

Report from ASCSU September 6-7, 2018

John Tarjan and Janet Millar

1. **Chair Nelson** referred us to her written report. Chair Nelson's current and past chair reports can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/

2. Excerpts from Other Reports

- **Academic Affairs** discussed the following topics.
 - Reviewed the prior year AA annual report.
 - 2018 ITL Summer Academy Report
 - EO 1100 (rev.) update
 - EO 1110 Update
 - Faculty leadership & Innovation Award Update
 - Community Engagement
 - ASCSU White Paper on Student Success—definitions of success
 - State University Grants
 - Three resolutions (see below for the one on commemorating service learning which was presented for first reading)
 - Student Performance Gaps (by race)
 - CCC Online College
 - Enrollment in online courses on campuses other than the one where a student is enrolled
 - Intellectual Property
 - CSU BOT Education Policy Agenda including the GI 2025 and RSCA Funding (to support creative activity & scholarship)
- **Academic Preparation and Education Programs** discussed the following topics.
 - WestEd study looking at implementation of EO 1110 (update and solicitation of advice for improving data collection) Campus visitations have already begun. The results from this summer's early start programs seem promising.
 - The potential use of Smarter Balanced (free-to-the-students assessment given in the junior year of high school, and before) as a factor in CSU admissions. Concerns were expressed that the test was not designed for that purpose.
 - C-ID descriptor and transfer model curricula reviews. The lack of CSU faculty participation is an ongoing issue.
 - Notification to the CO when a TMC will no longer be accepted by a campus major.
 - Recruitment of potential teachers of color.
 - Preparation of special education teachers.
 - Inclusive teaching.
 - Potential requirement of a 4th year of math/quantitative reasoning in the a-g admissions requirements.
- **Faculty Affairs** discussed the following topics.
 - Potential clinical track faculty in the CSU Sacramento nursing program.
 - EO 1096 (Title IX issues).
 - State allocation for unconscious bias training in the UC and CSU.
 - Shared governance in the CSU.
 - Online education: intellectual property, academic freedom, faculty evaluation, student success, etc.

- Where the \$25m of additional state funding for tenure track faculty hiring is actually being spent in the CSU.
- **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** discussed the following topics.
 - Position paper on GI 2025—graduation rates and number of graduates are often confounded in peoples’ minds but are not necessarily strongly associated.
 - New modes of lobbying for the year.
- **GE Advisory Committee** discussed the following issues.
 - Reviewed the Chancellor’s charge to the committee.
 - EO 1036—system-wide credit for prior learning—differences in credits awarded.
 - GE Course Reviewers Guiding Notes revisions
 - Gathering data from the campuses about best practices in GE assessment
- **GE Task Force**
 - Is focusing on student success.
 - A review of the GE Area Breadth is probably long overdue.
 - Campus ability to tailor the program for their students’ needs is transcendent.
 - Students do not understand GE programs—they seem cumbersome.
 - The members have consensus on several things.
 - Need to increase coherence.
 - More consistency needed.
 - Learning outcomes and assessment need to be important components.
 - Intentionality should be more obvious.
 - Learning should lead to meta cognition.
 - Scaffolding of learning should be built in across courses.
 - Other Issues Being Discussed
 - Values statement and communications plan
 - Methods to increase value to students and communicate
 - Decreasing complexity
 - Reduce “hidden” requirements (e.g., AI, GVAR)

Many senators provided feedback to the task force related to double-counting, impact on departments’ staffing, high unit majors, preparation for life success, refocusing on student learning outcomes rather than courses, the importance of ethnic studies, the importance of breadth, the value of a liberal education, etc.

