

Minutes
May 18-19, 2017
Office of the Chancellor

Thursday, May 18, 2017- 8:00 a.m. TO 5:00 p.m. - Dumke Auditorium

ASCSU Reception hosted by Chancellor Timothy P. White

5:30 p.m. TO 7:30 p.m., CSU State House

Friday, May 19, 2017 - 8:00 a.m. TO 12:00 noon - Dumke Auditorium

Organizational meeting and election of ASCSU 2017-18 Officers

1:00 p.m. TO 3:00 p.m., Dumke Auditorium

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: Bakersfield (Frye, Murphy (Absent), Tarjan (SUB)); Channel Islands (Aloisio, Yudelson); Chico (Ford (SUB), Schulte (Absent), Selvester (Absent)); Dominguez Hills (Esposito, Norman); East Bay (Fleming, Gubernat); Fresno (Benavides, Schlievert); Fullerton (Bruschke, Meyer, Hoven Stohs); Humboldt (Creadon, Eschker (Absent), Malloy (SUB)); Long Beach (Hood, Klink, Soni); Los Angeles (Baaske, Bodinger-DeUriarte (Absent), Riggio (SUB)); Maritime (Browne (Absent), Trevisan); Monterey Bay (Davis, Nishita); Northridge (Chong, Schutte, Swenson); Pomona (Speak, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Steffel, Ullman); San Diego (Butler-Byrd, Eadie, Ornatowski); San Francisco (Collins, Yee-Melichar, Vacant); San Jose (Frazier (SUB), Lee (Absent), Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Feroohar, LoCasio); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky (Absent)); Sonoma (Nelson, Reeder); Stanislaus (Filling, Strahm); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack); Office of the Chancellor (Van Cleve).

Guests: Loren Blanchard, CSU Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs; Jennifer Eagan, California Faculty Association (CFA); Brock Grubb, Academic Senate CSU Independent Consultant Ed Insights/Student Success Network Coordinators: Student Success; Dia Poole, Alumni Association Liaison; Michael Ratcliffe, California State Student Association (CSSA) Liaison; Diedre Sessoms, Director of Faculty Research Development and Professor in the College of Education at CSU Sacramento; Andrea Venezia, Associate Professor in the Public Policy and Administration Department and Executive Director of the Education Insights Center (EdInsights) at CSU Sacramento; Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Pasternak moved that CSU-ERFA President Blischke be added to the Agenda. The motion carried. The Agenda was Approved as Amended.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 26-27, 2017 MINUTES

The Minutes were Approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Miller announced that elections for the 2017-18 ASCSU Executive Committee would be held today.

PRESENTATIONS/INTRODUCTIONS

Senator Selvester announced that Senator Schulte would not be returning to the ASCSU. Senator Eadie announced that Senator Ornatowski was re-elected to a three-year term to the ASCSU. Senator Frye announced the return of Senator Tarjan and welcomed Senator Millar. Senator Steffel announced that Senator Ullman was re-elected to a three-year term to the ASCSU. Senator Krabacher announced that Senator Holl was re-elected to a three-year term to the ASCSU. Senator Selvester welcomed Senator Ford. Senator Strahm announced that Senator Filling was re-elected to a three-year term to the ASCSU. Senator Swenson announced that Senator Schutte was re-elected to a three-year term to the ASCSU. Senator Yudelson announced that Senator Aloisio was re-elected to the ASCSU. Senator Esposito announced that Senator Norman was re-elected to a three-year term to the ASCSU. Senator Speak welcomed Senator Urey as a new ASCSU senator from Cal Poly Pomona. Senator Bruschke welcomed Senator Shahi as a new ASCSU senator from Cal Poly Pomona. Senator Yee-Melichar announced that Senator Sinha was elected to the ASCSU from San Francisco State University. Senator Schlievert announced that Senator Jenkins would replace Senator Benevides as an ASCSU senator from Fresno State University. Senator Sabalius welcomed Senator Frazier as the substitute for Senator Lee from San Jose State University.

REPORTS

Chair

Chair Miller reported that it has been her privilege to represent the Academic Senate of the California State University between our last plenary meeting and the present one. She offered the following listing of my activities followed by summary and commentary on key issues that arose during that time.

Meetings and Activities

March, post-plenary

- Interim “agenda setting” meeting with Chancellor White and cabinet
- Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- Tenure Density Task Force (virtual)
- General Education Task Force in Long Beach
- Assembly Higher Education committee hearing on AB 394 (Medina) in Sacramento

April

- CSU governmental relations reception aboard the Golden Bear in Sacramento
- Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates Lobby Day in Sacramento
- CSU LA Senate and Executive Committee
- CSU Alumni Reception in Washington, D.C.
- CSU Capitol Hill Day in Washington, D.C.
- Long Beach Senate and Executive Committee
- CSU Budget Advocacy Group
- Humboldt Senate and Executive Committee
- ASCSU Legislative Advocacy Day

- Outstanding Alumni awards dinner in Sacramento
- Campus Senate Chair's Council meeting in Long Beach
- ASCSU virtual interim
- Senate Judiciary committee hearing on SB 677 (Moorlach) in Sacramento
- Assembly Budget Subcommittee II hearing in Sacramento

May, pre-plenary

- Interview with Larry Gordon, EdSource, on Academic Preparation (virtual)
- East Bay Senate and Executive Committee in Hayward
- General Education Task Force in Long Beach
- System Budget Advisory Committee in Long Beach

Upcoming

- Board of Trustees in Long Beach
- General Education Task Force in Hayward
- Meetings known at this time for 2017-18 ASCSU Chair, who assumes position June 1
 - Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates in Sacramento
 - Statistics Pathway meeting in Sacramento
 - CSSA meeting in Monterey Bay
 - Intersegmental Coordinating Committee in Sacramento
 - Board of Trustees in Long Beach
 - Systemwide Budget Advocacy Committee in Long Beach

