

Report from ASCSU Plenary Meeting
November 8-9, 2018
Heidi R. Riggio & Kris Bezdeczny
CSU Los Angeles

Reports

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

2. **ASCSU Committee Reports**

- **Academic Affairs** discussed at their meeting:
 - Observing the 20th Anniversary of the center for community engagement
 - Call for inclusion of tuition in Cal Grant B for freshman
 - Closing the achievement gap
 - Data-based decision making
 - Augmentation of Student Success White Paper (from GE Task Force)
 - Immigration status of students
 - Need for C-ID course reviewers
 - Alternative faculty appointments
 - Use of standardized tests in admissions
 - Funding for the Electronic Core Collection
- **Academic Preparation and Education Programs** discussed at their meeting:
 - Update on the WestEd study looking at implementation of EO 1110 (ongoing)
 - Disciplinary councils
 - Negative publicity about teacher education programs across the country
 - Proposal for a 4th (senior) year of quantitative reasoning in the a-g admissions standards
 - Proposal for a 3rd year of science in the a-g requirements (being considered by the UC also)
 - Update on student progress/classifications under the new EO 1110 structure
 - Resolutions (see below)
 - C-ID CORE faculty (course reviewers)
 - C-ID FDRG membership (in charge of maintaining discipline transfer curriculum)
 - Discipline council support
 - Commendation of Bechtel Corporation (January)
- **Faculty Affairs** discussed at their meeting:
 - State budget allocation to support unconscious bias training
 - Allocation of \$25m for tenure-track hiring
 - Appointment of clinical faculty (tenure-track with little or no scholarly activity expectations)
 - Presidential search process
 - Course Hero (posting of course materials without instructor consent or knowledge)
 - Outside requests for instructor/grade information
 - EO 1100 and 1110 implementation
- **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** discussed at their meeting:
 - Directory of who ASCSU legislative representatives are, including who represents the areas served by satellite campuses

- White paper on student success
- Planning for lobbying
- Tracking of legislation
- Tuition
- Campus budget allocations
- **GE Advisory Committee** discussed at their meeting:
 - Results of a survey of history chairs asking advice on units granted for AP modern history.
 - CCC Online College update (workforce, non-baccalaureate preparation)
 - GE Task Force report
 - Review of campus survey on best practices in GE assessment—will be looking at campus GE curriculum maps
 - Standardization of GE across the system as a result of EO 1100(rev.) implementation.
- **Senator Soni (CSU Long Beach) Report on ASCCC Plenary Meeting** highlighted the following discussed at their meeting:
 - The CCC Online College has no CEO and no faculty named yet.
 - There is a new CCC funding formula that includes incentives based upon student success. (Base plus enrollment, allocation based upon low income students, allocation based upon success) This may eventually move to a 60-20-20% breakdown.
 - Guided Pathways <http://cccgp.cccco.edu/>

3. **Faculty Trustee Sabalius** reported on the GI 2025 conference. The BOT met in its annual retreat the day before. He reported on his busy schedule since our last plenary, including many campus visits and meetings with faculty across the state. We anticipate a supplemental budget “ask” to the legislature of an additional \$456m. This would address deferred maintenance, student basic needs (housing, food, etc.), and enrollment growth of 5%. There is an increasing awareness of the magnitude of the CSU’s deferred maintenance problem. It is important to advocate for major increases in budget augmentation while the economy is healthy. He continues to argue for a deferred maintenance augmentation of at least \$1 billion. Deferred maintenance has a negative impact on student success. We need working, accessible infrastructure. Faculty Trustee reports can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/index.shtml

4. **Jennifer Eagan (CFA Liaison)** reported the following.

- Election Update
 - All but 2 CFA-endorsed candidates were elected with the possible exception of two people in races still too close to call (State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Insurance Commissioner).
 - CFA was out of force at the Newsome election celebration. Many students also attended.
 - Proposition 10 failed despite CFA endorsement.
 - Most CFA-endorsed senate candidates were elected or may be elected when final vote tallies come in.
 - CFA-endorsed candidates did well in assembly races. Several races still do not have definitive results.
 - We had a great partnership with the CSU administration, CSSA and others. Given that success, it was disappointing to see executive compensation increases being taken up by the BOT so soon after our budget became final.
- We are closely monitoring how the \$25m for new hires is being allocated/spent.

- Our contract runs out in 2020. While we are grateful for the raises under this contract, we are still “digging out of a compensation hole” dating back to before the big budget cuts. We are trying to educate faculty of the need to continue our strong efforts to address faculty issues. Bargaining has never been easy in this system.
- CFA is working on a paper on tenure density. We expect it to be released in June. Lecturer conversion to tenure-track positions, the impact of decreases in tenure-track counselors, etc. are issues currently being discussed.