3. **Faculty Trustee Sabalius** reported on the success of getting over \$100m more in state allocation that initially requested by the BOT. Unfortunately, much of the additional money is one-time funds. We believe the unified lobbying efforts across the CSU were critical in reversing the proposed cuts by the Governor and the additional funding. We hired 3 presidents this year. Dr. Sabalius detailed his campus visits and many other commitments as faculty trustee, including meeting with legislators. Written faculty trustee reports can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/index.shtml
4. We elected the CSU Faculty Recommending Committee which will screen candidates for the faculty trustee position which term begins in the fall 2019. The elected members include
 - Jodie Ulman, CSU, SB, Chair
 - Nola Butler-Byrd, SDSU
 - Steven Filling, CSU, Stanislaus
 - Mark Van Selst, SJSU

- Cynthia Trevisan, CSUMA
 - Additionally, the following campuses were randomly selected to provide members for the committee: CSU, Fullerton & CSUC.
5. We passed a “**Commendation of Eric Forbes**,” retiring Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management.
 6. We introduced the following resolution that will be considered for adoption at our November plenary. Copies of this resolution should be available shortly for campus review.
 - a. **Observing the 20th Anniversary of the CSU Center for Community Engagement, and Student Success in Service Learning and Community Engagement** encourages both system and campus-based observations to highlight the successes in service learning and community engagement across the system.
 7. The body engaged in an informal discussion of “Tenets of System Level Governance in the California State University” (see the copy of this document at the end of this report). This document was developed jointly by the 2017-18 Executive Committee and system administrative leadership. The 2017-2018 Senate chose not to waive a first reading of a resolution endorsing the document last spring, effectively tabling the item. This discussion was an attempt to determine the will of the body on how to proceed.
 8. **Jennifer Eagan (CFA Liaison):** Provided the following written report.
 1. We get a 3.5% raise on Nov. 1 (Dec check) and a 2.5% raise on July 1 next year (Aug check).
 2. It’s election season, so CFA will be advocating for our endorsed candidates. We’ll be working hard for Gavin Newsom and especially Tony Thurmond for Superintendent of Public Instruction. Chapters will be working on local state races as well. You can see a list of our endorsed candidates and positions on some props here: <https://www.calfac.org/endorsements>
 3. You can take action by signing up to phone bank and walk with your chapter here: <https://www.calfac.org/take-action> There’s also a link on this page for you to email Gov. Brown asking him to sign SB 968 into law (see below).
 4. CFA will be out for Rise for Climate, Jobs & Justice March in San Francisco this Saturday, meeting at 10am at the corner Steuart and Embarcadero. If you’re in the neighborhood, come on out, it should be fun. Details here: <https://www.calfac.org/headline/other-news-34>
 5. Three of our sponsored bills are on route to the Gov.’s desk.
 - **AB 2505 (Santiago): CSU Reporting** This bill would establish regular CSU reports. The report would include a review how staffing decisions are currently made and best practices from other public segments. **Status:** Passed Asm Floor on Concurrence 08/29/18 (79-0) – to Enrollment.
 - **SB 968 (Pan): Mental Health Counselor / Student Ratio** This bill would require each CSU campus to hire one mental health counselor per 1,500 students. The bill also requires a campus mental health survey every three years and campus reporting on attempted suicides. **Status:** Passed Sen Floor on Concurrence 08/30/18 (39-0) – to Enrollment.

- **SB 1421 (Skinner): Right to know** This bill would modify the special secrecy for police officers to make records available to the public in cases involving sexual assault or dishonesty in criminal investigations, where accusations were sustained after due process. The bill would also make available records related to police shootings and other serious or deadly uses of force incidents, after 180 days, or after an investigation has been concluded (whichever comes first).

Status: Passed Sen Floor on Concurrence 08/31/18 (26-11) – to Enrollment.

6. Please sign up for CFA Headlines which will come straight to your email

box: <https://www.calfac.org/cfa-headlines>

7. Please also listen to our podcast, with the latest editions from the great Theresa Montaño, Professor of Chicana and Chicano Studies at Cal State Northridge and VP of CTA and a report from Demos and the SEIU Racial Justice Center on creating a politically effective race-class narrative: <https://www.calfac.org/radio-free-csu>

9. **Manolo P. Morales** (Alumni Council President) shared some of the activities and challenges of the system and campus alumni groups. They were very happy to be very involved in advocacy for an increased budget for the CSU. Last year the council focused on mentoring and meeting students' basic needs (food and housing). This year's goals include making increased progress in meeting students' basic needs. Alumni Trustee Nilon has been very effective in his role on the Board. Because the alumni trustee is elected by the alumni rather than appointed by the Governor, he/she is in a unique position to be a strong independent voice.

