention paid to the situation of senior faculty. But everything cannot be healed in three years. Have heard this complaint from many, that is, we went so many years without hiring assistant professors, and meanwhile the market has moved. And the 2007 contract was not honored; had SSIs and GSIs been paid when they should have, the gap would be less and there would not be assistants leaping over associates. The gender gap would also have gotten better; it is 15% in the CSU. Their refusal to pay has harmed women and traditionally under-represented minorities.

**LoCascio:** Faculty are getting less and less say on hiring. Provosts use tenure-line allocations as a way to control deans and, ultimately, departments. Where, for example, did the concept of cluster hires come from? It is important also to continue to address the civility issue.

**Guerin:** What is the timeframe for the reopener?

**Merrifield:** May 1<sup>st</sup>, and as we are nearing that date it will be important not to drag our feet, to move quickly, strategically. (He also noted here that he himself was now off the bargaining team.)

**Guerin:** Will there be any faculty vote on a reopener?

**Merrifield:** It is not a statutory process, and CFA wants to avoid retroactive raises. Up front is better. That's why there is the intent to move as quickly as possible. CFA is hearing system-wide frustration about the 1.6%, which was close to the average raise in the USA. More money is needed and CFA intends to fight for it. On the matter of faculty voting on a specific amount: he is not sure. There has not been a specific amount in ten years.

**Jarvis:** There are civility problems—just because a concern has been raised doesn't mean that no such problems exist.

**Merrifield:** Everyone should have a safe workplace, safe from harassment and danger, and no one is suggesting that we are not going to protect such. Our concern is that someone is not deemed to be "civil" and so doesn't get that promotion. To say that civility has always been a part of academic freedom is not true. We are not advocating incivility. We don't want that concern to harm academic freedom. And students can be harmed as well.

**Van Selst:** De-certification has come up on a number of listservs. What is it?

**Merrifield:** It is the responsibility of people to go through a legal process when they no longer want the CFA as their sole representative in collective bargaining. We would oppose de-certification of CFA. Having been bargaining in the public sector since 1975, Merrifield ended by saying that he has never seen a contract finished when some who are dissatisfied didn't use the word.

## 7.9 Sara Sanders – CSSA Liaison

Sanders said it was a pleasure to be spending what, for many, is spring break week at the plenary. She thanked Miles Nevin, CSSA's Director, for sitting in for her in January and reporting to the plenary when she was unable to attend.

She spoke of a number of initiatives and concerns:

CSSA is now embarked on a marketing campaign to explain how their new Board-approved fees will be used, as well as to explain the "opt-out" provision.

The organization is currently working without a president after a recent resignation, so things are difficult and work is being spread around. They are looking at policies for internal reviews of executive officers as well as conducting some strategic planning.

Among their projects is a sequel to the CSSA white paper on online education; this will be voted on in their upcoming meeting. It recommends creating online communities for different constituencies in the CSU, for example, former foster youth, veterans, victims of sexual assault, with the hope of sharing best practices among student groups. This weekend they will also be voting on three federal and state bills. In her next report she will be able to report on advocacy and lobbying efforts.

**Kaiser:** Noted that foster youth can be designated as such until age 23, so students can be current students and foster youth. This can create a housing issue when they sometimes are not allowed to move into a dorm.

Also, was surprised to hear that the student trustee candidates must be current freshmen or sophomores. What is the thinking there?

**Sanders:** Not freshmen, but current sophomores because theirs will be a two-year term. Will get more information on this provision because she thought that this has always been the case.

**Swartz:** Particularly appreciated including veterans; in the ASCSU's conversations with Dr. O'Rourke of the Chancellor's office, veterans' issues are becoming a priority for the senate too. Can you learn which campuses do or do not have veterans' support services?

**Sanders:** Will look into the matter and report back. Veterans' support services and veterans' centers are on the CSSA's policy agenda this year.

## 7.10 William Blischke – CSU ERFA Liaison

After a number of attempts to meet with the Chancellor, the ERFA Executive Committee met with him last month and discussed three major topics: the role in philanthropy retirees can play (some have CSU in their wills); ERFA's lobbying for the CSU in Sacramento; and a recent push for volunteerism so that retired faculty might serve on campus committees, etc. The Chancellor agreed to take these matters up with the council of presidents.