Key Issues

General Education

Chair Miller reported that she and GE Task Force Co-Chair Ullman have convened the Task Force twice now. The first meeting featured review of its charge, general timeline and goals, as well as a discussion of shared governance and the curriculum. The second meeting engaged participants in consideration of why GE matters in the 21st century; more specifically, members considered what should be the goals of general education for CSU graduates, and a clustering of those goals to determine if themes emerged. The Task Force also considered the relationships between these overarching goals and the Association of American Colleges and Universities' LEAP (Liberal Education and America's Promise) Essential Learning Outcomes, the Lumina Foundation's Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), WASC (Western Association of Colleges and Universities' Senior College and University Commission) core competencies, and Executive Order 1100, which addresses CSU GE policies. The next meeting of the Task Force will take place at CSU East Bay in June, and will look more specifically at CSU campus GE programs.

Quantitative Reasoning

The Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) recommendations continue along their implementation path. Chair Miller has forwarded to the ASCSU the response of the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges to the QRTF report. ASCSU Committees as well as the Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) remain involved in advising the Chancellor's Office, and presumably the Center for the Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning Co-Director search will conclude soon so that the person selected can begin at the end of the month.

There has also been quite a bit of discussion related to statistics pathways offered on a pilot basis by some community colleges. It's a long and complicated story which doesn't lend itself to summary in 2-3 sentences. Perhaps it will suffice to say that the issues have been discussed robustly over the last few months in GEAC, and the ASCSU Chair will participate in an upcoming meeting that includes representatives from the CSU and CCC Chancellor's Office, the CSU and CCC Academic Senates, and the California Acceleration Project.

Tenure Density

Chair Miller reported that the Tenure Density Task Force report was due March 1. The Task Force determined that it needed more time to do justice to the issue, but it has not met since March 24 to complete the work, nor has an updated draft been circulated to its members for review.

Intellectual Property

Chair Miller reported that the CSU draft policy was circulated more than two months ago, and campuses have been providing their reactions to both the policy and the consultation process. The prevailing opinion among campuses seems to be coalescing around the view that the resolution and "white paper" produced by the Academic Senate at San Jose State University is an outstanding response to the request for consultation on the proposed policy.

Academic Preparation

Chair Miller reported that the ASCSU has been monitoring developments in academic preparation all year, and it's clear that changes in academic preparation are proceeding apace. One indicator is the publication of "Academic Preparation Frequently Asked Questions" on the Graduation Initiative website. Another is published reports in EdSource. These sources took faculty by surprise, and generated many questions. ASCSU committees (Executive, Academic Preparation and Education Programs, Academic Affairs) provided feedback to the Chancellor's Office on these sources.

In addition, a Coded Memorandum by Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard was distributed today, circulating a draft of an Executive Order relating to issues surrounding academic preparation. Feedback on the draft EO must be submitted within the month. Most certainly, ASCSU committees will be reviewing the draft.

Graduation Initiative

Chair Miller reported that the Chancellor's Office is convening "workgroups" to consider issues surrounding six "pillars" of the Graduation Initiative. ASCSU was asked to nominate members to serve on each. The Executive Committee selected the following senators in the six areas:

1. David Barsky, Academic Preparation
2. Praveen Soni, Financial Aid
3. Jodie Ullman, Data-Driven Decision Making
Mark Van Selst, Administrative Barriers
4. Catherine Nelson, Enrollment Management
Mark Hoven Stohs, Student Engagement and Well Being
5. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard has acknowledged these nominees and has indicated that the Senate will be notified once final membership for each of the workgroups has been finalized.

Legislative Advocacy

Chair Miller reported that she has been quite active in the Capitol building in the past few weeks, advocating formally during ICAS, ASCSU and CSU Lobby Days, and testifying during hearings on various bills. She also attended CSU Capitol Hill Day in Washington, D.C., and Chancellor White has ensured that the ASCSU Chair automatically will be included in invitations to participate in Hill Day in the future.

The key “talking point” for Hill Day was advocacy for the reestablishment of year-round Pell grants. Happily, year-round Pell grants are included in the FY 2017 Omnibus Appropriations bill, which funds the federal government through September 30, 2017. It is expected that the Department of Education will offer year-round Pell grants in time for students to use them during Summer Session 2018. The omnibus bill also provides funding for a cost-of-living increase in the maximum Pell Grant for 2017-2018. The maximum grant is projected to rise by \$105, from \$5,815 to \$5,920.

Chair Miller further reported that the meeting rooms and offices of the state and federal capitol are not the only places where she enjoys advocating for the mission of the CSU, and representing the role of the Senate in fulfilling that mission. She considers it a privilege to discuss with anyone who will listen the ways in which the Senate promotes academic quality and student success. Chair Miller thanked the ASCSU for this opportunity to do so. Lastly Chair Miller added an addendum to her report. Senator Ullman gave an update from CSU San Bernardino. The big picture was discussed. Chair Miller also discussed quantitative reasoning stats pathways. She reminded senators that the June 8, 2017 meeting will include individuals at the highest levels. It is important to for the discussion to remain at the highest levels. On tenure density, the addendum included discussion of an attempt to schedule a meeting at the end of May. No updates on legislative advocacy have been received. Concluding Chair Miller’s addendum was a discussion of how transparency is the hallmark of the academic senate and includes, but is not limited to, the following: 1) Consultation of the ASCSU Executive Committee; 2) Advanced notice of decision making; and, 3) Conversation between the ASCSU and Chancellor White. It is important to maintain the resolve necessary to model transparency.