10. **Chancellor Timothy White** began by thanking ASCSU for their part in our successful advocacy efforts last year that resulted in a budget increase. He also thanked the selection committee for the new Faculty Innovation and Leadership Innovation Awards. CSU administration is drafting a preliminary budget request for the Board to consider. (It may be in the range of a \$400m increase.) Stress is placed on the campuses when they have to plan for students and hire faculty and staff before final budgets are allocated. We hope to come to an agreement (compact?) with the new Governor related to multi-year funding and workload levels. We have insufficient funds to meet our infrastructure needs. We are in preliminary discussions with the UC for a joint bond issue that would fund needed new construction and critical deferred maintenance. We also hope that the state will offer a general obligation bond to help address infrastructure needs. There is no intention to increase tuition this year but state law mandates that consultation on potential tuition increases begin almost a year in advance so contingent conversations have begun with CSSA just in case disastrous unforeseen events happen and a tuition increase might appear unavoidable. New monies have been allocated for faculty hiring this year. Most of the budget increase from last year had to be allocated to pay increases and other mandatory costs. As a result, only \$75m was allocated to the campuses for hiring. In response to questions & comments: We have been able to leverage our size to save money and increase value of our funds spent in procurement because of our size. We are partnering with the UC to increase this leverage. It is always a balancing act to try to be more efficient through system cooperation while allowing campuses to have the autonomy to optimize the way in which their resources are allocated. Our federal legislative priorities include student financial aid (very important to our students), research funding (very important to our faculty) and immigration issues (very important for our broader community). We got about \$120m in one-time money to be spent over 4 years (the first

time something like this has happened). We allocated \$20 this year and anticipate allocating significantly more next year. Unfortunately, increasing costs keep eating into our budgets. We have updated our estimate of CSU deferred maintenance. It is getting close to \$4b. Construction costs are skyrocketing across the country—up 18% in CA last year. We find that emphasizing completion rates and graduation numbers are paid attention to among many decision-makers. In the academy we need to continue to also focus on other dimensions of student success. We need to build the capacity of the CSU or CA will fall far short of reaching its goals for its citizens.

11. EVC Loren Blanchard indicated that preparation for next week's Board meeting continues. Items being prepared for the Education Policies Committee include presentations on

- International Programs
 - Study abroad,
 - International collaborations
 - international students
 - International alumni
 - Faculty professional development—training and research
- Research, Scholarship & Creative Activities
- Progress on GI 2025, including both preparation and enrollment management
- Implementation of EO 1110, including a preliminary report on the WestEd study of campus implementation during the past summer

Note: Board meetings are livestreamed: <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees>
On October 17-16 a GI 2025 symposium will be hosted by SDSU. The plenary sessions will be livestreamed. <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/why-the-csu-matters/graduation-initiative-2025/symposium/2018-symposium>

Several Executive Orders will likely be revised during the coming year dealing with:

- Immunizations
- Title XI policies
- Student Organizations

Dr. Blanchard was very complementary of the leadership retreat organized by the ASCSU Executive Committee which focused on student success. Student success has three components: learning, access, and completion. The graduation initiative has three interrelated goals: increase graduation rates while maintaining quality, eliminate achievement gaps, and meet the state's workforce needs.

In response to questions: The system and campuses are addressing how to increase SFR and tenure density given current budget levels and one-time funding structures. We are aware of gender issues in reducing achievement gaps. On-line education is very much in the spotlight, especially given the development of online education in the CCC. Before we partner with outside groups and share data with said groups, our general counsel office reviews agreements to ensure compliance with mandated protection of student data. The CO perspective on student success dovetails with that of the faculty but we perhaps place relatively more emphasis on access and completion. We recognize that we need significantly more enrollment growth dollars (3-5%) than is our base budget to effectively meet our goals for the GI 2025. We clearly have fallen short in funding. The UC and private schools will have to provide more access if the state is to meet its workforce development goals.

12. Jason Wenrick (Executive Director, Common Human Resource System [CHRS])

CHRS is being rolled out campus-by-campus across the system. There have been 24 different HR systems across the CSU (including the CO) with different applications, data recording and reporting, etc. PeopleSoft 9.0 is not even being supported any longer. This effort to modernize and coordinate our HR system(s) should result in cost savings, make mandatory reporting to external groups easier, and significantly improve HR support across our campuses. The system should provide better support for

- Recruiting
- Workforce Administration
- Benefits Administration
- Absence Management
- Time and Labor Management
- Temporary Faculty Management
- Support of Negotiated Contracts
- etc.