Though the first page of their newsletter reports that the Chancellor will be speaking at the next ERFA meeting, they have since learned that he is unavailable, though it was not clear whom they were

superseded by since they had planned for the Chancellor to be their keynote. However, ERFA is pleased Trustee Stepanek has now agreed to give the keynote address.

A number of articles in the ERFA newsletter dealt with issues raised and reports given at the January plenary of the ASCSU—for example, the Alumni Director’s report on the graduating class of 3 Million. ERFA wants to get retired and emeriti faculty back in contact with their former students.

An unsettling piece of news to relay to retirees, and, in fact, to all faculty involved, is that there will be an 85% increase in the premiums for long-term care.

So far, there are no applications for ERFA’s Executive Director position. Please spread the word. The state-wide meeting is to be held April 25 in Long Beach. And as Dr. Blischke is taking on the presidency, he will no longer be liaison to ASCSU. May plenary will be his last meeting.

Barry Pasternack has been nominated for vice president, Rita Jones (Long Beach) for secretary, and Harry Sharpe (SLO), for treasurer. Among the at-large members recommended for reappointment is former ASCSU Senator Marshelle Thobaben.

When asked if there was anyone to complain to about the rising costs of long-term care, or any recourse, especially when cancelling a policy, to recoup some investment, Blischke agreed that this has been a problem, but ultimately the program is under the aegis of CalPERS, not the CSU.

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

The Chancellor welcomed those who are back from spring break. He noted that Monday afternoon the trustees would be interviewing finalists for the Sacramento State presidency, then it would be on to normal business. And Tuesday will mark the first time in a long while that a Chancellor will be reviewed by the Board of Trustees.

He reported that President Zingg is making progress; he is out of ICU, though still in the hospital. Next week Rollin Richmond will serve as acting Chico’s acting president. The Chancellor himself will travel next week to Chico to meet with senate, faculty, community members, and students. Richmond is up to date on the CSU and is ready to put all else aside and serve.

After his brief opening remarks, the Chancellor addressed senators’ questions:

**Kaiser:** As a matter of campus privilege, she recounted the many difficulties that the Chico campus has faced recently—the death of a lecturer in his office on Tuesday night; a past senior staff member and alum, member of the school board’s death in an auto accident; a student killed early Sunday morning attempting to stop a fight; and now the serious illness of the president. There has been an onslaught of deep emotions on the campus and so the clarity of the Chancellor’s response has been deeply appreciated. Meanwhile, the tragedies do not interfere with the campus’s commitments, for example, to exploring climate change and other concerns.

**White:** Was aware of two of the three episodes referred to. Yes, an unnerving time. Was proud to know that there is a resolve to find solutions among faculty, students, and alumni. Richmond himself has faced “white water” in his tenure as president at Humboldt, and perhaps this is a time for good solutions to come from inside the institution, not from outside.

**LoCascio:** As an aside, has heard a rumor from a Wiley rep that SLO was going to semesters in 2019.... As reported in a recent article in *The Economist*, a worldwide problem exists in educating young men.

Two suggestions are to encourage young men to enter teaching to help other young men and to pursue the field of health services, nursing, in particular. There seems to be no money to advertise for such, but there is tons of money for STEM, though unclear what is being done with it. Also, we can save 30 million dollars by keeping SLO on quarters, and ending Division I athletics. Another concern is the replacement of retiring faculty through cluster hires. Deans are now taking over what departments used to do in hiring.

**White:** Right. Society needs to be more mindful of young men and boys, and from many racial and ethnic groups. Youngsters in elementary school have only had contact usually with one male teacher. But everyone wants their own kid to be with a male teacher. There ought to be a way to position program promotion in order to attract males to elementary and high school teaching; society will suffer otherwise.

**Roberts:** Would like to address tenure density. If money could be line-itemed for tenure-track faculty in an intentional way we could make some progress. The nursing department at Sonoma had one hire, but we had lost four faculty. We're not doing replacement hiring, we know, but the new normal is really killing off the faculty who are left.

**White:** Did you seek one hire?

**Roberts:** We sought four. But were given one, hires being a precious commodity. There were seven well-qualified applicants, so we could have hired even more.