Standing Committees

Academic Affairs (AA)

Chair Ullman reported that it was an honor to work with the AA 2016-17 committee. Co-Chair Aloisio was thanked for his substitution for Chair Ullman at the meeting. The committee has authored and/or co-authored resolutions and contributed to the task force to study general education. AA worked hard to fix grading problems in the Golden 4, AB 422 DNP (Doctorate of Nursing Practice), and to support graduate education in the CSU. Chair Ullman also reported that AA offered advice on tenure density, support for California State University, Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). Active learning and High Impact Practices (HIPs) were also engaged. AA also co-sponsored a resolution with Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA) on veterans, provided consultation on EO 1100, reviewed campus surveys on General Education (GE), and offered feedback on EO 1071, Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report (QRTFR), discipline councils, and Project Rebound. The latter, Chair Ullman recommended to be taken up by the 2017-18 AA committee. Lastly, Chair Ullman reported that no new resolutions were created, but feedback was given on the B4 standards of the QRTEF, Academic Preparation Memo, Course Match Memo, and counseling and psych services. Priorities for next year were also discussed. These included an

examination of a definition of student success and re-examination of online education. Priorities also included extending invitation to Dr. Minor and the AVP of Research to meet with AA.

Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)

APEP Chair Fleming reported that the committee spent time meeting with colleagues and guest. The meeting began with a report from Bechtel, followed by meetings with Ed Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Research and Resources, Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Services, James Minor, Senior Strategist for Academic Success, and discussions of academic preparation and how to move forward. What constituted consultation was also discussed. The CO colleagues will work with APEP as they move forward. Implementation will be a campus by campus process. Chair Fleming also thanks Senator Benevides for his service and thanked those that will continue on APEPE.

Faculty Affairs (FA)

FA Chair Norman thanked the committee and vice chair for their service. He also thanked the former FA Chair Manzar Foroohar for her institutional memory and appreciated steady influence and mentoring in the authoring of resolutions. Senator Goldwhite from CSU ERFA and Senator Hood were also thanked for their service. The ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison Collins and Gerry Hanley, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Technology were also thanked. On Intellectual Property (IP), it has been important to have collegial conversation. FA will bring forward an IP Policy and the resolution on how we work with and respect our part time colleagues will be withdrawn. Lastly, FA Chair Norman reported that he looked forward to Executive Committee's goal to work on Intellectual Property over the summer.

Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA)

FGA Chair Soni reported that the committee met with three key individuals on the May revise. FGA also met with Kathleen Chavira, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Advocacy and State Relations, to discuss concerns of the legislature. \$4million will not have an impact on the campuses but will affect the systemwide budget. The governor has put \$35million in one-time funding for the Graduation Initiative 2025. FGA also discussed the bills that the CSU is sponsoring or taking positions on. Chair Soni also reported that FGA took some positions on bills, met with Paul Steenhausen, Senior Education Analyst for the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). The importance increased access and 2% growth were discussed. FGA receive a call from Ryan Storm, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget. He is working with Assistant Vice Chancellor Chavira on budget advocacy. Since 2013-14, the CSU has taken in 39,000 new FTES, the CSU has been responsive, the governor is not going to give the 4% requested or \$102 million. FGA also met with CFA President Eagan. The 3.5% faculty salary raise will be occurring in July. An SSI will also occur for those that are eligible. Chair Soni also reported that FGA worked on the Resolution on Campus Accommodation of Military Student's Service Obligations coming to plenary in Second Reading and Senator Jay Swartz would provide a report on CSU advocacy. Lastly, Chair Soni reported that FGA worked on ideas about expanding local advocacy and why it is important to understand the CSU finances and accountings that are of issue. Chair Soni also thanked FGA for their hard work and fantastic job and gave a special thanks to Senator Swartz for his organization of Advocacy Day.

Senator Jay Swartz – Advocacy Day

Senator Swartz thanked At-Large Senator Krabacher for his guidance in organizing Advocacy Day. Senator Swartz reported that this was a successful year that was marked by team effort. Throughout the course of the year, 5 senate and 8 assembly meetings occurred. CSU students and California

State University Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (CSU ERFA) were also involved in advocacy. 43 meetings were had and 11 were with principles legislator and/or staffers. Senator Leyva came to greet the senators. Earlier in the year, FGA received call from legislators for advice on bills, which suggests that the ASCSU had become a resource. The following:

1. Where was the LAO on the demand for increasing or decreasing enrollment?
2. There does not seems too much of a change. There may not be the money for the Graduation Initiative 2025. It is believed that the CSU can do something on the graduation initiative on their own.
3. Cal Poly took 2,600 extra students. Will 50 new students equal one new administrator and where will we find people to teach these students? It is important to pay attention to the administrator student ratio.

Steven Stepanek – CSU Faculty Trustee

Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported that senators could find his report on the March 21-22, 2017 CSU Board of Trustees meeting as a separate attachment to this report in the email sent. He also attached the Faculty Trustee Faculty-to-Faculty Newsletter column written on April 18, 2017, which will appear in the next release of the newsletter. Faculty Trustee Stepanek also reported on his activities since the March 2017 ASCSU Plenary. On March 23, 2017 Trustee Stepanek visited CSU Dominguez Hills with Trustee Faigan and Trustee Abrego. During this visit, they received valuable information of the current condition of many of the older and temporary facilities on campus. On March 30, Trustee Stepanek attended the inauguration of President Ellen Junn at Stanislaus State. On April 2-4, he attended the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) National Conference on Trusteeship held in Dallas, TX along with Trustee Abrego, Student Trustees Reyes and White, and Chancellor White. This was Trustee Stepanek's first attendance of an AGB conference. He also reported that it was interesting to hear and compare how other system and university boards were structured and operated. He reminded senators that the CSU belief in campus autonomy is a distinction for us to take pride in and protect when compared to how some other multi-campus universities operate. On April 10, 2017, he visited CSU Channel Islands and commented on his amazement at how Channel Islands had renovated and utilized the buildings that were already on site when the university was formed. Two of the key endeavors for the campus is to increase onsite housing and to have renovation work performed on the last remaining unoccupied original major structure so it can be utilized for classrooms and offices as the campus population grows.