Software design is complete, 23% of the software has been completed. We are currently preparing for the first wave of campus implementation in 2020. Piloting of a couple of modules (recruiting) will begin on 5 campuses beginning in January 2019.

13. AVC James Minor began by mentioning the faculty Leadership and Innovation Awards and expressing his appreciation to the selection committee for their fine work. There were 26 awards made and well over 300 applicants. The 26 awardees will be featured in a media campaign. He then updated us on GI 2025. He mentioned the upcoming GI 2025 conference (see links above for more information). It is likely that all sessions will be livestreamed. Campus watch parties will be supported, with goodies available for those attending via livestream on a campus. The data from campuses offering EO 1110 supported/Early Start summer sessions this year are quite promising. Student success in mathematics under this model seems to have increased significantly and progress was made much faster than is being made by students in the same category beginning studies during the normal school year. Significant funds are being allocated to campuses to support the implementation of EO 1110. The GI 2025 workgroups continue to meet and have generated many recommendations, many of which overlap. There will be an attempt to continue to support the workgroups and coordinate their work.

14. Wilson Hall (CSSA Liaison) student leaders from across the state recently at CSULB for CSUnity with state decision-makers to develop an advocacy plan for the year. The policy agenda for CSSA this year includes the following items.

- Providing food and housing (basic needs) for all students.
- Assuring accessibility, affordability, and sustainability for the CSU.
- Academic success and a holistic learning experience for all students.

Several senators offered suggestions for addition issue to address including alcohol on campus and its correlation with sexual assault, serving the needs of “non-traditional” students, being an advocate for equity at all levels of education, serving graduate students, etc.

15. Bill Blischke (ERFSA President) Began by enumerating the many ways in which retired faculty continue to contribute to their campuses, many of which overlap with their former

roles. Note: ERFSA provides many very valuable resources for retired and nearly-retired CSU employees. The website is particularly valuable. <http://csuerfa.org/>

Tenets of System Level Shared Governance in the California State University

The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) and the Chancellor affirm their commitment that joint decision making is the long-accepted manner of shared governance at the system level.ⁱ Shared governance refers to the appropriately shared authority, responsibility and cooperative action among governing boards, administration and faculty in the governance and accountability of an academic institution.ⁱⁱ

The Constitution of the ASCSU establishes the purpose of the systemwide senate, as well as the means of consultation and decision making by which the senate will act.ⁱⁱⁱ Both the ASCSU and the chancellor recognize there will be areas of consultation and decision making in which one party or the other will have primary responsibility.^{iv} In the case of the faculty, primacy includes academic programs, curricula, methods of instruction, and areas of student life that directly relate to the educational process.^v In these areas the ASCSU is the formal policy-recommending body on systemwide academic and curricular policy and matters that directly impact them; it is also the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide fiscal decisions.^{vi} The authority of the faculty in these areas derives from its recognized expertise in academic matters. The chancellor maintains administrative responsibility for the institution. The chancellor shares responsibility for the defining and attaining of systemwide goals, which may include goals for the educational program, and the communication that links all components. In the case of academic policy, proposals for changes in policy or for new policy may arise from academic administrators.^{vii} Both parties accept the fiduciary and governing authority of the Board of Trustees of the California State University ultimately to set policy. For the CSU, consultation must take place with the ASCSU in areas of faculty primacy described above. This primacy means the faculty voice is given the greatest weight, although the authority for the final decision resides in the Office of the Chancellor. In areas of faculty primacy, recommendations of the faculty are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons.^{viii}

Consultation and mutual respect are key components of shared governance. Effective consultation and joint decision making result in decisions that better serve the CSU and its students. While discussions may take place in different forms with other constituencies, faculty consultation means that there is an established process of deliberation that offers a means for the faculty—either as a

whole or through authorized representatives—to develop and provide formal input in advance of decision making on the particular issue under consideration. System level policy affecting faculty primacy areas shall result from consultation between the chancellor and the ASCSU. Joint decision making in these areas results from effective consultation, as characterized below. While the ASCSU serves as the official voice of the faculty on systemwide issues, campus senates serve as the official voice of their respective faculty. Consistent with the precepts of this document, but not expressly addressed herein, campuses have their own relationships with the Office of the Chancellor. A normative culture of meaningful consultation must be characterized by:

- openness and transparency;
- commitment to civility, integrity, respect and open communication;
- mutual responsibility for decisions;
- trust, including trust of good intentions;
- a commitment to responsible participation on the part of all parties;
- a respect for evidence-based deliberation;
- a recognition of established best practices and promising new data-driven practices in the evaluation of subjects under consideration; and
- a recognition that consultation must allow both parties the time to consider, debate, develop their responses and work toward consensus while recognizing the need to proceed in a timely manner.

In accordance with the above described culture of consultation, any plan or policy that could affect faculty primacy areas and that may actually or potentially result in an executive order, shall be provided in draft form to the ASCSU body (or Executive Committee if during the summer), allowing for a reasonable review period (normally expected to approximate 75 days). If requested by the Executive Committee, additional extensions to obtain feedback may be authorized by mutual agreement. Each party recognizes that there will be occasional circumstances in which time constraints do not allow for normal systems of consultation to work effectively. The formal consultation process will therefore make provision to allow for an explicit agreement between the ASCSU and the chancellor to engage in a mutually agreed-upon process of expedited consultation in such cases, while still recognizing the formal role of the academic senates as the faculty voice on the matters under consideration. In the unlikely event that agreement cannot be reached, the chancellor will decide. Because an expedited process is not the most optimal form of consultation and shortchanges a robust shared governance process, its use should be limited to those rare circumstances that justify departing from the more comprehensive process intended by this document.

Ultimately, genuine consultation based on sound reasoning occurs only in such a time and manner that each party has a reasonable opportunity to affect the decision being made.

ⁱ In California, the faculty role in shared governance and the centrality of joint decision making in that process is clarified in the Higher Education Employee Relations Act (HEERA); HEERA was to establish collective bargaining for faculty at CSU to insure that in doing so, traditional shared governance practices are not inhibited or undermined: “*The Legislature recognizes that joint decision making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this chapter to both preserve and encourage that process. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict, limit, or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of the faculty in any shared governance mechanisms or practices...*”

<https://www.perb.ca.gov/laws/statutes.aspx#ST3560>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>.

ⁱⁱⁱ http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/records/about_the_senate/documents/constitution_2013_revision.pdf

^{iv} <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>.

^v <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>.

^{vi} http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/records/about_the_senate/documents/constitution_2013_revision.pdf

^{vii} <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>.

^{viii} [*Report of the Board of Trustees' Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University*](#). Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, September 1985.

Addendum

This document resulted from a series of meetings between members of the ASCSU Executive Committee (Christine Miller, Catherine Nelson, Simone Aloisio, Thomas Krabacher, and Robert Keith Collins) and members of the leadership team at the Office of the Chancellor (Timothy White, Loren Blanchard, Christine Mallon, James Minor and Leo Van Cleve). The meetings took place during the 2017-18 academic year, and culminated in mutual agreement on May 8, 2018.

The following definitions aided in the crafting of this document:

Chancellor: For the purpose of this document the Chancellor refers broadly to the functions assigned to the Chancellor and the staff who work in the Office of the Chancellor.

The following definitions are used by the American Association of University Professors and the American Conference of Academic Deans in surveys of higher education governance in 1970 and 2001. (1)

“Consultation: Consultation means that there is a formal procedure or established practice which provides a means for the faculty (as a whole or through authorized representatives) to present its judgment in the form of a recommendation, vote or other expression sufficiently explicit to record the position or positions taken by the faculty. This explicit expression of faculty judgment must take place prior to the actual making of the decision in question. Initiative for the expression of faculty judgment may come from the faculty, the administration, or the board.”

“Discussion: Discussion means that there is only an informal expression of opinion from the faculty or from individual faculty members; or that there is formally expressed opinion only from administratively selected committees.”

(1) <https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/97F85F15-0C93-4F2D-8291-E0E3DAC00329/0/01surv.pdf>