

Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Minutes

November 6–7, 2014
Office of the Chancellor

Plenary - Thursday, November 6, 2014 – 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Dumke Auditorium

Plenary - Friday, November 7, 2014 – 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., Dumke Auditorium

1. Call to order: 8:34 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 (Browne, Chisholm); Monterey Bay (Davis, Nishita); Northridge (Chong, Schutte); Pomona (Neto, Swartz); Sacramento (Holl, Krabacher, Miller); San Bernardino (Steffel, Ullman); San Diego (Eadie, Ornatowski, Wheeler); San Francisco (Collins, Yee-Melichar); San Jose (Lessow-Hurley, Sabalius, Van Selst); San Luis Obispo (Froohar, LoCascio); San Marcos (Barsky, Brodowsky); Sonoma (Nelson, Roberts); Stanislaus (Eudey, Filling); Emeritus/Retired Faculty (Pasternack)

Guests: William Blischke (CSU-ERFA); Andy Merrifield (CFA, via teleconference); Sara Sanders (CSSA); Steven Stepanek (Faculty Trustee); Ron Vogel (CO); Ed Sullivan (CO); Chancellor Timothy P. White

3. Approval of Agenda: Approved as revised.

4. Approval of Minutes of September 4–5, 2014: Approved.

5. Announcements

Senator Gubernat announced an all-day AAUP- and campus-sponsored conference at East Bay, scheduled for Friday, March 13, 2015, on the theme of academic freedom and honoring past ASCSU East Bay Senator and current AAUP Vice President Hank Reichman on the occasion of his retirement. Details to follow. All are invited.

6. Presentations/Introductions

None.

7. Reports

7.1 Chair

Chair Filling referred to his written report, previously distributed:

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/documents/November-2014-Chairs-Rept.pdf

Exception requests to the 120/180-unit limit are sitting in bank boxes in the office of the Chancellor, who has promised that he will communicate with faculty before ruling on exception requests. The Chair asked campuses for narratives relating to the process and has found wide variations therein. An individual faculty member had done some consultancy work for the CO on 120/180 limits, but the senate was told that the work went beyond the scope of the project and the report generated could not be shared. CFA meanwhile made an information request about the work done; it exists in a huge PDF file and the Chair will make it available in more digestible bits. The report concludes that those programs that had been exceeding the 120/180-unit limitation did not affect time-to-graduation rates.

The San Jose and Chico campuses have requested administrative reviews and campus climate studies; both campuses have asked for help in bringing campus issues to the attention of the CO.

On the matter of SB 850, the devil seems to be in the details and to date no one has created a process whereby the CSU can respond to requests to determine if a proposed CCC baccalaureate program duplicates an extant offering. The Academic Affairs Committee has been asked to take on the task of developing a process of determining likeness.

After putting out a call for volunteers, and at times having found that the Executive Committee had to appoint its own members when there were no volunteers, the following appointments have been made to these committees/task forces: Senator Guerin to Institute of Teaching and Learning; Senator Benavides to Quality Assurance; Senators Chisholm, Collins, Roberts to Modes of Instruction; Senators Baaske, Murphy, and Van Selst to Discipline Councils. The Chair believes that it is important to make appointments initially from among members of the ASCSU; however, due to workload increases and a dearth of responses to calls for volunteers recently, the senate may need to expand the pool to the entire faculty.

Recently attended meetings: At the Academic Council meeting in October, Ryan Storm and Phil Garcia of the CO presented their overview of the mandated performance measures; additional measures were also discussed. When asked what the provosts wanted money for most, the provosts' answer was money for faculty hiring. At the meeting of campus Senate Chairs, there was a request for data on hiring trends. At the CSSA meeting at Humboldt, a spirited discussion of student fees was led by Student Trustee Alexanian. During the Graduation Initiative meeting of October 15, enrollment and graduation targets were distributed. Ed Trust personnel plotted historical trend lines, and the various campus teams were given access to the dashboard project. The Chair encouraged senators to consult the relevant URL for the data.

The search for the position of Executive Vice Chancellor is progressing but the status of candidates is, understandably, confidential. The intention is to identify and hire by year-end. EVC Smith will stay on board until the new EVC can assume the position.

Finally, the new task force on "financial sustainability" has a charge that has been drafted, though the group is empowered to modify that charge. Along with the Faculty Trustee, the Chair sits on this task force, and has found, so far, that there could be bold new financial models for campuses emerging from the work of the group; they will continue meeting in January and March.

Vice Chair Miller on the Academic Conference

Vice Chair Miller thanked the planning team for their work, particularly in the long journey from the Hilton to the CO, the many meetings, teleconferences, and emails. She thanked the following

individuals on the team: the entire Executive Committee and Senators Baaske, Nelson, Yee-Melichar, and Kaiser. Even now, so soon before the conference, many adjustments are having to be made. Because a late finish to the Board meeting is anticipated, the schedule has been shifted, but the overall scaffolding remains in place. Participants should come on Thursday for lunch and registration. Welcome remarks by Chair Filling after lunch will be followed by that day's keynote by Kevin Finneran; breakout sessions on the themes of the keynote will follow, then the CSSA presentation, students' poster session, final remarks, and dinner. Friday begins with breakfast, a keynote by Suzanne Mettler, breakout sessions, a panel discussion and adjournment by noon.