On April 11, 2017, Trustee Stepanek was asked by Chancellor White to participate in the on-campus conversations that form a part of the 6-year cyclic review of President Karen Hayes at CSU San Marcos. On April 20, 2017, he attended the investiture of President Judy K. Sakak at Sonoma State University and attended the CSU Maritime Academy military commissioning ceremony and commencement on April 22, 2017. Their commencement is the earliest in the system to provide time for the summer cruises of the TS Golden Bear. On April 23, 2017, the Faculty Trustee was a passenger on board the TS Golden Bear during its daytime voyage from Vallejo, Calif to Sacramento. He had excellent conversations with cadets, faculty, staff and some friends of the campus who were also onboard that day for the slow journey up river to the Port of West Sacramento. On April 24, 2017, he participated in the TS Golden Bear reception for state legislators, their aids, and local dignitaries while the ship was docked in the Port of West Sacramento. On April 26, 2017, Faculty Trustee Stepanek visited CSU Chico. He reported with regret that he was unable to attend the investiture of President Hutchinson; however, he was able examine how things are progressing at Chico and meet with their new president and their new provost, Debra Larson.

On May 2, 2017, Trustee Stepanek visited CSU Fullerton and engaged in discussions regarding their student enrollment management, student outreach activities and physical growth on a landlocked campus with minimal room for new construction. CSU Fullerton's aging infrastructure issues and their plans for the library building that is currently closed due to fire code and seismic safety issues were also discussed. On May 3, he, along with Chancellor White, attended the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo announcement of the \$110 million gift by Bill and Linda Frost to the College of Science and Mathematics towards the construction of an undergraduate multidiscipline research building with long-term support funds for faculty release time to engage students in research and for student scholarships so students will have the time and opportunity to participate. This donation was the largest ever to public higher education in California. On May 4, 2017, he attended the investiture of President Mary Papazian at San Jose State University and attended the investiture of President Erika Beck at CSU Channel Islands on May 5, 2017. Faculty Trustee further reported that he planned to attend the following commencements in upcoming weeks:

1. May 20, 2017: Channel Islands
2. May 21-22, 2017: Northridge
3. May 25, 2017: San Francisco
4. May 27, 2017: San Jose
5. June 9-10: Pomona

Lastly, Faculty Trustee Stepanek reported that during the March 21-22 meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees, the major topic of discussion was state funding of the CSU and consideration of a possible tuition increase of \$270 per year for in-state full-time students. As the faculty trustee, he believed that it is his responsibility to be aware of the conversations that occur during ASCSU meetings and the resolutions passed by that body, remain aware of the general needs of the faculty and the students on the CSU campuses, and adhere to the CSU Trustee's Code of Conduct (https://www.calstate.edu/bot/documents/rules_of_procedure.pdf). This code states in part, "A Trustee shall act and make judgments always on the basis of what is best for the California State University as a whole and for the advancement of higher education in general." Faculty Trustee Stepanek reminded the body that although he voted for the tuition increase, what was possible not visible was that his final decision about how he would vote on this issue was not made until just minutes before the actual vote. He was well aware of the ASCSU and CSSA resolutions opposing the tuition increase, but there were other factors to consider.

In his March 2017, Faculty-to-Faculty Newsletter column (http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Newsletter/March_2017/Faculty_Trustee_Report.shtml), which was written on Feb 20, 2017, he expressed his concerns regarding the system being properly funded just to meet its current obligations and the ramifications of being under funded for 2017-2018. He disliked the tuition increases and very much agreed that the state needs to properly fund the CSU; but, it was becoming apparent that the state has a different view. In conversations with people familiar with the climate in Sacramento towards the CSU, it had been suggested that we are

getting more this year than last and we need to live within that budget amount with the likelihood of additional base funding being very slim. Faculty Trustee Stepenek also spoke with several campus presidents and CFOs. He believes that if the trustees voted down the tuition increase and the state did not provide any additional funding, more than just Graduation Initiative 2025 activities would need to be suspended. Many campuses had already made long-term commitments by hired additional tenure-track faculty and staff for student advisement on the assumption of continued funding of the Graduation Initiative 2025. If there was not some continued level of funding, currently open faculty searches would need to be suspended and the number of course offerings

reduced. This could also increase the likelihood that students would have the expense of an extra semester tuition after experiencing frustrated at not being able to get the courses they need. That was a gamble Faculty Trustee Stepanek was unwilling to take. What helped in making my decision was the amendment to the board resolution stating that if the state provided the full amount of funding requested, the tuition increase would be automatically rolled back.

Faculty Trustee Stepanek concluded his report by discussing the recently released May Revision of the proposed state budget for 2017-18 (<http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/FullBudgetSummary.pdf>). The position is maintained that \$157.2 million in supplemental funds should be sufficient to handle our needs for the coming year. Because of the tuition increases by the CSU and the UC, it is estimated that the state funding for Cal Grant awards will need to be increased by \$8 million; an expense the state budget covers by reducing the funding to each system by \$4 million. In the budget's discussion on the rising of tuition at public universities, the statement is made "These growth rates exceed any standard measure of inflation." That statement shows a lack of awareness that overall increases in state support have not yet restored our funding to 2007 levels (when the CSU had a lot fewer students) nor does it take into consideration that in 2016 the CSU "did the right thing" in collective bargaining with a number of the collective bargaining units in the CSU. The true costs of those 2016 collective bargaining agreements coming due with the 2017-2018 budget. This is why the board's budget request included \$26 million for increases in mandatory costs such as health care and utilities, \$139.1 million for current compensation commitments (the overdue salary increases for faculty and many staff), and \$55.1 million to cover new collective bargaining compensation commitments. Just the first two of these items exceeds the \$157.2 million increase proposed by the state without any consideration of the third item or the requests for \$75 million for Graduation Initiative 2025, \$10 million for desperately needed improvements to facilities and infrastructure, and state funding for any reasonable FTES growth. Time is short for this budget cycle but the CSU needs to make a stronger case to the state regarding past and current pay inequities and the importance of 4-year public higher education institutions to the long-term economic well-being of the state. Senators were also reminded that a formal agenda for the May 23-24 meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees has been released (<http://calstate.edu/bot/agendas/>). An update on the state funding of the CSU is part of that meeting's agenda.