5. **Alumni Trustee John Nilon**

In response to questions/comments: In at least some cases, it appears that open presidential searches result in a smaller pool of candidates than do closed searches. The search firm we have used assures us that this is the case across the country. He will work to help collaboration between the administration and faculty be even more effective. He will look into the issues surrounding the use of non-tenure-track faculty and tenure density. He addressed both our relationship with the legislature and our funding challenges. We may need to focus more attention on advocacy efforts at the legislative district level. Alumni can be a key component in building momentum for adequate funding for the CSU. He will ask the Chancellor about the status of the proposed task force on tenure/alternative types of appointment. We need to do a better job of maintaining email addresses for our graduates. He is very interested in student mental health issues and the need to do a better job of getting young men of color to attend our campuses. The state is considering a bond issue which might bring us \$4b to deal with deferred maintenance. However, unless the state pays off the bond, this will not help much with our funding challenges. Faculty diversity is an important topic for the CSU. We need to do a better job of concisely communicating what the CSU means to the state in terms of workforce development. We need to balance efficiency with effectiveness in what we do. We may want to consider the idea of designating all campus alcohol sales-related revenues go to funding student services, especially mental health services.

6. **EVC Loren Blanchard** began by lamenting the unfortunate and senseless shootings of young people, including college students, that took place last night in Thousand Oaks. CSU students were involved. We are putting our inter-campus cooperation plan into effect to assist CSU, Northridge in any way needed including counseling of students.

Next week the Board of Trustees will be focusing on student mental health. We are partnering with local and regional support services to increase our ability to meet student needs. Student basic needs (food, housing) will also be addressed. We will provide an update on the services we offer to our military veterans. We have over 21,000 service members, veteran’s, and service family members attending the CSU. The BOT will get an update on the GI 2025. We are proud of the number of students who are achieving a quality degree from the CSU. Our 4-year graduation rates have improved from 23% to 25% over the past year, the 6-year rate from 59 to 61, 2-year transfer student rate 35% to 38%, and the 4-year transfer student rate 75% to 78%. The URM graduation gap decreased from 12.2% to 10.5% and the Pell-eligible gap decreased from 12.6% to 9.5% over that same period.

GI 2025 workgroups continue their work. There is broad representation from across our system on these groups. They have done a great job in outlining some priorities for the coming years. Four foci going forward include:

- Campus implement of student preparation initiatives.
- Framework for student care and well-being.

- Increasing student course loads.
- Improving advising.

Dr. Blanchard addressed the public information request about faculty information and course grades. Our counsel's office has negotiated what we feel is a more reasonable request. We have a committee on technology and on-line education. It replaces other committees. It is focused on increasing student access. This committee will begin meeting later this month. The committee is composed of administrators from across the system, the ASCSU Executive Committee, and the CSSA President.

In response to questions about: The Interpretation of EO 1100 (rev.): We hope to help campuses be responsive to EO 1100 and align with system expectations without being overly prescriptive. Faculty Development Opportunities for Lecturers: The faculty representatives involved in overseeing those programs should be consulted on those issues.

7. **AVC Ryan Storm and Director Kara Perkins** made a presentation about the CSU budget. They began with a historical review. The CSU has lost much over the past 14 years. Real (adjusted for inflation) budget per student has dropped significantly. The holes in our budget from 6 years ago have not been filled even as our allocation has grown. Expenses per student are significantly lower than at our comparison institutions and a fraction of what they are at UC. CSU students graduate with significantly less debt than the national average. The base budget supplement request/projection has \$75m for the Graduation Initiative, \$206.1m for 5% enrollment growth, \$147.8 for employee compensation increases (approximately 3% increase), \$80m for academic facilities and infrastructure needs and \$45.4m for mandatory cost increases (health care benefits, retirement contributions, etc.) for a total of \$554.3m. We are asking the state for a general fund increase of \$456 and expect a \$98.3m increase student fund revenue (based on 5% enrollment increase) for the total of \$554.3m. The system anticipates also asking for a one-time funding augmentation of \$15m to meet student basic needs and \$250m for deferred maintenance. As soon as the BOT approves a budget request, advocacy will begin in earnest. Capital financing options for the state/CSU were reviewed. The best solution for the CSU might be for the state to put additional debt service funding into our base budget and allow us to borrow and repay our own construction funds. This would be a cheaper and faster alternative to having the state issue general obligation or lease-revenue bonds. Many technical questions regarding lobbying strategies, capital funding, recurring vs. one-time funding, etc. were asked and thoroughly answered. Of note is the possibility that if we ever make a pitch for a major increase in capital funding, this may be an opportune year with a new state administration taking office and a relatively robust economy.
8. **Joe Nino (CSSA Chair)** CSSA has been focused on voter registration and turnout. They are now refocusing their attention on their legislative/advocacy agenda. CSSA was glad to attend the GI 2025 conference and hopes that we can do things to remove the student success equity gap. Campuses are encouraged to nominate individuals for consideration for the student trustee position. CSSA is working with our sister segments' students to ensure adequate financial aid is available to all deserving students. They are preparing to weigh in on the proposed CSU executive compensation policy.
9. **James Swartz (ERFSA Liaison)** ERFSA is working with the CO to create better links across campuses. They are discussing our current tuition structure which is based upon unit tiers rather

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

Resolutions

1. We passed the following resolution upon second reading. Copies of this and other resolutions can be found at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/>.
 - **Observing the 20th Anniversary of the CSU Center for Community Engagement, and Student Success in Service Learning and Community Engagement** is self-explanatory.

2. We passed the following resolutions after waiving a second reading, because of their urgency. Copies of this and other resolutions can be found at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/>.
 - **Requirements for Appointment of Course Outline of Record (COR) Evaluators for the California Course-Identification (C-ID) Process** establishes criteria and a process for the appointment of CSU reviewers of CCC courses submitted for inclusion in CCC Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). Tenured, tenure-track and full-time lecturer faculty and FERP faculty with expertise in curriculum and articulation are eligible for appointment by the CSU Executive Committee. The delay in appointing CSU course reviewers has hindered the approval of campus ADTs, preventing students from utilizing this preferred avenue for transfer. CCC leadership has been urging expediting of this process for some time now.
 - **Presidential Search Process in the California State University System: Announcement of Finalists and Visitors to Campuses** argues for a return to the practice of conducting open searches for campus presidents. The ASCSU wanted to offer advice in time to inform the coming presidential searches this academic year.

3. We introduced the following resolutions that will be considered for adoption at our January plenary. Copies of this resolution should be available shortly for campus review.
 - a. **Adoption of “Tenets of System Level Governance in the California State University”** (see text at the end of this report.)
 - b. **Misappropriation of CSU Faculty Instructional Materials by Course Hero** opposes the use of faculty intellectual property by this entity without the permission of the faculty members affected. It asserts that this misappropriation enables academic dishonesty and theft of intellectual property.
 - c. **A Call for the Inclusion of Tuition in the Cal Grant B Program for Freshman** This program currently does not provide funds to low-income freshmen to cover tuition.
 - d. **Increased Funding for the Electronic Core Collection (ECC)** Not only is this collection used by all 23 campuses, but this approach to acquisitions continues to save our campuses significant resources every year.
 - e. **Notification of CSU Parties Involved in a California Public Records Act Request** requests that the CSU keep the appropriate individuals informed when requests under the CPRA may affect them.
 - f. **Closing the Achievement Gap and Increasing College Completer Outcomes and Success for All CSU Students** supports this goal, commends the CSU’s commitment to achieving this goal, applauds the GI 2025 initiative for its commitment to the goal, commends the ITL for its support in reaching this goal, lists factors affecting equity, and

asks that additional analyses be conducted to look at equity in other outcomes such as major selection and employment experiences after graduation.

- g. Encouraging Responsible Curriculum Development and Modification Under HEERA** Asserts that research supports our system’s previous approach to remediation and that too much focus on graduation rates may result in some negative consequences, reiterates a concern about flawed approach to shared governance evidenced in the development and implementation of EOs 1100(rev.) and 1110, encourages campus senates to assert their control over the curriculum, and encourages the CSU administration to engage in data-driven and genuine consultation regarding the future of these two executive orders.
- h. Requirements for Appointment to be a Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) Member for the California Course-Identification (C-ID) Process** clarifies the criteria and process for these appointments. These individuals oversee the Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) that can be incorporated into CCC campus Associate Degrees for Transfer and the content of the courses which populate these degrees.
- i. Creation of California State University Discipline Councils** encourages the Chancellor’s Office to maintain contact lists of appropriate faculty for all disciplines for which a Transfer Model Curriculum exists and support electronic communications for those groups and to support the formation of discipline councils for those groups, similar to the Math and English Councils.
- j. Examining the Impact of Attrition and Enrollment Growth on the Number of CSU Students** asserts that increasing graduation rates, in and of itself, may not increase the number of graduates over time, encourages the CSU to recognize the impact of student attrition, urges the creation of a task force to examine student attrition, and supports the request of additional state funding to fully support an increase in the number of students served by the CSU. Background information related to this resolution can be found at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/jd9eesjag7mnyqy/Stohs-Schutte%20-%20Oct%202018%20Grad%20Rate%20Myth.pdf?dl=0>

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 BOT.”

“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>