**White:** You've heard me say we need to reverse this decaying tenure density. While there's been an effort to hire more faculty, due to turnover, we haven't made much progress. Lori Lamb has done an analysis of system-wide tenure density that she has shared with the presidents. Some campuses are doing okay; some are not. The solution is not one that gets centralized by edict; accountability lies with the campuses. Making line items for faculty hiring would not be as effective—though clear on the goal, it would be too loose on means. But presidents need to make progress every year in doing so and finding ways to solve the problem.

**Krabacher:** When speaking to the Assembly Budget Committee, you were asked if campuses were being penalized for going over enrollment targets. Later, we asked provosts and they were still under the impression that they were being penalized. What is the status of the penalty?

**White:** This is a policy I abolished for the reason that if enrollments went up, more students would be involved in the learning environment and we want to get them to degrees sooner rather than later. As I understand it, this year there were people in the penalty phase from last year, and are finishing up. But enrollments over target this year won't be penalized.

It is also not fair, to keep FTES low to avoid a penalty, artificially slowing time to degree. Units should go up so all have access; after the first cut, those who can be successful at 18 or 20 units can fill in the gaps. Presidents are being held accountable to keep enrollments under control, and that's not an overnight request—there needs to be planning over time. A campus can increase carrying capacity, that is, more students earning degrees in a shorter amount of time. So FTEs go up, but there has to be some regulation at the entry point if more students are taking more credits. This is a case that needs to be made in Sacramento in order to attract more funding.

**Ullman:** The San Bernardino campus expresses its appreciation of your declaration of a crisis response. There have been two weeks of shock, and the extra security did restore confidence.

**White:** It took nine minutes for that approval, quicker with San Bernardino even than with Chico. Appreciate the point, there are some things that don't need to be thought about for too long, especially

what to do about ensuring the safety of faculty, staff, students and guests. Have faced such in Riverside, and glad to see things are settling down.

**Ullman:** She was found this morning. Alive.

**White:** That's encouraging.

**Creadon:** This is a reminder of what you already know, but it issues from informal conversations this morning about how to improve graduation rates, while accounting for our students and their difficult lives—students who just got kicked out of their homes, who have children, or are primary care-givers, or have to withdraw from the university to care for a family member. We are as eager as anyone to get them ready for careers, get their debt down, but not always with such a broad brush approach to improving graduation rates. Some kind of more complex algorithm or accounting method needs to be in place when someone presses you to do something about graduation rates.

**White:** Fully agree. It is vexing when a slower time to graduation is not on us only (not enough labs, for example) but because of our students' challenging lives, per your narrative. What hurts us is the way that this state and the nation calculate rates. There is a need to influence the public, try to get a complex situation into sound bites without dummifying it down. If you look at our students over a decade, 70% earn a degree; of those who do, the median time is 4.7 years. In UC, it's 4 years and one term. There is a need to define success rates based in fact, to be able to talk about it; the students are not just screwing around. The other way to normalize time to degree is on the number of courses taken, so that a 50% effort would be great at eight years.

**Guerin:** At Fullerton's Excom, I asked if there is anything they wanted me to ask you, and it was this: Are we going to be more effective in our advocacy than Janet Napolitano will be?

**White:** The requests from both systems are the same, essentially. There is a 100 M gap between requests and what the governor says. The tactics to get there are obviously different. My judgment is that I don't know. Will SB 15 or Atkins carry the day? The people who can have influence recognize that there is a capacity issue, that there is 8,000 dollars from the state less than we used to have for a degree. All of you have felt that. Monterey Bay and San Bernardino are leading the pack in attracting those grants for innovation, although those are one-time, nonrecurring dollars. Time will tell. We've played our cards with restraint and well. I'm an optimist.

## **7.12 Gerard Hanley, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Technology Services**

Hanley noted that he was at the plenary to provide an update on CourseMatch and on instructional technology in general and that he could also talk about AB 386.

Hanley said that the intent of CourseMatch is to help with enrollment bottlenecks, to enable students to take a fully online course at a CSU campus in a cost-effective way in order to aid timely graduation. Eligibility is somewhat limited: no first-time freshmen or first-time transfers, students had to be in good standing. In the courses, grade distributions have to be comparable to those in face-to-face classes, and there have to be articulation agreements. The students who took this option were not to be disadvantaged in any way.

