

Report from ASCSU January 25-26, 2018

John Tarjan and Janet Millar

1. Announcements

- a. Admissions Advisory Council is discussing the implications of new EOs, a potential revision of the CSU eligibility index.
- b. The Tenure Density Task Force has finished its work and has forwarded its recommendations to the Chancellor.

2. **Chair Miller** reported on developments related to Executive Committee discussions with the administration dealing with shared governance. She believes the meetings have been productive and is optimistic about the eventual outcome of these meetings. This feeling was echoed by another Executive Committee member who indicated that the discussions should conclude by the end of the spring. Another member emphasized the need to consistently stress the importance of realistic timelines and keeping campuses involved in decision-making. Yet another member emphasized that the discussions are focused on moving forward rather than looking back at past issues and indicated confidence that the faculty concerns are being heard. Chair Miller's current and other past chair reports can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/

3. Excerpts from Other Reports

- a. **Academic Affairs** discussed the following topics.
 - i. Perfected a resolution on Project Rebound.
 - ii. Are co-sponsoring a resolution on counseling support.
 - iii. Measures of student success (for March plenary).
 - iv. Evaluation of impact of EO 1100 implementation. WestEd has been contracted to conduct the evaluation. Early Start, multiple measures, curriculum redesign, etc.
 - v. Systemwide professional development (webinars) to support the implementation of EOs 1100/1110.
 - vi. LAO report on online education and CSU reporting. We also previewed software which supports cross-campus enrollment in on-line courses.
 - vii. The need for the CSU online education committee to meet.
- b. **Academic Preparation and Education Programs** discussed the following topics.
 - i. Had a number of reports from CO personnel, many of which were focused on needed changes to systems to adapt to EO 1110 regarding admissions, etc.
 - ii. Attended the AA meeting with Dr. James Minor regarding evaluation of the impact of the new EOs.
 - iii. There is a critical need for special education, bilingual education, and math and science teachers. The state needs more teachers.
 - iv. Continue to discuss quantitative reasoning standards.
 - v. Will ask for the resolution on alternate process for C-ID review to be pulled.
- c. **Faculty Affairs** discussed the following topics.

- i. Received reports on CalState Online and other IT issues.
 - ii. Background check policies.
 - iii. Resolution on counseling support.
 - iv. Potential resolution on verbal and potential physical attacks on faculty.
 - v. Potential research funds related to climate change funded by cap and trade fines.
 - vi. Human mascots.
 - vii. Potential distinguished system service award.
 - viii. Potential faculty innovation in student success awards (\$15k/campus) funded by a philanthropic gift.
 - ix. Hope to take up the topic of bullying.
- d. **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** discussed the following topics.
- i. Heard a report on CSSA advocacy and their action plan for the year including
 - 1. Homelessness
 - 2. Immigration status
 - 3. Pell grants
 - ii. Tuition and fee increases.
 - iii. Pending legislation—the process is very fluid and this is an ongoing process.
 - 1. There are many proposed bills related to MANY aspects of the CSU and its operations and composition.
 - iv. Chair Miller and Executive Committee member Krabacher were thanked for their ongoing work in Sacramento on behalf of ASCSU.
- e. **GE Advisory Committee** discussed the following issues.
- i. Received a report on implementation of EO 1100. 9 campuses were granted implementation extensions. There were no extensions for implementation of EO 1110. For more information see: <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/why-the-csu-matters/graduation-initiative-2025/academic-preparation/pages/eo-1100-and-1110-policy-changes.aspx>
 - ii. The StatWay pilot is ending soon.
 - iii. A group of faculty representative from majors requiring intermediate algebra proficiency in their C-ID transfer model curricula will be meeting to discuss changes to B4 prerequisites.
 - iv. AP scores of 3 or above will now be considered to fulfill the B4 requirement.
 - v. The Chair will be collecting campus GE assessment plans which will be reviewed by the committee with an eye to discovering best practices.
 - vi. Will be reviewing WSCUC measures of student effectiveness.
 - vii. Will be reviewing the CSU GE Course Review Guiding Notes.
- f. **GE Task Force**
- i. Have been meeting.
 - ii. Is broadly constituted including students CCC, trustees, faculty
 - iii. Has consensus on the following issues.
 - 1. GE should be student-centric
 - 2. GE should be designed with intentionality
 - 3. GE is an important part of the baccalaureate

