**Report on Academic Senate CSU Meeting**

**November 1-4, 2016**

**Submitted by Catherine Nelson, SSU Statewide Academic Senator**

**Resolutions Passed**

**AS-3268-16/FGA (Rev) ACR 158 (Holden): Undergraduate Student Transfers**: *Background*: Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 158 was introduced in response to the difficulty one student had in transferring a course between two CSU campuses. The situation was resolved. But the California State Assembly and Senate passed the resolution to encourage the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges (CCCs), CSU and UC to expedite their efforts to streamline the transfer process and to ensure that all General Education Credits can transfer between all three systems. The full text of ACR 158 is available at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_0151-0200/acr_158_bill_20160825_chaptered.html>.

In response to ACR 158, *AS-3268-16/FGA (Rev) ACR 158 (Holden)* reaffirms the ASCSU’s longstanding commitment to improving student transfer within and among California’s three public higher education segments, and asserts its continued support for existing CSU policies that facilitate such transfers. It emphasizes the ASCSU’s willingness to collaborate with the California Legislature to further improve undergraduate student transfers and requests that members of the California State Senate and Assembly first consult with the ASCSU when considering future legislative actions that might impact the CSU system.

**AS-3269-AA/APEP (Rev) Course Grading in the Golden Four**:

*Background*: In 2011 the ASCSU passed AS-3020-11/APEP/AA (Rev) Grade Minima for CSU General Education Courses in the “Golden Four,” that called for a minimum of a C (2.0) for the award of GE credit in the “Golden Four” (written communication, oral communication, mathematical/quantitative reasoning and critical thinking). In 2015, Executive Order (EO) 1100, Section 2.2.2 required the 2.0 grade for all native and transfer students. The CSU subsequently issued Coded Memorandum ASA-2016-8 “Basic Subject Courses and the Grade of C-“ which stated, *“Students performing at the low end of the scale at any CSU or external campuses that do not award C- might likely receive C grades.  The consequence is that the literal intention of section 2.2.2 of Executive Order 1100 cannot be evenly enforced”.* The memorandum, issued without consultation with faculty, consequently imposed grade minima of C- for the “Golden Four.” Subsequent to the issuance of the coded memorandum, a working group of faculty and Chancellor’s Office staff was created to explore solutions other than those in ASA-2016-8.

*AS-3269-AA/APEP (Rev) Course Grading in the Golden Four* is based on the results of the work groups’ efforts. It recommends that course-to-course transfer of credit for lower division basic subjects in the Golden Four follow the rules for GE credit from the institution where the student completed the course. It also reiterates ASCSU support for grade minima of C (2.0) in each course of the “Golden Four,” and encourages the adoption of a systemwide rule that a grade lower than C- will not yield CSU Golden Four GE credit regardless of the institution of origin.

**AS-3270-16/APEP (Rev) Implementation of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) Recommendations**: This resolution endorses the recommendations in the QRTF Report and asks the Chancellor’s Office, in collaboration with the ASCSU, to engage appropriate stakeholders in the implementation of those recommendations. For the full text of the report, see <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/index.shtml>.

**AS-3271-16/AA (Rev) Establishment of an Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Task Force to Study General Education:** This resolution calls for the creation of an ASCSU task force to examine, offer suggestions, and report on GE programs systemwide. The resolution indicates that the work of the task force may include, among other things, analyzing the data generated by the recent Chancellor’s Office systemwide survey of campus GE programs, identifying best practices in communicating GE pathways and requirements to students and assessing student learning outcomes, identifying ways to coordinate transferability of GE courses without sacrificing academic quality or campus autonomy and reviewing EO 1100, “General Education Breadth Requirements,” and to provide recommendations for revision if warranted. The impetus for the resolution is to maintain currency in GE programs, identify best practices across the system and respond to increasing interest in CSU GE by external stakeholders.