There were 59 courses this spring semester, with 300 students requesting enrollment. So far, the volume is low while the processes are being streamlined. We're keeping it narrowly scoped as a small project until articulation is figured out, especially in upper-division coursework. There is still need to collect evidence. The coding has been hand-done, and now we will be getting more reliable data.

**Kaiser:** At Chico there has been much discussion about the differences between 386 and CourseMatch, the former going into effect this fall, and involving all online courses, including grad courses. For CourseMatch there can be highly vetted and polished courses, but 386 doesn't give anyone money to do such work. There are critical issues: one is that of articulation when a student assumes that what works on one campus will work on the other. How can you mandate articulation? Another issue is ensuring identity—for some online coursework students get live-scanned, they must be finger-printed. A school district will have no way to ascertain that that has occurred.

**Hanley:** In CourseMatch, because it is voluntary, there are control points. For 386, we will have to make a list of online courses; the actual law only requires making the list. If there are open seats available, then a campus can make that decision of availability, or decide to close the door

On the question of AB 386 courses hitting a campus's enrollment target: I'll bring that back to get an answer for you.

**Van Selst:** What is the status of establishing discipline councils?

**Hanley:** We have talked about an essential strategy for the CSU's support for faculty in the course redesign process: Coursematch, online education, all can be informed by disciplinary expertise. With CourseMatch and its structure, we end up moving more and more toward a system definition and away from campus autonomy, and we will need to be much clearer than we already are about articulation, maybe through a look-up on ASSIST. Angela and Eric will know more about this. We will need to make a tool for a student to see how a course articulates, campus to campus. This has not been worked out, and discipline councils could be of help with this.

**Roberts:** Thank you for your work, for being inclusive for those folks who couldn't always get here for meetings. The fly in the ointment, if you will, for Coursematch at Sonoma is that one of my faculty members is offering an upper division GE online, a brand new course, but it's never been offered face to face, so how to go about that?

**Hanley:** Grade distributions are a poor substitute or proxy for the student experience side. Ultimately, it is important to ask if you are applying good design principles to online courses that can lead to positive successful learning experiences, working with quality assurance, QOLT. If faculty have taken that training and applied the rubrics then we'd say okay; it gives us a level of confidence that a course will result in a successful online experience. So, have faculty participate in QM or the QOLT process. The training is free.

**Walker:** At the recent senate chairs' meeting there was concern that articulation officers are accepting upper-division course credit without consulting with faculty. Another concern is that many have a nine-unit residency requirement, and it's not clear how that interacts with CourseMatch. We don't want to have a student wind up with deferred graduation because of this.

**Hanley:** I can bring this issue up, that is, articulation officers failing to consult. They have to follow procedures. I will mention this to Angela and Eric. About the nine-unit residency issue: we do a "Welcome Wagon" memo when a student takes a course on another campus, explaining about their LMS, their library, etc. Maybe now that student also needs to be informed of such residency issues.

**Benavides:** There is an ATAC committee, but we haven't heard anything about its meetings.

**Hanley:** Will talk to Steve Filling and you about getting that going. Faculty consultation around academic technology is essential, and something we haven't paid attention to. But it's already March; bad on us.

## **8. Committee Recommendations**

### **Action Items:**

- 8.1 Opposition to John Wiley & Sons Requiring the CSU to Purchase Access to Unwanted Journals in its Bundling of Online Journals (AS-3202-15/FA (Rev)). Second Reading. Approved.
- 8.2 Initial 2015 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University. (AS-3204-14/FGA (Rev)). First Reading/Waiver. Approved unanimously.
- 8.3 Support for "Stand with the CSU" Budget Initiative (AS-3205-15/FGA). First Reading/Waiver. Approved unanimously.

### **First-reading Items**

- 8.4 Academic Senate, CSU, Participation in the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) Passport Project (AS-3206-15/AA)
- 8.5 A Call for a Plan to Increase Tenure Density in the California State University (AS-3207-15/FA)
- 8.6 Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2015-2016 Meetings (AS-3208-15/EX)
- 8.7 Towards a Culture of Assessment in the California State University System: A Call for Faculty Professional Development (AS-3209-15/AA)
- 8.8 Request for Executive Order Governing Campus Lease Agreements (AS-3210-15/FGA)
- 8.9 Expectations for Upper Division General Education (AS-3211-15/AA)

**9. Adjournment** at 2:44 p.m.