The ASCSU met on Thursday-Friday, September 6-7, 2018.

1. Reports from the Standing Committees of the ASCSU

   a. Academic Affairs reported on the following topics:
      1) Executive Order 1100: some campuses are still having problems, including changes in GE offerings implemented this summer by the Chancellor’s Office. Individual campus Departments are losing FTES and faculty positions. Lecturers are particularly likely to lose teaching assignments with changes in GE courses offered within any department.
      2) Faculty leadership & Innovation Awards: 360 nominations, 26 recipients.
      3) The ASCSU White Paper on Student Success
      4) State University Grants
      5) A resolution commemorating service learning within the CSU presented as a first-reading item.
      6) The Achievement Gap in the CSU
      7) California Community Colleges (CCC) are developing an Online College.
      8) Allowing CSU student enrollment in online courses at various CSU campuses.
      9) CSU BOT Education Policy Agenda, particularly the Graduation Initiative.

   b. Academic Preparation and Education Programs reported on the following topics:
      1) West Ed is conducting a study to examine the implementation and results of EO 1110 (changes to remedial/entry/GE Math and English). They have started campus visits, examining outcomes of this year’s Early Start (summer) programs at three campuses (Fullerton, LA, Stanislaus). Early results appear positive but are preliminary.
      2) Smarter Balanced, a digital assessment system currently used by the CA Department of Education, is being considered as a placement indicator for CSU Math and English, and CSU admissions.
      3) Recruitment activities on campus, specifically efforts to increase recruitment of faculty persons of color.
      4) Preparation of Special Education teachers in the CSU.

   c. Faculty Affairs reported on the following topics:
      1) Executive Order 1096 revised, Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking. Revisions focus on: a) combining previous EOs 1096 and 1097 into one policy; b) a new definition of harassment, from “persistent” to “sufficiently severe and pervasive;” c) reporting requirements for students working in Student Residence; d) provision of information about processes and resources
to respondents; e) new language concerning appeal submissions; e) new
definitions of “stealthing” and “sexual exploitation” are added.
2) A $1.2 million state allocation to the CSU and the UC for unconscious bias
training.
3) Developing Clinical tenure-track faculty positions in Nursing, beginning at
Sacramento State.
4) Online courses in the CSU, specifically issues surrounding student opinion
surveys, intellectual property, and academic freedom
5) How the $25 million budgeted this year for hiring tenure-track faculty in the
CSU is being allocated and used.

d. Fiscal and Governmental Affairs reported on the following topics:
   1) They are working on a position paper on Graduation Initiative 2025.
   2) They are considering new ways of lobbying for the CSU.

e. General Education Advisory Committee reported on the following topics:
   1) Executive Order 1036, especially systemwide awarding of credits for transfer
courses.
   2) They are collecting data from campuses about best practices in assessment
within General Education.

f. General Education Task Force reported on the following topics:
   1) Review of General Education breadth requirements.
   2) Increasing students’ understanding of the structure and intentions of General
Education.
   3) Development of students’ learning attitudes, including meta-cognition.

2. Resolutions addressed by the ASCSU:

a. Observing the 20th Anniversary of the CSU Center for Community Engagement,
   and Student Success in Service Learning and Community Engagement.
   This resolution will be addressed as a second-reading item at the November plenary.

3. Visitors

a. Jennifer Eagan (CFA President and Liaison) provided a 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.
   a. **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.
   b. **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.
   c. **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

b. **Executive Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard**

EVC Blanchard outlined the agenda for the Board of Trustees meeting scheduled for week of 9/10/2018. Broad topics include international programs (including study abroad, international collaborations, international students and alumni); faculty scholarship, particularly the role of student training in research and collaboration with faculty; Graduation Initiative 2025, including enrollment management; EO 1110 and the preliminary report from West Ed on Early Start programs from several campuses.
EVC Blanchard indicated that several Executive Orders will be revised this year, including EOs on Title IX policies, student immunizations, and student organizations, including the role of faculty advisors.