**AS-3273-16/FGA Support for the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees (BOT) 2017-18 Budget Request:** According to the rationale for this resolution, at this early stage, the state’s funding plan for the CSU does not include sufficient resources to meet the CSU 2017-18 preliminary budget plan. The resolution conveys the ASCSU’s support for the CSU BOT 2017-18 budget request for additional monies from the state, over and above the $157.2 million funding commitment to the CSU by the Governor for student success, completion and access, infrastructure/facilities and employee compensation. It also urges that in its request, the BOT allocate at least half the monies for the Graduation Initiative 2025 to assist in resolving the tenure density issue in the CSU by hiring and retention of tenure track faculty to improve student success and access.

**AS-3275/AA/APEP Commendation of Ken O’Donnell:** This resolution is a commendation for Ken O’Donnell for his accomplishments while serving as CSU Senior Director of Student Engagement. O’Donnell recently left the Chancellor’s Office to take a position as Associate Vice President for Student Success Integration and Assessment at CSU Dominguez Hills.

**First Reading Resolutions**

**AS-3276-16/FA Academic Freedom Policy:**

*Background*:In January 2015 the ASCSU approved a resolution requesting that “…the Chancellor’s Office and Board of Trustees draft a comprehensive policy on academic freedom in consultation with ASCSU representatives.” (AS-3197-14/ FA The Need for a Comprehensive CSU Policy on Academic Freedom, <https://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2014-2015/documents/3197.shtml> After some delay the CSU Office of General Counsel informed the ASCSU that academic freedom is within the scope of bargaining, and in the absence of a formal CFA relinquishment of its collective bargaining rights on academic freedom the administration will not join the CFA and ASCSU to discuss the issue. In October 2016 the administration sent the ASCSU a draft policy, developed by the administration with no consultation with the faculty, and asked for ASCSU input. FA found that the draft ignores recommendations of past ASCSU resolutions, violates policies on academic freedom developed by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and keeps the CSU way behind other universities in respect to academic freedom policies.

FA subsequently developed its own academic freedom policy.

*AS-3276-16/FA Academic Freedom Policy* reaffirms the ASCSU’s strong commitment and constitutional responsibility to “advance the principles of academic freedom and freedom of inquiry” and approves the academic freedom policy developed by the Faculty Affairs (FA) Committee. It also urges the CSU to adopt the FA academic freedom policy as a model for a comprehensive and updated systemwide policy.

**AS-3277-16/FA Lactation Resource Policy and Practices in the California State University:** The rationale for this resolution states that many CSU campuses have failed to develop or adequately implement policies that meet the basic standards and criteria in existing law regarding lactation resources. In the resolution, the ASCSU recognizes the importance and value of adequate lactation resources for all members of the CSU community and calls for the review of existing policies and the development of new policies on campuses where there is none. A series of specific recommendations includes a call for campus policies to comply with existing law by requiring a minimum number of dedicated and regularly-maintained lactation stations on each campus, and for all plans for new CSU multi-use buildings to include easily accessible, dedicated lactation resources.

**AS-3278-16/APEP A Call for Increased Funding to the California State University to Avert a Tuition Increase**: The CSU has announced a potential tuition increase of $270.00 for the 2017-18 academic year. This resolution acknowledges the significant disinvestment in the CSU by the state of California over the last decade, acknowledges the burden even a modest tuition increase can impose, especially on vulnerable student populations and encourages the CSU, ASCSU and California State Student Association (CSSA) to continue to engage in sustained joint advocacy to secure adequate state funding to avert the need for a tuition increase. The CSSA has expressed its opposition to the proposed increase and created a website to keep the public informed about the proposal and its position and plans for action. The website url is <http://tuition.calstatestudents.org/> . CFA also opposes the increase.

For the full text of resolutions see <http://calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/>.

**Other Meeting Highlights**

**Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations:** Implementation of the task force recommendations is moving forward. The Chancellor’s Office is in conversation with the ASCSU about the distribution of responsibility/accountability for various aspects of the recommendations. The Center for Mathematics Instruction is proving to be one of the more controversial aspects of the project. In addition, the Co-Chairs of the task force, Steven Filling (Stanislaus) and Kate Stevenson (Fullerton) are meeting with state legislative and governor’s office staff, campus academic senates and others about the recommendations. Lt. Governor Gavin Newsom called Steven Filling to ask what he could to encourage the CSU to take action on the recommendations. The full report is available at <http://calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/index.shtml>.