Other committees and committee liaisons

Jennifer Eagan – California Faculty Association (CFA) Liaison Report

CFA Liaison, President Eagan reported that CFA has done some budget advocacy work. The budget news is bad; however, there is time to work on the legislature and we may do better than the may revise, if strategy is placed on student fees. President Eagan also reported that AB 393 had been pulled by the author, three bills sponsored by the CFA, particularly AB 1036, are still alive. AB 21 is in suspense (the CSU is not opposing), AB 1464 on tenure density is through committee and still in suspense. Other activities include addressing right-wing attacks on professors and developing tips on how to deal with these attacks. Additional information can be found on the "Be a smart Resister" page on the CFA website. The current social and political environments speak to the need for staying vigilant on Academic Freedom. It is important to support faculty. Many of the right-wing attacks are funded from outside groups. Their goal is not freedom of expression, but setting the stage for a law suit. Summer projects will include engaging in collective bargaining by begin internal discussions and preparing for the loss of fair share or agency fees. This may reduce the CFA budget by approximately 30%. The CFA's biggest expense is personnel and will be sponsoring a resolution to come before the democratic party on a return to the California Master Plan. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Is the loss of agency fees a new phenomenon?
2. In *Fredricks vs. CTA*, the decision was a 4/4 split, and this means that all now pay dues to ensure representation. Many anti-union cases are occurring and may reach the supreme court, which might result in the reduction of fees. This will be a big budget cut, but the best way to insulate against this is to increase membership.
3. On the resolution on the return to the master plan, is free tuition vs. minimal tuition and doctoral degrees being discussed?
4. The resolution is on the CFA website. The CFA is not the primary author but a supporter. This will be a statement of principles and we will see what it turns into.
5. When we talk about to the return to the master plan, we have to consider administrative bloat. It is important to go back to faculty being the most important component in the CSU. It is important to also remember that State University Grants (SUGS) were once fully funded and now they are not.
6. The CFA has been beating the drum about administrative bloat for a while now.
7. On some campuses, it is difficult to get budget data. Is there a way to put pressure on at the state level to get this information? How can we fulfill our roles to our campuses when no one has seen a budget in years?
8. The only way that this can occur is by filing freedom of information requests. More oversight is necessary.
9. How much will union dues increase, and when, if the agency fees go away?
10. The last increase was from 1.05 -1.3%. This goes into effect when our GSI goes into effect. This was in preparation for fair share fees. The more public employee unions are under attack, the more expensive it becomes to be a union.

Loren Blanchard – CSU Executive Vice Chancellor (Executive Vice Chancellor), Academic and Student Affairs

Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard and Nathan Evan, reported on the draft Academic Preparation Executive Order (EO). The goals of this order are to ensure preparation and the closing of the achievement gap. Campus models have been explored. This draft engages the 4th year of mathematics requirements and Title IX language. Feedback is being sought by June 15, 2017 and it is hoped that the final draft will reflect expect from throughout the system. Work that will follow with engage the Graduation Initiative (GI) 2025 and shape implementation. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard reminded the ASCSU of the commitment to shared governance that this process reflects and that six work groups for operational priorities will adhere to these principles. Campus presidents, the ASCSU, and the CSSA submitted nominations. He also reminded the ASCSU that despite the small reduction in the CSU budget, advocacy would continue. The Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) and the Office of the Governor have both acknowledged the efforts of the CSU. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard also reported that he visited San Diego State University, CSU Channel Islands, and Fresno State University. These visits have enabled him to understand the work done by faculty and the role that they will play in creating one million graduates to the work force in the State of California. Over the next few weeks, students will be earning their degrees. It is important to remember that the CSU understands that it could never get its work done without the faculty. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. On the implementation of the Executive Order, the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report (QRTFR) is a document. If it is used as a guide to dealing with the 4th year of math, then students may be prepared.