EVC Blanchard emphasized student success as being composed of three primary factors: learning quality, access, and completion. He asserted that Graduation Initiative 2025 has three goals: increasing graduation rates while maintaining high quality; eliminating achievement gaps; and meeting California’s workforce needs.

c. Chancellor White

Chancellor White indicated that a preliminary budget request for next year to the Board of Trustees would include an increase of $400 million to the state allocation. He indicated that a proposal to the new Governor may include a multi-year funding agreement rather than seeking a new budget every year. He indicated that the CSU is in discussions with the University of California for a joint bond for infrastructure needs, including a General Obligation. Preliminary amounts are in the $4-5 billion range.

Chancellor White indicated that student fee increases are not intended this year but that they must consult on potential increases at least one year in advance. The CSU has begun discussion of fee increases with the California State Student Association (CSSA).

This year’s budget allocation included an increase of $283 million to the CSU, including $122 million for compensation increases and $75 million for Graduation Initiative 2025. Within that $75 million, $25 million must be spent on tenure-track hiring. He indicated that campuses will develop their own hiring plans and priorities, with accountability to the CA legislature.

d. Jason Wenrick, Executive Director, Common Human Resource System [CHRS].

CHRS is being adopted systemwide. Currently the different CSUs use a variety of HR systems that involve different applications, differences in data recording and reporting, and so on. PeopleSoft 9.0 is no longer supported. Adoption of CHRS is an effort to modernize and coordinate HR system with goals of increased efficiency, increased HR support at each campus and systemwide, and cost savings. The new system should provide better support for recruitment, time management, benefits and workforce administration, management of Lecturer faculty across multiple campuses, support of contracts, and so on. The CHRS system will be piloted on five campuses starting in 2019, with plans for the first wave of campus implementation in 2020.

e. Assistant Vice Chancellor James Minor

AVC Minor mentioned the Faculty Leadership and Innovation Awards, expressing his appreciation to the selection committee. There were 26 awards from 360 applications. The 26 awardees will be featured in a media campaign. He then updated us on GI 2025.
He mentioned the upcoming GI 2025 conference in October. It is likely that all sessions will be livestreamed. Campus watch parties will be supported.

AVC Minor reported that the preliminary results from campuses offering EO 1110 supported Early Start summer sessions this year are 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 recommendations. There will be an attempt to continue to support the workgroups and coordinate their work.

f. **Manolo P. Morales (Alumni Council President) reported.** System and campus alumni groups were involved in lobbying efforts this year. The Council is focused on students’ basic needs (housing, food) and overall well-being, including through mentoring activities. Next steps include increasing alumni involvement on campuses and within student groups, classrooms, and faculty activities. CSU faculty who are also alumni are an untapped resource.

g. **Wilson Hall (CSSA Liaison) reported.** He indicated that the policy agenda for CSSA this year includes: 1) providing food and housing (basic needs) for all students; 2) assuring accessibility, affordability, and sustainability for the CSU; 3) academic success and a holistic learning experience for all students.

h. **Bill Blischke (ERFSA President) reported.** He began by enumerating the many ways in which retired faculty continue to contribute to their campuses, many of which overlap with their former roles. He described charitable activities ERFSA engages in, including Soles for Souls, a drive to collect used shoes from campuses for distribution to the less fortunate around the world.

4. **Other issues**

   The body engaged in an extensive quasi-meeting of the whole and discussed the document titled “*Tenets of System Level Governance in the California State University*” (see below). This document was developed jointly by the 2017-18 ASCSU Executive Committee and CSU leadership. The 2017-2018 Senate chose not to waive a first reading of a resolution endorsing the document in May 2018, effectively tabling discussion of the document. The discussion at this meeting was an attempt to determine the will of the body on how to proceed. We voted to place the document on the November meeting agenda as a first-reading item, although that may again change into a longer quasi-meeting of the whole discussion of the document.
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. 

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](https://www.perb.ca.gov/laws/statutes.aspx#ST3560)


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 Aloisi, 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