Questions about the purposes and outcomes of the conference were raised at the FGA committee meeting. The conference website has a brief paragraph that may answer some of the questions. The ASCSU is resurrecting a tradition that was in place but had been abandoned. One of the purposes is community building, bringing various constituencies together (trustees, faculty, students, administrators) for formal and informal dialogue. Forty-six senators are registered, a number exceeding expectations, as do the following numbers: 17 senate chairs; 14 presidents; 19 provosts; over 40 students; 10 trustees. Miller said that such an opportunity to speak with members of the BOT is rare; they hear from faculty about bargaining or other concerns, whereas this is an opportunity for faculty to tell their stories. There are no "talking points" but an opportunity for dialogue. Faculty might also encourage the students to be engaged as well and to intermingle with other constituencies.

The conference also provides the chance to collect information gleaned during breakout sessions; Miller made special note of the excellent work of Senators Soni on the breakout sessions and Yee-Melichar on the survey instrument.

Plans are also being developed for archiving the event; there will be a videotape of the keynotes and a photographer will be on site, capturing still photos. Senators praised the event organizers; the Chair lauded Vice Chair Miller's work as the lead on the conference. He commented that the collaboration between the ASCSU and the Chancellor on solving the conference's many challenges bodes well for the relationship between the senate and the Chancellor in the future.

7.2 Standing committees

Academic Affairs (AA) – Bill Eadie, Chair

Eadie noted the committee's increased workload, with more meetings and deadlines between plenaries, including a special meeting in September to provide feedback on student success fees.

At the committee's meeting yesterday the following were on the agenda:

- A referral to revisit EO 1065, which had been reviewed by the committee last year, in light of current revisions, which had previously been seen as non-substantive. The committee will continue to work on the issues raised, in concert with GEAC, and report back. Among the issues were grades allowed for the Golden Four.
- A draft in response to the academic sustainability plan is being worked on and will appear as a resolution.
- As tasked by the Executive Committee, AA is working on giving advice on the process mandated by SB 850 to determine duplication with CSU degrees. The committee discussed what criteria

should be used to assess duplication and how the process should be structured at the system and campus level. Eadie expects to deliver an interim report since the draft is nearly complete. One concern is that there be a CSU review of the pilot programs not only at their initiation but throughout the process, since the substance of the curriculum could change and duplication be introduced later.

- The committee prepared, and will present at plenary, a commendation of Wayne Tikkanen upon his retirement.

Other ongoing projects involve campus response to A2E, in particular, in relation to active learning and student success; assessment of ILOs by campuses and how the ASCSU might provide help in the process; and the necessary role of Intermediate Algebra in the curriculum. (Math Council is split on the issue.) The committee is waiting for the Ethnic Studies task force report before making any recommendations or taking any action in that arena.

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

Fleming reported that the committee met yesterday with Dr. Sharon Russell, who provided updates on the Commission on Credentialing; she relayed that there is now a fourth option to assess candidates through Pearson at a cost of 400 dollars; the choice of assessment tool is a local matter.

The committee is looking at the Academy for Excellence’s three-tier band of assessment descriptors; there may be a need to go beyond their gold standard. Fleming invited senators to send her an email if there is interest, as well as to email her on issues of accreditation.

Fleming also reported that new Early Start data will be coming in. Numbers system-wide are down, due to glitches in transcripts. Of most concern to the committee was that the ERWC program, devised by CSU faculty, and used to exempt students, is now using a “C” grade instead of the “B” grade that faculty recommended. When the committee asked about why that change was made, they were told that otherwise students would find the exemption process too complex. Since that made little sense to the committee, they are planning to consult with English Council about the original “B” recommendation.

Senators raised various questions and concerns from the floor about teacher credentialing; ERWC and the Common Core; Common Core and Smarter Balance; and the possibility of an earlier, that is, a grammar-school, threshold for determining readiness.

Faculty Affairs (FA) – Manzar Foroohar, Chair

Foroohar reported that the committee is perfecting two second reading items, one on sexual assault and violence, and the other on protecting faculty’s academic freedom, and both will be presented to the body at plenary. Two first reading items in preparation are on the subjects of non-tenure-track faculty in shared governance and the need for a comprehensive update on the CSU policy on academic freedom. The General Counsel met briefly with the committee on the latter. There was also a phone call with Andy Merrifield of the CFA regarding the tentative agreement on the contract.

HR sent the committee a written report that should be of interest to the body: There were 750 tenure-track searches in the system last year, with 900 anticipated in the upcoming year. While the numbers look impressive in contrast to previous years, the system’s net gain, due to resignations and retirements, is only 124. Meanwhile, a large number of lecturer positions have been added; the

lecturer FTE across the system accounts for much more than does the tenure track. Tenure density is now 56.5%, far below ACR 73's goal of 75%. (It was mentioned later that tenure density also includes FERPs, so the percentage is even more dire.)

In response to the numbers reported above, senators raised the issues of t-t faculty being replaced by lecturers, not tenure lines, and the fact that, while enrollment is growing, tenure-track faculty ranks are not. Meanwhile, lecturers are taking on more of the burden, including service, which is not mandated, and their course loads are higher; many long-term lecturers would welcome the opportunity to be hired full-time as tenured professors. Some senators raised the point that how lecturers are treated, say, in regard to credit for their service, is a campus-based, or even department-based, decision and that "full-time" is indeed a slippery term when applied to lecturers. Concern was expressed both about the exploitation of lecturers as well as about their lacking some of the protections, particularly in regard to issues of academic freedom, that tenure-track faculty enjoy.

Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) – Thomas Krabacher, Chair

Krabacher reported that the committee plans to bring a resolution to the plenary addressing the annual BOT report on the budget and will be co-sponsoring the resolution on the sustainability plan metrics. The committee had heard from Ryan Storm on the latter, and the committee is particularly interested in the fiscal implications of the goals of the legislation.