2. In the Academic Preparation Memo, many areas seem to be the purview of the ASCSU.
A: We will follow through on this as requested.
3. Given food and housing insecurities among our students, it is important to help ensure resources are available for students to get prepared, as a lack of preparedness seems to be related.
4. A basic needs assessment is being sought to work with external agencies to contribute to addressing the problem (i.e., food pantries, etc.).
5. As a department chair of English, we are concerned about the academic preparation place. It is important to invited Early Start Directors into conversation. We who know students' needs are not being consulted. I hope that you will take this into consideration.
A: We will do it and not just take it into consideration. This will allow us to bring stakeholders together to get the advice needed.
6. I am concerned that we have deadlines being given for feedback and implementation deadlines that are not viable given the many campuses impacted.
7. The 2018 deadline gives us the time to ensure support and to correct some of these changes. The work that needs to get done is driven and informed by English's work on stretch English and stretch mathematics. We will work diligently to get all the resources that are needed. There is a lot of value to the 2018 block.
8. In the draft memo on the tuition increase and May revise, there seems to be commitment to the Graduation Initiative (GI) 2025. We seem to be missing the guerilla in the room. Historically, there has been enrollment increases, we can expect them. If we allocate fund to the GI 2025, what happens to enrollment? This requires us to hire 700 more faculty. Last year we hire 700 faculty. Attrition, however, has been 600 faculty per year. There needs to be more dialogue on tenure density. What is your opinion?
9. This is a loaded question. The Board of Trustees (BoT) made it clear that funds for hiring faculty to enhance academic support and increase course selections will be a priority. You raise a good point.
10. Enrollment and student success must be examined at the same time in order for us to reach our goals.
11. Does this mean that we should have the system in place for 2018? Our students need to be capable in all areas. Every single student needs extra time with faculty to meet them where they are. How are we going to get out faculty colleagues' input on what we do to close the achievement gap? It would be wrong to turn student away.
A: The culture of care that is already in place needs to be highlighted. We have begun some of the work with the math faculty. I assure you that we have more work to do. We will also be inviting stakeholders to join the conversation. We have a lot more listening to do but we also have steps that we want to take. You have my commitment on that.
12. As Chair of APEP, I was grateful to members of the Chancellor's Office (CO) to discuss academic preparation. We are committed to our joint stance. In light of proposed initiatives, we are going to need data. How are you and your colleagues planning ahead so that these initiatives are on track? To what extent might there be pressure to systematize further in ways that conflict with campus autonomy?
A: This is a way to reflect on Early Start. Some campuses are at different places. This insight can be brought into this new process.
A: There is no interest in systematizing math instruction or English. There campuses will be working in their own best interests.

13. Along with the hiring of new faculty, are there plans to offer faculty funds to enhance their teaching? I encourage you to consider how important it is for student success that we have an increase in teaching expertise in the classroom.
A: You have my commitment to this effort. We have already done this with professional development in math and English.
14. On the \$140,000 for each campus, can you elaborate on how it can be used and how will it be allocated?
A: These funds can be focused on the redesign of developmental education. The examination of Early Start will be included. Based on feedback, real change will occur when it is a department that is involved.
A: We have also see interest around academic preparation. We need sustained funding to continue the success.
15. It is important to have comparable data to see which campuses have better practices than others. This should be done before implementation.
A: I agree. Part of the work on the annual symposium is to showcase best practices in the CSU. Some campuses have used these best practices to improve their own. Data will enable all to understand the best practices from campus to campus.
A: We have also looked into data needs so that campuses can build a cadre of people across their campuses who are engaged in best practices.
16. Is it possible to think about the professional development of the administration?
A: Great point. And to the credit of the presidents, they have asked to sit in so that they can understand the models on math and English.
17. Is there any way to look at the alternative models that suggest this process takes time and should not be done expeditiously? As an English professor, we have learned that changes take time.
18. When you talk about Early Start changes, is this elimination of one unit? Do you mean that we may have a three semester course series with Early Start as the first semester course? Rumors are going around that GVAR is being eliminated. What is going on?
A: We had a dialogue on these issues. Some campuses have moved to a stretch model. This is part of the listening process. What we have learned is that greater impact is possible. Utilizing summer and fall sessions are models available to campuses.
A: We are in a listening process. This year, campus visits enabled discussion of all interests. These discussions centered on adjustments and remediation. Input was received from administrators and faculty for the EO 1048 revisions. GVAR is a part of this process. Some have asked for the elimination of GVAR; however, it is not related to academic preparation.
19. When will conversations start?
A: Sometime in the fall.
A: We are hearing from faculty that there is interest in eliminating GVAR. Other campuses are saying that they are changing their summer school models.
20. Chair Miller invited Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard to lunch and the social at Chancellor White's residence.

Deidre Sessom, Director of Faculty Research Development and Professor in the College of Education at CSU Sacramento; Andrea Venezia, Associate Professor in the Public Policy and Administration Department and Executive Director of the Education Insights Center (EdInsights) at CSU Sacramento; and, Brock Grubb, Academic Senate CSU Independent Consultant Ed Insights/ Student Success Network (SSN) Coordinators: Student Success.

SSN Representative, Dr. Venezia, from the Student Success Network reported that there are many points of connection that will show what has gone on, current activities, and way that faculty can get involved. The SSN consists of faculty, staff, and administrators interested in new ways to collaborate and experiment together. Central in this collaboration is the goal of learning from one another and building on what has been learned to ensure the creation of the highest possible quality learning tools. Representatives also reported that how the SSN works is by engaging in applied research, examining student success, exchanging ideas, and creating work plans. Common language and terms are used to understand student experiences. Projects begin work from the middle and campuses host forums that bring educators together. Dr. Sessoms reported that the key benefits of the SSN include enhanced support for efforts focused on high quality learning and progress toward graduation. Faculty, staff, and administrators are given the opportunity to share knowledge, which helps more students reach educational goals. Campuses gain new support for shared campus and system goals and a vehicle for professional development and learning. Representative Grubb reported that network accomplishments have included campus based meeting (e.g., SF State on March 4, 2017), enhanced institutional research, and data transparency. Questions engaged centered on how to understand current information on student learning and map success across the system, the challenges that people are facing, student qualitative information gathering, and website development for the dissemination of these data. Lastly, representative Dr. Grubb encouraged ASCSU senators to consider research, convening SSN meetings, labs, and joining the SSN mailing list as ways to get involved. Data fellows are being sought, as well as faculty interested in working on regional pathways, working with men of color, STEM curricula, and college readiness. Ten campuses have expressed interest in these areas and senators were urged to share this information with their campus communities. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. This information was centered around campuses; however, there are 12,000 emeritus faculty. How might you involve them?
2. Of the research discussed, is it your plan to put this information and associated findings on your website?
3. I am hopeful that there can be an interface between the CSU, ASCSU, and SSN. We discussed what does student success mean to us. Are there ways to examine this online?
4. We are interested in networking and are open to the idea.
5. Some CSU campuses are hosting a data fest. CSU Northridge was the focus of the last data set. Data use and student success are central.
6. It would be great if faculty could go to a higher education resource website like Merlot that shows best practices. Building something like this over time would be great.
7. Are you connected to the CO and Dr. Minor's office? You are modeling what our faculty have to offer.