- 4. We need to address a broad array of stakeholder concerns.
 - iv. Will receive a report on national trends.
 - v. The student representatives have been very involved in discussions.
 - g. **Admissions Advisory Council**
 - i. The most recent eligibility report indicated that our admission standards result in 40.8% of CA HS graduates being eligible for admission to the CSU. The Master Plan for Higher Education in California sets the target eligibility percentage at 33.3%.
 - ii. The Governor's office indicated that perhaps the CSU eligibility index needs to be reexamined.
 - h. **Tenure Density Task Force**
 - i. Their report will be available soon.
4. **Faculty Trustee Sabalius** reported on his activities since our November plenary. Campus visits by a trustee require formal coordination. Humboldt will continue to have a football team after an influx of private funds. Student food insecurity continues to be an important issue. Dr. Sabalius continues to solicit feedback and input regarding his new role. The Governor's budget is both disappointing and surprising. We ALL need to advocate for a more realistic budget for the CSU. A tuition increase needs to be at least considered at this time. Trustee Sabalius will work to ensure that we work together and that we do not point fingers at each other concerning compensation, etc. The Senate provided a number of suggestions concerning groups the trustees may want to meet with during their campus visits including senate leaders, department chairs, and actual classes.
- http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/index.shtml
5. The following second reading item has been tabled.
- a. **Shared Governance and Consultation in the CSU**
6. The following second reading item was postponed indefinitely.
- a. **An Alternative Process for C-ID Course Review**
7. We passed the following resolution upon second reading.
- <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/>
- a. **Project Rebound Program: Support and Expansion** advocates for this program which supports formerly incarcerated individuals who are attending the CSU, encourages expansion of the program, argues for more coordination of programs across the state and argues for permanency of Second Chance Pell Grant funding.
8. We introduced the following resolutions that will be considered for adoption at our March plenary. Copies of this resolution should be available shortly for campus review.
- a. **Resolution Opposing the Governor's Proposal for a State Mandated Online Learning Lab** is in response to a \$10m ongoing appropriation to develop a vaguely defined organization dealing with on-line state supported higher education. The proposal would likely result in significant redundancy with current initiatives and programs and appears to support a "one size fits all" approach to online education which would be inappropriate. The

resolution argues for a thorough analysis of the potential impact of the Governor's proposal. Note: It is likely more information will be available on this proposal prior to our March meeting.

- b. **Revisions to Faculty Trustee Recommendation Criteria and Procedures** is in response to suggestions regarding criteria and procedures from prior ASCSU Trustee recommending committees and commends a set of "best practices" to future committees.
- c. **Tuition Increases in the California State University** opposes tuition increases in principle and argues that any tuition increases be based upon a long term strategy and be predictable.
- d. **Counseling Support Services and Student Success** asserts a strong relationship between mental health and student success. It also argues for adequate funding for counseling support.
- e. **2018 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University** proposes positions on a number of bills which might include support, support in concept, no position, oppose, oppose unless amended, watch closely, etc. NOTE: the body was informally polled to develop a sense of Senate on each bill to facilitate lobbying efforts between now and our March plenary.

9. **CFA Liaison & President Jennifer Eagan** indicated that CFA's main focus will be budget advocacy. CFA will advocate for a sum higher than the Trustees' request (an additional \$165m). We need to educate the legislature on the relationship between capacity and student success. CFA leadership had meetings with the leading gubernatorial candidates. CFA is opposed to tuition increases. President Eagan discussed the Janus case. An adverse ruling would be very harmful. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/28/us/politics/supreme-court-will-hear-case-on-mandatory-fees-to-unions.html> CFA is not a signatory to the tenure density report due to a lack of specific goals in the report.

10. **Chancellor Timothy White** just returned from Sacramento. He explained the process by which the Board develops their budget request for the year. The Board pared the list of priorities to a very short list in this year's request. Even that shortened list of needs did not even come close to being met in the Governor's proposed budget. The proposal would only cover about ½ of the state's official rate of inflation (3%) for the coming year in the absence of a student fee increase. (The proposal today really amounts to a 2.7% increase to the general fund portion of our budget which only accounts for about ½ of our overall budget.) The Chancellor went on to explain much of the intricacies of our budget and funding over the past few years. Bottom line: the situation is dire and we desperately need to advocate together for increased essential funding (for compensation, maintenance, capacity, etc.). We expect the May revise to come in with healthy tax revenue increases. Our advocacy should also include speaking with potential gubernatorial candidate to try to secure commitment for support of higher education. It may be more important than ever to focus our advocacy on both the legislative and executive branches. Supporting student success and the impact of the CSU on the success of California should be stressed. One Senator requested the creation of a set of talking points regarding the budget that could be used in advocacy. It is already in the works. Dr. White will be reviewing the tenure density report shortly and it will be

made public soon after. The Board will meet with the SDSU presidential finalists next week before the Board meeting and with the Bakersfield and Dominguez Hills in March. The Fullerton search will conclude sometime thereafter. Interestingly, the overall cost of higher education has decreased over the past couple of decades—we have just shifted an increasing percentage of costs onto the students. In response to a lengthy inquiry, the Chancellor laid out a number of CSU funding scenarios that would require close cooperation and agreements with the state but might be much preferable to the current reality of how we are funded.

11. EVC Loren Blanchard indicated that while enrollment management, some Title 5 changes (related to in-state tuition changes mandated by the legislature, DNP) and the Wang Awards will be on the Board agenda next week, the state support budget will dominate discussions. Campus impact, student redirection, and local student preference for impacted majors, are topics currently under discussion. Input from the Admissions Advisory Council have been invaluable. The \$92m budget increase proposed by the Governor will only address half the rate of inflation. United advocacy will be critical this year. There have been several developments related to GI 2025. All 6 workgroups have met. We had a meeting with the CSU composition directors and Early Start leaders which was very productive and enlightening regarding directed self-placement and other EO 1110 implementation issues. We continue to address the concerns raised by the campuses. We are reporting progress on the campuses to reduce “excess” units, tenure density, provide adequate class sections, student support, high impact practices, etc. There are many areas that the CO needs to report on to the Legislature and the Board on an ongoing basis. Sacramento continues to focus on our student success efforts. We have had productive conversations regarding shared governance with the Executive Committee. He is highly encouraged by the discussions and hopes that a written report will come forward soon. The tenure density report has been submitted to the Chancellor and will be published soon. Q: Since so many groups believed the shared governance process regarding the EOs was flawed, why does the CO indicate that it was appropriate. A: I hope to look forward. We are attempting to address individual campus concerns regarding implementation timelines. Note: there was a lengthy discussion of budget and advocacy. We have not yet been able to respond to the eligibility report. Q: How many of these curriculum changes related to student success have been generated by outside, non-faculty groups? Complete College America was specifically mentioned. A: Hard to say but many of these changes have been developed internally and based upon successful programs from other states. [Dr. James Minor: we are not a member of Complete College America. These groups indicate that their role is to support activities across the country rather than argue for adoption.] We are basing our student success effort on our students and their needs rather than work being done nationally. Q: Are you committed to making shared governance work? A: I wouldn't be here if I wasn't committed to doing this.

12. Ryan Brown (CSSA Liaison) reported that CSSA is focused on a response to the proposed tuition increase. We just had an increase and CSSA is concerned that there may be more increases in the future. Some members argue for small,

predictable increases but that is not the position of the CSSA board, which has taken no position on tuition increases yet. It will be discussed at our plenary tomorrow at CSUDH. We are considering a shared governance resolution which would request a more formal, written role for students and a more robust evaluation protocol for senior administrators. We are stressing civic engagement (voter registration and voting, education) and inclusiveness for all. We hope to register an additional 10% of our students by the end of 2018. We want to educate more students on the workings of Sacramento and potential legislation. We have more ambitious voter registration and civic engagement goals for the next 5 years. We are looking at debt burden among our students and potential inequities across student groups. This examination will result in CSSA's first research paper. We are considering a resolution on sexual harassment and violence which will argue for returning to the procedural standards established under the Obama administration.

13. Sheila Thomas (AVC, Extended Education, etc.) reported on a joint legislative audit (2012) on extended education in the CSU. In 2014 a task force was established to develop a clearer definition of "supplanting state support courses." In 2015, AB 716 was signed by the government. Ongoing discussions and bargaining with CFA resulted in EO 1099 to implement the agreed-upon changes. See <https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1099.html>

The changes touch on the following major issues, as well as including other issues (coordination with other campuses, state fees for summer term, and disclosure of third party vendors).

- The EO resulted in a new definition of "supplanting." (EU offerings should not result in fewer state-supported courses on a campus.
- Financial considerations (reserves, fees, reporting).
- Annual reporting on supplanting by campus.

14. Jay Swartz (ERFA Liaison) ERFA is voting to allow staff members to join. The next State Council meeting will be April 7 in Oakland. President Bill Blischke is continuing to advocate for the campaign to collect used shoes that can potentially be redirected to some of the approximately 1 billion people in the world lacking adequate footwear.

15. Brad Well (AVC, Business & Finance) and Kata Perkins (Executive Budget Director) presented an overview of the Governor's budget.

- California's fiscal outlook is positive
- The state rainy day fund has reached \$13.5b, the statutory maximum
- The \$92m increase for the CSU is less than a 3% increase.

The proposal for the CSU would result in a \$171m shortfall for the CSU. Even backing off of the graduation initiative, cancelling enrollment growth and not funding emergency maintenance, we will still have to cut an additional \$61m.

Five Key Goals for the CSU This Year

- Find resources to maintain quality
- Affordability
- No impact to students with greatest need
- Time-to-degree
- Advocate for the Trustees' requested budget

Advocacy will be ongoing. It appears that the legislature is more open to increase the CSU budget than is the governor's office. Several Senators asked questions dealing with the priority of athletics in setting campus budgets.

16. Shawn Whalen (Senior Project Officer, College Futures Foundation) and Elizabeth Gonzalez (Portfolio Director, James Irvine Foundation) College Futures Foundation advocates for increased numbers of college graduates in California. They make \$17-\$18m in grants annually. They are shifting their focus from providing scholarships to supporting the institutions that provide higher education. Their focus is on the central valley, the inland empire and LA area. The James Irvine Foundation provides grants to support social advancement in California. They focus specifically on supporting working families who are nonetheless struggling financially. They also have an inland California focus. Both speakers shared more on the goals and focus of their organizations and invited the Senators to ask them any questions they might have. There are relatively few foundations that focus on higher education (vs. K-12). There have been a number of innovations across the state that have resulted in significantly improved student success.