Other topics of concern included the uses of foundation funds; the possible implications of the Time-Warner/Comcast merger vis a vis access to educational materials; and how closing the achievement gap may pose issues for the committee to pursue. As charged, the committee is reviewing the LAO report on higher ed budgeting for 14-15; a time certain phone call with the LAO raised a number of issues on the budget and on the new debt service model. (Senators from the floor raised a number of concerns about this short-term strategy to solve long-term problems.) The LAO representatives on the call also spent a surprisingly great deal of time asking questions about SB 1440. (In response to a senator's question, Krabacher acknowledged that the committee reported to the LAO that, so far, SB 1440 has had no effect on enrollment.)

Krabacher noted that, by now, the Governor has acted on proposed legislation; he will be circulating a report to the body this morning or this afternoon on the disposition of the relevant bills. The committee had originally hoped to organize some fall advocacy with the legislature but now the focus is on getting senators to speak to local legislators, and to make contact with newly elected leaders to make them aware of the CSU and its concerns. In a teleconference, the committee learned from Andy Martinez that, though the high offices remain in Democratic hands, there is no longer a super-majority, and this could have budget implications. Martinez added that, for a variety of reasons, including lack of a strong student vote, higher ed will not be a hot topic going forward.

7.3 Other committees and committee liaisons

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) - Senator Van Selst, Chair

Van Selst referred to his written report forwarded to the senate. He noted the following issues in summary:

- GEAC is reviewing AP course credit by exam; some of the labels have changed, and the issue is timely because the CCCs are beholden to our credit-by-exam policy. An AP seminar, suggested to count toward A3, was recommended instead for elective credit.
- “Linked Learning,” which provides a variety of health science pathways, is an initiative that could enable students to adopt better study habits earlier through blocked scheduling.
- The Compass project will wrap up in February in Sacramento. There is possibility of a system minor. (A question from the floor raised the issue of why a system minor was necessary and who was behind it? Were faculty? Themed GE can work differently on different campuses. The answer was that this was “bottom-up,” that Compass participants were interested in finding points of commonality; perhaps a better term than “system minor” should be advanced. The sustainability minor at Chico and Butte was also offered as an example of a prototype of thematic GE work in STEM in particular.)
- GEAC is involved in the WICHE project wherein three of the Golden Four are being examined across states for transferability; an issue for the CSU is how to include the Critical Thinking requirement in future.
- The community college report indicated that that Fall C-ID efforts are being hampered by a lack of personnel, and if a district is going to offer a transfer degree, their offering must align with C-ID and GE objectives.

Ethnic Studies Task Force

Senator Kensinger reported that there will be a meeting of the task force tomorrow and again in December. They did not meet in October and at this point do not have reports from all campuses.

7.4 Faculty Trustee report

Trustee Stepanek referred to his written report sent out earlier in the week. He reported that in recent visits to the Chico, Maritime, and Humboldt campuses he encountered warm welcomes and had excellent conversations with students and faculty. He enjoyed the campus tours. The next campus he intends to visit is San Jose and is looking forward to exploring, on site, the issues that have been raised there.

He has been a regular attendee at the student success fees working group and indicated links in his report, including an audio link at Sonoma. There may be a preliminary report coming to the BOT, and he expressed the hope that he might be involved in shaping it. The basic decision is whether or not to grandfather in those fees already in existence. A big change could require a formal student vote after consultation for any new campus fees. The legislation that requires fees to be reconfirmed every five years by a new vote raises issues because of lifespan; right now on some campuses, fees are being used for classroom support, which is traditionally in the regular budget, and/or to hire tenure-track professors. Such a five-year funding model is problematic when considering how to finance hiring and retention of permanent faculty.

Stepanek, who is also on the Executive Vice Chancellor search committee, reiterated what Chair Filling reported about the committee’s moving forward, with the expectation of an announcement of a hiring at year’s end.

About the Graduation Initiative: He indicated that particular numbers given to campuses for their goals took people by surprise. He referred senators to the dashboard for details and trends, including historic reports, demographics, persistence rate, achievement gaps, etc. The target date of 2025 could enable the CSU to start working with high schools now to promote readiness.

Stepanek then addressed questions and heard comments from the body:

Senators asked about whether the five-year re-approval process would be applied to those campuses, such as San Diego, where t-t faculty have already been hired through student success fees. The answer was that the expectation is that current fees in effect would be grandfathered in. Meanwhile, it was brought out, that it is important that students always have a referendum on the fees they agree to be charged with. There is further need to explore process and for more transparency around how the monies are allocated. Many questions were raised about the inequities of student success fees across campuses, how they relate to spending on athletics (that may no longer be necessary to attract students), and how, ultimately, success fees are more of a "hidden tax" and it would be more honest to raise tuition. A final concern was that continuing to charge higher and higher fees is a way of "privatizing" public higher education by shifting the burden away from the state and onto students and their families.

About the issue of reaching down into the high schools: there is a need to get some attention paid to common assessment tools during the transition to Common Core; much is in a state of flux in K-12.

Senators also expressed concern about the statistical underpinning driving the models of success found in the dashboard measures. The sentiment was that they are running inappropriate models that will not yield useful data and that there is more work to do on these models.

7.5 Andy Merrifield, CFA Liaison Report

Via teleconference: Dr. Merrifield directed the body to the CFA website where the tentative agreement had been posted; editing of the document has been made clear with highlights, bolds, and deletes noted. Highlights of the agreement include a general salary increase for three years with a reopener for May 2015 for both sides that could lead to a statutory process, if warranted. There is also discussion of a reopener for those teaching in Extended Education.

There has been no substantial change in the salary proposal from when he last reported to the ASCSU. The new agreement calls for progression through the ranks among the lower-paid lecturers; Range L is eliminated; lecturers can go to B from A, based on their terminal degree.

A formal proposal for years 2 and 3 has not been put together. This has always been about repairing the ongoing inversion problems; there is also a need to face the compression experienced by full professors and other senior faculty who have not gotten anything since PPIs in 2009. This will be a significant issue in years 2 and 3.

Based on the results of faculty surveys, workload and salary were the two most important issues for the new contract to address; problems that have arisen in both, according to Merrifield, have been based in poor management decisions in the past. The TA now sets aside money for all newly hired tenure-track faculty to get a minimum amount of reassigned time, one course per term, or to maintain a current campus norm if it is preferable.

A pool of money will be set aside for “exceptional service”—that is, for faculty dealing with first-generation students, faculty in small departments with responsibility for more committee work, faculty with excessive student contact for theses, internships, etc. The pool, totaling 1.3M system-wide, is based in an FTE ratio, and will be controlled through faculty governance. Like RSCA funds, the monies will be reliant on faculty deciding how to make the distributions. The reassignment costs are 2.7M, on average, over three years.

Other changes to the contract include electronic storage of records to make for a greener university and obviate the need for excessive paper use, with security issues being addressed. The WPAF can be electronic as a campus option. There will be better protection of evaluation processes for online teaching, improved parental leave, prohibitions against unpaid work, particularly among coaches with a 10-month contract who are required to work in summer and need to be compensated. Those who teach 4-unit courses who have been required to teach an additional one unit for free or get less than their entitlement will now be paid at a regular rate. The sabbatical process has been modified; a faculty member can only be turned down once if deemed “irreplaceable.” There are no changes in parking fees.

The tentative agreement can be voted on until November 9, 2014 at 5 p.m. The CFA Board of Directors is urging a “yes” vote.

On the legislative advocacy front: CFA is working with PAC folks and government relations people to put together material, and possible legislation, for the upcoming session. The word “supplanting” still needs a clear definition; a compromise had been reached during the last session, but the CSU pulled out and the bill was defeated. There may be other legislation that the CFA will work on going forward, to be determined.

If the contract is ratified, it is hoped that both sides, administration and faculty, and the BOT will work together for our common interests, including for a reasonable budget. The Chancellor made that clear in written statements during bargaining. And, as was true last year, CFA intends to work collaboratively with the ASCSU.

Senators brought up the need for SSIs, particularly for senior faculty of long-standing. Senior faculty about to retire, who have never been paid that well to begin with, are losing out in this contract, and their retirement plans are being affected. There are conflicts created now among senior and junior faculty and adjunct faculty as well as talk of union de-certification and separate bargaining units. In response, Merrifield said that the hope was to deal with compression in years 2 and 3. The philosophy of the contract is that unfortunately all problems cannot be fixed in a single year, given the limited resources the system makes available; priorities were set in response to member surveys about what needs were most immediate. Merrifield also said that all contracts have left people dissatisfied in the past, and that de-certification, which has arisen as a possibility before, but has never been acted upon, would be disastrous for faculty.

Senators also expressed concern about the contract’s provisions related to governance, in particular, the assigned time that senates will have to make decisions about; this could be a “hot potato” and potentially divisive. There doesn’t seem to have been any consultation with senates on this provision, yet it is binding upon them now in the contract. Merrifield responded that members on the bargaining team who had been active in governance for years felt that asking senates, rather than management, to decide on how to allocate the reassigned time was the better idea. It was felt that this was akin to RSCA processes.

To a question about summer work for coaches that is not compensated, Merrifield directed the faculty member to the local CFA; they need to be paid at a faculty rate in Extended Ed.

7.6 Sara Sanders, CSSA Liaison Report

Having visited Humboldt for the last CSSA meeting, Sanders noted that she now fully understands the difficulties of travel to and from that campus. The next meeting will be held at Sonoma. Among the CSSA goals are to increase advocacy efforts and to help with transfer issues in collaboration with the CCCs. Other concerns: she referred to last year's CSSA white paper on online education as still on their radar, as well as GE, Ethnic Studies, and veterans' issues. CSSA has a resolution on campus fees, enabling campus autonomy, and another resolution on upgrading the open-meetings laws. CSSA would like to see the public interest protected vis a vis how auxiliaries function by making them subject to the Brown Act. She noted that students involved in the Academic Conference next week are excited about their role, particularly in the campus poster sessions. She announced the recent resignation of CSSA President Daniel Clark and the fact that they are working to fill his various roles in the conference; the student trustee, Talar Alexanian, has agreed to do so. In response to a question about not making clear why CSSA is asking to raise a four-dollar fee for their own uses, Sanders said that there is a whole list she could share, but principally the fee would be helpful in funding advocacy efforts with the legislature at both state and national levels. She opined that using funds this way could result in more money to do away with fees altogether.

7.7 William Blischke, CSU ERFA Liaison Report

Dr. Blischke reported that at the last ERFA plenary, which consisted mostly of reports, a major concern among emeriti was the decrease in the number of tenure-track faculty. He offered help in any advocacy efforts going forward. ERFA focused on the community-college baccalaureate legislation and where that might be headed. They also offered their support for the faculty trustee bill. Blischke reminded the body that the senate archives are held at Dominguez Hills where there is a "gold mine" of information on the CSU. He urged senators to make an appointment and see for themselves.