Timothy P. White – CSU Chancellor

Chancellor White reported that it is crucial to see this time of year as important and thanked the senators for their faculty and leadership roles in academic achievement. There are some issues of confidentiality that need discussion. On confidentiality, we cannot put toothpaste back in the tube.

The presidents search has raised questions in this room. At the time of the search, travels had taken the Chancellor elsewhere. Confidentiality was breech a long time ago. Confidentiality in executive searches will continue to be insisted upon. The fifteenth search of 23 presidents will occur this fall. A much more diverse set of campus presidents has resulted and inclusive participation by campuses has occurred, while maintaining confidentiality. All candidates, to reach this level, have achieved a high level of success. The conversations at this level are quite candid: what are your aims and values, goals and governance styles? On the subject of honorary degrees, they are not awarded by the academic enterprise but the BoT. They are also based in the arch of work that individuals have done for campus, community, humanity, etc. On the conversation of whether or not this should be rescinded, the decision must be weighed against a profound contribution. In the history of giving honorary doctorates, there has only been one that has been rescinded. Bill Cosby, was one. A policy was needed, as there was none. It is important to remember why academic senates are important to the chancellor. The senate plays a vital role in university shared governance, how we need to hold ourselves personally and one another to a high standard in behavior, words, and intent. Sharing governance also includes holding ourselves to a high standard. In facing how to get a cabinet to work together, a lesson was learned that included an understanding of the nature of the cabinet, which included the nature of contrary opinion. Why are there two conversations? We discuss this every year and decide how we behave together and how we interact together. We have also looked into what is a fiduciary. This term is reserved for the trustees. There are three overarching duties in the fiduciary world: loyalty, care, obedience. The one that is most at the core is the notion of loyalty. Trustees are required to act in good faith and in the best interests of the university. They do not act with avarice or in the interest of external group. While we spend much time on shared governance, IP, etc. Do we spend enough time on how we work with each other and do this in a way that advances the best interest of the university and our students? The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. On the San Bernardino issue, the lack of judgement of the former trustee is really the issue.
2. The thoughtfulness of your remarks is most appreciated. With all due respect, you talk about loyalty and acting in good faith, expectation, high standards etc. I hope that you understand that the resolutions before us today are the result to those qualities and a passionate commitment to what our colleagues have said with their vote of no confidence at San Bernardino. 60% of a vote of no confidence should hopefully cause you and the BoT to bring people in to see what it going on. This would say that we respect shared governance, as senates do not just vote willy nilly on no confidence. All of this should warrant at minimum the sending of someone in to say I hear you and have someone sit down with the president on how to move forward together.
3. We have a white supremacist on our campus and all of our students are feeling like there is a strong rejection of white supremacist ideology coming from the university and system leadership. Students are not interested in denying freedom of speech, what they are concerned about is a lack of a robust push back against these ideas. There is a lot of legal language used, but not an assertion of university values of inclusion. It is important to have a robust tapestry of ideas that would be a good push back.
4. On free speech on campus, there is a difference between freedom of speech and harassment. This has happened on several campuses overtime. Freedom of speech is being mixed with incitement of violence. It is important to talk to the leadership so that they know the distinction between freedom of speech and harassment. At CSU San Bernardino, the academic senate has voted no confidence and you are being asked to look into this situation.

On our campus, we had a similar situation. We asked your office to look into this issue (i.e., high raises for MPPs). We received a letter that you had confidence in the leadership and then the auditor's reports showed the problem raised by the academic senate. Raises were given to 70 MPP positions with no evaluation.

5. On the elephants, there is another point of concern: the responsibility of the leadership in responding to the points and public perception of the actions or inaction. We know how votes of no confidence work and they are the result of dealing with deep rooted problems. It is important to acknowledge these concerns. Silence could suggest that you are in agreement. This is more than the senate having their feelings hurt. This can work against the senates. It is important to have, at least, a statement that things went too far and show address of complaints.

A: The issues that San Bernardino raised through their climate survey were raised at great length. These issues had been considered, thought about, and understood. In reading the resolution, this was a letter to the campus, and this was to initiate conversation for the campus on a vote of no confidence. If on every issue that one disagrees with and there is a note from the chancellor, then it will not have an impact. Given our current political climate, as chancellor, my role has been out in front. It is important consider when to speak and when not to speak. I want to be public and disagree with you on the notion that I do not care.

6. For those that are looking for some sort of response the lack of response can suggest that this is the case.

A: For those that want to know, they can just ask me. It is a false conclusion on the part of those that will, as I must keep confidentiality central. I take the point; however, speaking to my earlier points, it is important to discuss – as leaders – how do we treat one another.

7. Your point that the all faculty vote will be awaited is respected; however, it is important to think about this with the many options before you, that you visit the faculty to hear what the faculty have to say. It would go a long way, if the faculty do vote in favor of what the senate said, if someone went to the campus to hear what they had to say. Behavior can be symbolic: openness to faculty concern.

8. On the op-ed being well known, the information in that op-ed was news to me. The information seems to have been held confidential until recently.

9. On the op-ed, it is important to consider revoking the commendation of the former board chair. It seems to be libel and I am concerned with the disrespect by a gentleman that we honored. It seems that the public has some concerns about us and the op-ed seems to support this notion. This is a very disturbing moment. Who knew that he thought so little of us.

A: The anecdote to bad talk is alternative talk. What about the senate writing something? It is then possible to set the record straight. Focusing on a faculty point of view would counter this information.