**California Faculty Association**: CFA President Jennifer Eagan reported on union action around the November 8 election. A list of CFA legislative and proposition endorsements is available on the union’s website at <http://calfac.org>. The union is devoting substantial time and energy to the campaign for Proposition 55, which extends higher income tax rates for the wealthiest Californians and dedicate the funds to healthcare and public education. CFA is also launching a research paper aimed at telling the Legislature the story of the CSU at this time of a massive amount of state disinvestment in the institution coupled with the changing demographics of students. The main theme is that as students become less white, state investment has gone down. This is why CFA is taking a position against new student fees. With regard to academic freedom, Eagan reported that the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) published a letter listing what they think are unconstitutional free speech policies on college campuses. Seven CSUs and two UCs are on the list. See <https://www.thefire.org/fire-to-red-light-public-universities-revise-your-unconstitutional-speech-codes/>.

**Presentation on CSU Support Budget and Student Fee Increase by Ryan Storm, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget**: AVC Storm and Cara Perkins, Assistant Budget Director, presented the Chancellor’s Office case for the tuition increase. They explained that under AB 970 (<http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201120120AB970> ) the CSU is required to comply with prescribed public notice and student consultation procedures prior to adopting an increase in mandatory system fees. Two distinct meetings of the Board of Trustees are required, the first where the proposal is introduced and the second where it becomes an action item (much like a first and second reading). Under that timeline the Board could potentially adopt the increase in early 2017, to be effective Fall 2017. A multiple-year plan for predictable fee increases will be considered only if the Board is willing to support the initial 5% increase for 2017-18. Currently, systemwide undergraduate tuition in the CSU is $5472. The 5% increase of $270/year raises that to $5742. Storm repeated the argument made every time the CSU considers a fee increase, that students who qualify for financial aid (family income of $70,000/year or less) would have their tuition covered by a Cal Grant, State University Grant (SUG), Pell Grant or a state waiver. In response to a senator’s question about the impact of increased fees on graduation rates, Storm claimed that increased fees could result in better “through put” for students. That is, if a smaller tuition increase resulted in more classes, etc., that could shrink graduation time from 4 ½ to 4 years. The senator asked for evidence to that effect. To paraphrase CFA President Eagan, it is unlikely an extensive argument will be needed to convince the Board of Trustees to raise fees.

**Chancellor White**: The tuition increase dominated the conversation with Chancellor White. He urged senators to listen to his October 25 interview with local PBS station KQED, which focused heavily on the fee increase (Google KQED Timothy White, can’t get url to work). White claimed he doesn’t want to raise tuition, but without enough resources, the CSU can’t serve the state and the public good. If the state doesn’t pay the CSU will ask students to cost share. If the CSU is successful with the state, the “hydraulic” for tuition goes down. The Chancellor described the situation as “…an ecosystem, not a last minute ‘oh crap we need more money’ appeal.” White concluded that the CSU has to find way to tell its story successfully, a la “when in Rome…” To that end he reported that this year the CSU is developing strong relationships with young elected officials in the legislature on both sides of the isle who will “get the gavel” (leadership positions) in the future.

The question of tenure density (ratio of tenured/tenure-track faculty to total full time equivalent faculty workforce) also came up during White’s visit. In response to a question about hiring new tenure track faculty to increase tenure density, White indicated that it was part of the metrics for presidents that they add to campus tenure track ranks. If the number isn’t moving, he will have a conversation with a president about what’s getting in the way. He did question tenure density as a measure of the appropriate level of tenure/tenure track faculty, but believes there should be a goal and campuses should be held accountable for it.

Full minutes of ASCSU plenary meetings are available at: <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Minutes/index.shtml>