ERFA's Executive Director Don Cameron will be retiring from that position in July so there is a search committee approving the final wording for a call. The description of the position can be found on their website and he urges faculty to urge emeriti who fit the bill to apply. Deadline: January 19, 2015. A major limitation is the office's location in Northridge where there has been free space, computer, phone, mail, etc., so ERFA does not want to move offices. The position is 15 hours per week, with the necessity of being on site twice a month. Travel costs are covered.

ERFA leadership is also looking forward to meeting with the Chancellor soon to make him aware of their organization and its important activities, including the newsletter (a quarterly, delayed this time in order to capture the news of this plenary).

Note: Before the lunch break, Senator Sabalius next took a moment of personal privilege to ask the Executive Committee the following question: It is nearly two years since Chancellor White has

taken over; former Chancellor Reed was particularly good at building relationships with the legislature. What do the Executive Committee members think is the greatest quality of the current chancellor? How do they feel about him?

Members of the Executive Committee responded by noting Chancellor's White genuine interest in the academy; his dedication to the mission of the CSU. Especially notable: his skills as a communicator who listens and can be persuaded to change his mind through entertaining other perspectives; who has worked with great good will to help the Academic Conference succeed through a number of significant changes; whose intent is to "change the culture" of the CO; who welcomes solutions rather than problems; who delegates, and expects accountability from his cabinet; who has a sense of humor.

7.8 Timothy P. White, CSU Chancellor

The Chancellor welcomed the senate in advance to his home, where he and his wife Karen will host a reception for the ASCSU this evening following the plenary.

He remarked that at the next BOT meeting, new finance authority for capital projects will be coming up—it is mandated in the law, but there remain mixed feelings about the implications. Debt moved into the CSU budget allows for new authority that can bypass state processes, giving the CSU more authority on capital projects, new buildings, attracting philanthropic as well as state dollars; however, new authority without new revenues could well be problematic in the future.

Also at the BOT, student success fees will be an information, not yet an action, item. There has been a moratorium on new fees, per the legislature, and now the concern is how to move forward. The CSU's overall budget request, because it asks much more than is provided for in the Governor's plan, will garner conversation. The CSU will need to make sure officials understand our highest priority needs. An added dimension to the conversation is the context of the UC's proposed tuition hikes. For the CSU, it will be important to remain grounded in what we do: the need to serve more students, earning degrees sooner, good faculty, good facilities—and how to go about getting the resources the CSU needs and fulfilling CA's expectations of us. The Chancellor concluded with the expression "There is a lot of sand moving out there."

The Chancellor then addressed the following questions and comments from the floor:

Q. Vice Chair Miller asked about the progress being made on granting exceptions to high-unit majors. She also referred to the CFA information request that revealed that Academic Affairs at the CO had once employed a faculty consultant to weigh in on the matter, but the results of that consultancy had not been made available to the ASCSU when asked for. Some of what is now being learned is that the consultant's findings paralleled our own, in particular with reference to the need for exceptions in Engineering. Miller asked then when could the CSU learn of the Chancellor's decision on the exceptions submitted to his office since timelines on that decision seem to have shifted.

A. The Chancellor referred to the two bank boxes and binders in his office holding the requests for exceptions and promised to get to them sooner rather than later. He said he respects what students and faculty need and the need to advocate for quality. He said he was unaware of that consultant's study but will look into it. The Chancellor remarked on the challenge of trying to stay with the big picture while so much attention right now is needed to such details distracting him from larger projects.

Q. Senator LoCascio noted that he shared Vice Chair Miller's concerns and wanted to draw the Chancellor's attention to the difference between a 2-3 page report coming from a campus asking for exceptions for their engineering programs and the ABET 600-page report. He also posited that the true costs and the outcomes (including improving graduation rates) of moving from quarters to semesters are still to be revealed. SLO alumni are against quarter to semester conversion.

A. The Chancellor offered to buy him a drink at tonight's reception.

Q. Senator Kaiser alluded to the many recent tragedies and serious problems extant among students on our campuses: deaths, suicides, hate crimes, etc. Faculty who do counseling cannot keep up and when they retire, are being replaced by staff. The mental health needs of students are of major concern, yet there is often no person available to turn to for help, merely a phone number.

A. The Chancellor acknowledged that he shared the senator's concern and will ask the new Vice Chancellor of Human Resources to see what can be done for Chico faculty and staff. In his days in campus leadership, he said, there was nothing more difficult than confronting these tragedies and mental health challenges, and at a residential campus, the need is even more profound.

Q. Senator Van Selst asked about the new debt service model. Why not ask for a higher percentage from the state, as UC did, as costs are going up, and whatever the government doesn't pay for becomes the CSU responsibility? It is terrifying.

A. The Chancellor answered that the BOT request has a new line item of 25 million dollars for debt service. The money is fungible but will be earmarked; in Sacramento, memories are short and the CSU needs to create firewalls in both our budgeting and their thinking. He has confidence that Steve Relyea will have a handle on this, but while the opportunities are enormous, the tensions will not go away during Governor Brown's administration.

Q. Senator Benavides asked what the Chancellor's expectations were for next week's Academic Conference. Does he have any ideas and/or recommendations?

A. The Chancellor replied that the senate "owns" the conference, that he is "just a bank." Ultimately, relationships trump just about everything else, and the best ideas should win, no matter from whom they originate. As a "relative newcomer," he welcomes the big step forward to be made in his understanding of and respect for the CSU community. In terms of outcomes, he looks forward to two or three big ideas emerging from the conference that could show great promise of an incredible return if we develop them.

Q. Senator Baaske asked, in light of the budget request, while there is provision for enrollment growth, there doesn't seem to be much attention being paid to recouping the losses of recent years in faculty hires. There has been a precipitous decline in tenure-track faculty lines; we're at 56% down from 66%, and nowhere near the ACR-73 goal.

A. The Chancellor said he takes the senator's point about the need to increase tenure-track hires. In his State of the CSU speech in January, he says, he will speak to the reversals of those curves and how the long-term health of the organization is dependent upon doing so. But requesting to backfill the one billion dollar loss would result in a budget request that is DOA. It has been difficult to get agreement on a budget request that goes beyond that known to be what the Governor will approve.

The CSU has to now have the courage to engage in other conversations about how to get revenue, and if we wait for the state, we will slide back in terms of both quality and access.

The Chancellor continued by saying that the new task force on financial sustainability is so crucial; we cannot continue on this current path if we are to meet access needs, provide quality at an affordable price, and timely completion of degrees. As we talk about this going forward, as a community, we have to recognize the ideology of the past we grew up in is no longer viable, and that, given the reality, if we don't adapt our ways, we will slide into mediocrity. The Chancellor ended by affirming "that is not why I signed up."

7.9 Ed Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research & Resources

Sullivan referred to his time spent at Fullerton and reminded the ASCSU of his recent appearance at last May's plenary to report on Early Start data on that campus. Among his going-away presents from Fullerton, he displayed a keychain from the senate and encouraged senators to seek him out; he has an open door policy—so no business cards.

He then answered the following questions from senators:

Q. Senator Kaiser asked how he collected data from the campuses.

A. Sullivan remarked that some of the campus systems date back to the 70s, and are even still in ASCII text files, so that the CO must often rely on the quality of the data that comes from an individual campus--and that we can do better with data quality. Accountability measures may place more of a burden on campuses in the future, and his goal is to try to soften the load on the individual campus and help all become more strategic.

Q. Senator Brodowsky asked how difficult it is to have comparable data across campuses that collect it locally then attempt to see it system-wide, for instance, data on SB 1440 or Early Start. Campuses need guidance on the kind of data needed to be collected if what is being looked for is an apples-to-apples comparison, that is, meaningful system-wide data.

A. Sullivan replied that he agreed with the Senator. A data element dictionary is strong here; interpretations of nuances inside of a dictionary can return different answers that are all correct, and additional conversations are required. SB 1440, he said, is a beautiful example: "Did you use it for admissions?" vs. "Did you admit him using SB 1440?" will get you different answers. Much of what we do requires that we become better communicators.

Q. Senator Holl said that the campuses have been hammered with graduation rates, size of curriculum, etc., yet our data is old. SB 1440 data, for example, is only anecdotal, and she asserted that we [in engineering] can graduate students just as quickly at 132 units as at 120, because the students are motivated. But there is nothing to prove this. So is the new dashboard going to give us more modern, useful data?

A. Sullivan responded that among the better conversations he has had have been with colleges of engineering regarding graduation rates. Meanwhile, he has questions related to admissions standards and calling students who need remediation for two full semesters "first-time freshmen." It will be important to look at retention rates vs. graduation rates during the first two years. We could start to affect rates immediately, and we need to do a better job on comparison rates.

Q. Senator Guerin said for those who live data, like data, want to use data and explore how factors influence the CSU, the analytics studies website was unfortunately defunded in 09-10. Can we hope to get it back, as it is critical for transparency and accountability?

A. Sullivan acknowledged that the website is not as good as he would like. We may not get all of it back, but he agreed to return with more information. He said he has control over trend data on enrollments and is working on moving that forward. There is lots of work ahead, and right now the job is getting their house in order.

Guerin responded by naming some of the data she'd like to see: SFR, number of administrators, tenure density—what we think of as drivers of quality, but when the data stop at 2009, that becomes really difficult. Faculty want to point to official data and not be questioned about its validity; while there has been suspicion from the BOT about certain faculty claims, getting data from you would make us more credible.

Q. Senator Walker asked when will transfer student information, information about STEM and grad rates, in particular, be up on the dashboard, and Sullivan answered that he believed it is to be found lower down on the page.

7.10 Ephraim Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

EVC Smith reported on the progress of those initiatives he described as “front-burner”:

- **The Graduation Initiative:** A summit was held on October 15 with four people from each campus in discussions about how to move forward. CSU will come in over target with a six-year rate of 54 or 55%, or more. However, the achievement gap unfortunately remains because “all boats rose.” The CSU will have a six-year goal for Pell recipients, for underrepresented populations, and with varying goals on campuses.
- **Early Start:** 29,000 students were in Early Start English and Math on the semester campuses, and now that the quarter campuses are at census, their reports will added to the number and he will report back on those figures in January.
- **SB 1440:** Academic Affairs is now taking a different tack here, focusing on campus experience of TMCs, looking for which campuses are successful with transfers from community colleges in order to learn what to do for more traction.
- **Bottlenecks and SB 386:** By fall 2015 the goal is to have developed a portal where anyone can access online courses. Gerry Hanley will go into this further in his report. Smith has found that, in speaking with the UC, they have created, independent of the CSU, a similar infrastructure. He expects to be ready this spring with 3,000 courses in the system to be listed; as previously mentioned there was a trial run this summer with 700 online courses. On the matter of upper-division articulation: the guideline being used is from a 1974 Executive Order wherein the student is described as “visiting student.” It is well written and provides good protections but will have to be reviewed to see if it fits the online scenario where it might need modification. Provisions include no first-time freshmen, only one course per term; first-time transfers also cannot sign up.

EVC Smith then addressed the following questions from senators:

Q. Senator Baaske noted that though his campus president has shared their own targets at LA, it would be useful if the ASCSU could be provided with the targets for each campus so some comparisons could be generated.

A. Smith said that at the end of the October 15 meeting it was decided that the data were still in draft mode, and there would be time for presidents to review their goals and discuss them further before releasing them broadly. The goals will be released during the Chancellor's State of the University address in January.

Q. Regarding 386, Senator Guerin asked if there are data indicating student success in these online courses. How do students perform in terms of completion, or GPA, or any other indicators? When Smith suggested that the matter should be referred to Hanley, Guerin then mused that any TA working in an afternoon could easily generate the data. Why is it taking so long to get data on student success in this program? Further on the subject of CourseMatch: Senator Kaiser expressed concern about random students signing up for courses in a WASC-certified two-year degree in sociology at Chico. There has been some reassurance that prerequisites are the filter, but, unfortunately, students often self-certify.

Q. Senator LoCascio inquired as to graduation and admission rates by gender. At Cal Poly SLO females are graduating at a rate that is 10% higher than that of males, and more females are being admitted. Also, what do we know about the cost per degree in light of the new redistribution of funds? Why don't we know more about what it costs to educate students by campus? By program?

A. Smith responded that SFRs by department on every campus should provide a good idea of what the costs are. Facilities costs, deferred maintenance, new buildings meanwhile seem uppermost in the minds of the BOT, and since the state doesn't want to supply the money, the problem is worsening. Gender is a national issue, he added. There is little research on it, and he agrees with the senator, that it is of concern.

Q. Senator Van Selst inquired about the status of electronic transfer of transcripts from the CCCs.

A. Smith directed him to Eric Forbes to inquire about this matter. The cost would be so little that Smith is not sure why but, so far, it cannot work on all of the CCC campuses.

Q. Senator Brodowsky said that he appreciated the work on these initiatives, but if faculty are not told what the measures are going to be, how will they know how to work toward them, and if and when they arrive at a good result? We have a lack of information that could be used to compare campuses, although there is no shortage of data.

A. Smith agreed. He said the problem is that some of these initiatives have been started not by the CSU but by the legislature or the BOT; how do we know, then, that, for example, 60% is the right goal? It seems achievable, based on our mission, but may not be definitive. Meanwhile, how many students should come through the pipeline of SB 1440? What happens if we are overrun with transfers—an issue that was raised at the last BOT meeting?

Q. Senator Ullman commented that some of the analyses being produced are not based on state of the art; predictors in the models do not make sense. Faculty could help develop better goals through theory-based models that allow for interpretation of predictors. The end point seems to be the focus, but what's missing is the process—so that, on the dashboard, for example, for the six-year

graduation rate, the biggest predictor is whether or not the student has been there in the 4th year. The wealth of talent across the CSU in terms of modeling and interpretation could be relied upon but it seems not to have occurred, especially when data are not made available to faculty.

A. Smith agreed. Initially, money was made available for coming up with proposals for high-impact practices and quite a bit of effort was devoted there to move the needle. Much attention had been paid to freshman year. More can be done, and there will be some money in the budget for other pilot studies.

Ullman clarified that she was referring to analysis that has already been done, the outcomes on the dashboard, in particular. Smith referred her to Jeff Gold or Ed Sullivan.

Q. Senator Yudelson thanked EVC Smith for his years of dedication in the system. His question was about the role of computers in student learning. MOOCs have been a disappointment, obviously. They may provide “access” but access to what? If the CSU is to maintain and advance its reputation, computers are mere tools that cannot replace faculty. What happens when students rarely if ever see a professor and have little or no chance for on-ground interaction? Adding 200 people to an online class for access sake is not the answer; the hope is for more tenure-track faculty hiring, and not so many more computers. Yudelson added that he speaks from the perspective of a lecturer who has been “temporary” in the system since 1990.

A. Smith replied that they have been carefully monitoring what happens with MOOCs. He agrees that they are not an alternative to classroom learning, especially given their history of retention rates, and that online learning is not appropriate for all students. As far as the diminishing number of tenure-track faculty: since the recession, counts are low and tied to the budget, and after accounting for fixed costs in the Governor’s 119M proposal, little is left to increase the rate of faculty hiring. Meanwhile, what are reasonable enrollments that we should be targeting, given the budget allocation? That should be in the conversation.

Q. Senator Guerin said that she wanted to echo Senator Yudelson’s remarks. She referred to various situations at her home campus, Fullerton, including enrollment limits for students, class sections not being made available, GE at risk in Engineering programs. Are we saying that graduation rates could be improved if people agree to lower standards? So, is this a race toward mediocrity? Lately, the CSU is trying to meet the needs of the state at the expense of our reputation and quality and the investment we make in the citizenry. These are, in her words, “dark days.” Will faculty eventually be ashamed to work here?

A. Smith answered that students are being encouraged to take up to 17 units. But some campuses are over-enrolling new students, and this is a problem. No student should be held under 15 units. Ten years ago the graduation rates were pathetic; some campuses might even have lost financial aid, they were that low. But now the spotlight is on completion. It’s still not clear what the appropriate graduation rate should be, and institutional research people will continue working on that for the next few years. Our challenge is how we are funded as a system. We are short on sections and need to make a commitment that courses will be available when they are needed. It is not a matter of scheduling but of more sections. Smith says he would not back down on that; it has to be done. In closing, he brought up the fact that we are surpassing other comprehensives in our graduation rate; the next big push nationally is for a 15-unit semester. But how does that fit our mission? Can all our students handle it?

7.11 Gerard Hanley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Technology Services

Hanley said he was there to address the body about various academic technology initiatives. He said that 54 courses are expected in CourseMatch in Spring 2015; some are still being submitted, and it takes some time to get them processed and approved. He is working with Eric Forbes and his group to streamline requests for CourseMatch classes and get them away from paper-based forms. He hopes to pilot an online form; though this may sound simple, there are issues of security and protecting personal information online. Requirements to take a CourseMatch class continue to be the same: no first-time freshmen or first-time transfers; a course must not require anything face to face; it cannot be hybrid.

Q. Senator Brodowsky posed the following problem: He had developed an online course with people from four other campuses, but his department chair will not allow the course to be offered online, will not, in fact, schedule any online courses. Does Hanley have any suggestions?

A. Hanley said there could be financial benefit for the department if online courses were offered. What seems to be needed is more communication around support for faculty. If funding from the CO to develop such a course online was granted, there may be some leverage, especially if the department chair signed off on it.

Q. Guerin asked if there were any data available on student success in these online courses?

A. Hanley replied that no, there has been no tracking of students in CourseMatch. Now that Ed Sullivan is on board there may be the possibility of doing so.

Guerin suggested that even if the individual student is not identified, the instructor is, and data could be tracked that way. Hanley said there would have to be a commitment to do so.

Q. Senator Aloisio noted that on his campus (Channel Islands) faculty were instructed to save seats in their CourseMatch sections for students from other campuses. Is this required?

A. Hanley responded that when a course is identified as a CourseMatch course there is a commitment to provide seats; the number of seats set aside is relatively low in order to meet the needs of the students who are on campus. Campuses need to do both: provide the seats their own students need in order to make progress toward graduation and to make some seats available for CourseMatch registrants.

Q. Aloisio also asked about a problem he saw in getting the money generated by CourseMatch to the departments offering those courses, though it's not a great amount.

A. Hanley agreed to find out how the process is occurring; perhaps a Peoplesoft account is needed for an individual department.

Aloisio also remarked that while he usually agrees with Senator Brodowsky, he hopes that we don't have policies that restrict departments from making their own decisions about whether or not to put a course on line. This is a matter that is up to faculty, and also up to faculty to convince their colleagues of the efficacy of online delivery. Hanley answered that yes, a department is indeed a community of faculty making such decisions.

Q. Senator Creadon added that she still worries about ensuring that students at the offering campus get seats first, and is no longer sure that will happen. Native students get first crack at registration, but there are a number of scenarios that compel a student to register later. Can seats be held for native students, with that in mind?

A. Hanley said that timing is critical. CourseMatch students should only be enrolling later, not in early or pre-registration. The system doesn't control who gets enrolled and how; this could be a campus process, and as clear guidelines are still needed he will attempt to communicate them. EVC Smith has emphasized this as a first priority.

Q. Senator Frye said he shared concerns about access; many on his campus, however, are on financial aid and need late registration. It is his understanding that by contract the assignment of online classes has been the purview of the department chair, just as the time block or room assignment is at the chair's discretion. It seems that more discussion on the matter is warranted, since online may be seen as a faculty member's choice of teaching methodology.

Q. Senator LoCascio asked that when Cal Poly SLO is the last quarter campus standing, will the CourseMatch silo built between quarter and semester campuses eventually be taken down? What problems could there be?

A. Hanley answered that right now, because of financial aid issues, taking a quarter course while on a semester campus could result in less than a full load. In three more years, he said, more will be known about how all this will work.

Q. Senator Bodinger-deUriarte noted that, at this point, if faculty want to deliver a course online, or even transform it into a hybrid format, there are many layers of review needed for course modification that can take as much as a year on her campus. It's not merely up to the department chair to approve of the mode of course delivery. If campus processes were modified, we might be able to offer more on-line courses.

A. Hanley suggested that maybe a coded memo or Executive Order might be of help here. While he said he supported individual degree programs' needs and goals, more sharing of exemplary processes across the system might be useful, and that he "would be up for that."

8. Committee Recommendations

Action Items:

8.1 Improving Campus Response to Sexual Assault and Sexual Violence: AS-3192/FA/AA (Rev).
Second Reading. Approved without dissent.

8.2 Protecting the Academic Freedom of California State University Faculty: AS-3193-14/FA (Rev).
Second Reading. Approved.

8.3 Response to AB 94 (Liu): Goal Setting for Academic Performance Measures for Academic Sustainability Plan:
AS-3194-14/FGA. First Reading/Waiver. Approved unanimously.

8.4 Commendation for Wayne Tikkanen: AS-3195-14/AA. First Reading/Waiver. Approved by acclamation.

8.5 California State University Board of Trustees' Proposed 2015-2016 Support Budget: AS-3196-14/FGA. First Reading/Waiver. Approved without dissent.

8.7 Support for Encouraging 11th Graders to Take the SAT or ACT as a Means of Establishing College Readiness in English and Mathematics and the Dissemination of Registration Fee Waiver Information: AS-3198-14/FA. First Reading/Waiver. Approved unanimously.

First-reading Items:

8.6 The Need for a Current, Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom: AS-3197-14/FA

8.8 Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance in the California State University: AS-3199-14/FA

9. Adjournment at 2:30 p.m.