10. In your discussion of a cabinet, based on what you were saying, it seems that your cabinet was useful, offered feedback, and was transparent. Do all 23 presidents utilize a cabinet like the one you have? Are you willing to go and motivate them to create such a cabinet? If we are all invested in shared governance and shared leadership, then these votes of no confidence will no longer be necessary. Loyalty to the institution can take precedent over loyalty to the individual.

11. It is important for campus presidents to have the freedom and authority to run campuses the way they see important. Leadership can be effective in different ways. Often it is asked whether or not centralization is important or decentralization. Rather the question is how do we optimize. Shared governance requires work in ambiguity and for some this is uncomfortable.
12. It is important if we think of the best leaders of our campuses and invest in their leadership. It is also important to ensure that the trustees and leadership have the same confidence in the faculty. The op-ed says that there is a real problem. Someone leading the system at that level is symptomatic of a divide between faculty, administration, and BoT. The fact that we are having these conversations is disappointing. It is important to believe that we work for the same team.
13. It is important to remember that members do not speak for the BoT or one faculty member speaks for all faculty. This is just one op-ed and a one day story. It is not in the press. The BoT works very hard to make it clear that they support the work of the faculty. The evidence is in the celebration of faculty work. We have many new trustees and they are visiting campuses and listening to what campuses are most proud about. The BoT permanently endowed the recognition of four faculty every year. The trustees care deeply about success in the life of faculty. It is healthy for us to have these conversations from time to time. It shows a shared commitment to think about these issues. It is important to take these conversations back to your campuses and think about what are our expectations of one another, and call one another out when we are wrong. The other evidence is a faculty trustee with full voting authority, except in bargaining due to labor law reasons. This is another important voice. My leadership came from an academic point view, rather than administrative.

Dia Poole – Alumni Association Liaison Report

Alumni Association Liaison Poole reported that her term ends on June 30, 2017. Mr. Morales will be taking over the new President. The alumni association met in Marc and there is much potential for future growth. With 3.3 million alumni, additional momentum can be gained by the council participating in career preparation, food and housing insecurity, etc. Presentations from Dr. Minor, Senior Strategist for Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence and others were made during the last meeting. Tiger teams were created to address how alumni can help with basic needs and career preparation. The teams yielded six pages of ideas. Alumni Association Liaison Poole also reported that the association passed a resolution on GI 2025 and produced a tool kit on how alumni could help with student success goals. A copy will be provided to the ASCSU and the tool kit will be release at the end of this month. Chair Miller will be included in the memo. The GI is expected to create an additional 500,000 alumni. Dr. Krabacher represented the ASCSU at the last meeting. Alumni Association Liaison Poole further reported that the Alumni Council has been helping in advocacy for full funding to the CSU and attended the Golder Bear reception in Sacramento. Alumni Association Liaison Poole thanked the ASCSU for their advocacy efforts to ensure additional CSU funding. California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) showcased alumni and each graduating senior was allowed to bring a faculty member as an escort for the distinguished award. This action points out the important roles that faculty play in student success. Lastly, Alumni

Association Liaison Poole reported that CSU San Bernardino lost a President Emeritus was lost. Alumni Association Liaison Poole also thanked the ASCSU for their gracious invitations during her presidency. The following concerns and questions were raised:

1. Next year, FGA will be engaging in local advocacy. Former Senator Swartz will be coming back as the LLA and it would be nice to partner with you on advocacy.
2. The Alumni Council is happy to support the advocacy efforts.

Michael Ratcliffe – California State Student Association (CSSA) Liaison Report

CSSA Liaison Ratcliffe reported that this will be his last report, as he is graduating in twenty days. The past CSSA plenary consisted of Executive Office elections. Maggie White will serve as the new CSSA President. Student Trustee and Special Officer elections are still being conducted. Resolutions were passed on the Real Food Challenge and legislative bills pertinent to student concerns. These included, but were not limited to, Student Financial Aid and Pell Grant (Rodrigues), DNP, and Dream Resource Liaison, Kick Start My Future loan forgiveness, etc. Stances have not been taken on SB 677 on Student Whistleblowers and AB 847. These will be discussed at the July plenary. Resolutions Black Student Success and Ethnic Studies have been passed. The following concerns and questions were raised:

Senator Swartz thanked the CSSA for their collaborative work on advocacy.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Incorporating the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) Recommendations in Revising Executive Order (EO) 1100	<u>AS-3291-17/APEP (Rev)</u> <i>Postponed indefinitely</i>
Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar 2017-18 Meetings	<u>AS-3292-17/EX (Rev)</u> <i>Approved Unanimously</i>
Support for Active Learning and High Impact Practices in CSU Graduation Initiative 2025	<u>AS-3293-17/AA (Rev)</u> <i>Approved Without Dissent</i>
Campus Accommodation of Military Students’ Service Obligations	<u>AS-3295-17/FGA/AA (Rev)</u> <i>Approved Unanimously</i>
Regarding Lack of Consultation on the Drafting of a CSU Intellectual Property Policy	<u>AS-3296-17/FA</u> <i>Approved Without Dissent</i>
Expression of Respect for CSU San Bernardino (CSUSB) No Confidence Vote	<u>AS-3297-17/EX</u> <i>Approved Unanimously</i>
Resolution Regarding Violation of Confidentiality of CSU San Bernardino (CSUSB) Presidential Search Process and	<u>AS-3298-17/EX</u> <i>Approved</i>
Censure of Trustee Emeritus Lou Monville and Mr. Paul Granillo	
Establishment of a Task-Force to Explore Models of Employment Security for Senior Contingent Faculty, Librarian, Coaches, and Counselors	<u>AS-3283-17/FA (Rev)</u> <i>Approved Unanimously</i>

ADJOURNMENT

The ASCSU Plenary adjourned at 5:00p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary