The Chancellor’s Report
Chancellor Timothy White made a brief report. He discussed the search for the position of Executive Vice Chancellor and requested feedback from faculty concerning what they would like to see in the position. He also reported that the Trustees have established a student success fees working group. There will be a website which will allow feedback from the campuses. He stated that in January we will be clearer on what the facts are. [CSUB senate should have more information soon.]

Among the questions asked of the Chancellor were the following:
Is there inclusive cohort planning for incoming freshman? What are we doing to help 17-19 year olds to understand what they are doing? What is the CSU going to do when the governor signs Senate Bill 967? The Chancellor stated that there would be a briefing on all the campuses. According to him, “We have more things in place than people know about.”¹

The Chancellor was asked about the amount of San Jose State money going to the football program. Thirteen and a half million dollars go to the program every year. Half of that money comes from student fees. This is while classes get cancelled and lecturers get laid off. The chancellor was asked if he was willing to revisit the issue of sports. His answer seems to indicate “No”. He spoke about a healthy balance between academics and athletics, and he asserted that he supported athletics. He referred to a new report which indicates that athletic graduates in division one universities graduate at a higher rate (than other students?). He discussed the value of athletics for campuses in general, and how many other students benefitted particularly those in music, nursing, and business. Moreover, according to him, athletics encouraged alumni support, and gave the campuses visibility on the sports pages. He encouraged “campus-based conversations” on this issue. Many senators were not convinced.

Another senator stated that on his campus academic affairs gets less than 50% of the budget. Can CO send money to fix this? There was not a satisfactory answer from the chancellor.

Another senator raised the fact that in some CSUs there is 62% female enrollment and 38% male enrollment. No one, he stated, is asking the question why the males are not coming. We may miss a whole generation of young men. The chancellor answered that this is an issue for enrollment management and outreach. He said that male Latino and African American students are at the greatest risk of dropping out. He concluded that this is not just a problem in the CSU. It is a nationwide issue. It is on his radar.

¹Senate Bill 967, sponsored by Sen. Kevin de Leon, D-Los Angeles, would require California colleges getting student financial aid from the state to have an "affirmative consent" standard when determining whether a sexual assault occurred. It also requires comprehensive outreach programs to prevent rape, dating violence and stalking. Bill excerpt: —“Affirmative consent” means affirmative, conscious, and voluntary agreement to engage in sexual activity. ... Lack of protest or resistance does not mean consent, nor does silence mean consent. (It) ... can be revoked at any time.”
The drought was also brought up and the Chancellor discussed what is being done on campuses to reduce water consumption.

The continuing issue of unit limits for Engineering was also brought up, but not resolved.

Eric Forbes - Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
Forbes spoke about funds for eAdvisor. It will help with degree audits and is a planning tool that would work with PeopleSoft. Smart Planner is being rolled out in three campuses this fall and will be very helpful to department chairs. Forbes stated that it is necessary to have early warning systems which reveal where an intervention might be helpful. There are various versions of these tools. All of these tools fit under the Graduation Initiative. Forbes is also interested in determining the difference between freshman performance versus transfer performance?

Forbes was asked why is eAdvisor on certain campuses and not others? (No clear answer). The graduation rate for four-year degrees also came up for discussion. Forbes hopes that there will be a 60% graduation rate by 2025 (referring to those students who will graduate in six years). Four-year graduation rates need to improve. The four-year graduation rate right now is very low. In Long Beach it is 17%.

Andy Merrifield from CFA Reports
The Contract has been extended for another 60 days. He mentioned there needs to be more recognition of work being done by non-tenure-track faculty (if one is not being paid in a month, one is not supposed to work in that month). FERP is at status quo for the new contract. He said that Intellectual Property (IP) is a moving target for a variety of reasons. We need an expanded definition for additional clarity. It needs to be protected from third parties. IP belongs to the faculty who create it, unless there is extraordinary support from the university when it is being created. Merrifield concluded by stating that four issues divide us (CFA and CSU).

a. Salary
b. Stagnation (no step increases for the last 7 years
c. Misclassification. Some very qualified lecturers are not classified properly.
d. Workload. Classes are often too big. There are too many internships, independent studies, and too much service including outreach. There is not enough support for scholarship. (Research Scholarly and Creative Activity grants are back in the budget this year. However, the amount of money needs to be increased.)

Election of the CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee
There was an election for 5 members of this committee. There was also a random draw of 2 campuses to solicit for two final members. Bakersfield was one of the campuses selected.

Upcoming Elections
Another issue that threaded its ways through the meeting and particularly through the agenda of the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee was the upcoming November elections. It was suggested that there be a campaign to get candidates (especially those in contentious districts) to state their position on higher education. Of course candidates are going to say they are for it, but

---

2 Assembly Bill 2324 was signed on September 15, 2014. This bill allows a faculty member to remain on the board after his or her 2-year term expires for one additional 2-year term if the Governor has not appointed a successor, as specified. This has been a problem in the past as the governor has stalled up to two years in appointing a faculty trustee.
the aim is to let them know we expect them to fight on issues of interest to the CSU when elected. There will be more details on this soon.

Resolutions
Below is a summary of resolutions passed at the plenary. It was provided by the Chair of the Statewide Academic Senate Steven Filing to the CSU Board of Trustees on September 9, 2014.

A – The Senate issued a commendation thanking the S. D. Bechtel Foundation for their continuing support and partnership on projects addressing k-12 teacher training and skills acquisition in Science, Math and Literacy. The Senate noted that those projects seek to address some of the college-readiness challenges we face. [There was criticism from some senators about problems involved with accepting funds from private enterprise.]

B – The Senate approved a resolution changing its position on AB 46 [reporting on online courses within the CSU]. ASCSU was in support of the initial bill, but the bill was amended in the legislative process in ways that ASCSU believes make it unsupportable. The senate therefore changed its position to oppose the bill and communicate to the Governor the ASCSU’s request that he not sign the bill into law. (Resolution can be found on pp. 5-6 of this report. The rationale explains why there was opposition.)

Report of Chair of Statewide Academic Senate to Board of Trustees
Below is part of the report that Steven Filing, Chair of the Statewide Academic Senate, provided the Board of Trustees at their meeting on September 9-10. This is not yet on line, but when it is you should be able to find the full report here: http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/

“Over the summer ASCSU leadership developed priorities and goals for the year. Last year my predecessor Dr. Guerin convened a group including Chancellor White, CO AA executives and CSSA leadership to share priorities for the year. The positive outcomes of that event led us to convene the same group in August this year. A priority that all groups shared is reviewing and perhaps updating the Access to Excellence Strategic Plan. ASCSU shares Chancellor White’s goal of reviewing the plan, and we suggest that a wide review with all stakeholders would further our ability to meet the goals laid out in the plan.

We also suggest that a focus on data-driven, outcomes-based metrics would provide the best decision information as we evaluate our progress on plan goals. Further, we think development of those metrics would assist us as we communicate the value of what we do to the public and to policy makers. As Ryan Storm suggested yesterday, there are required performance measures we must report, but we should also make use of additional metrics to provide context for understanding of those performance measures.

A continuing priority for the ASCSU is improving communication, both internal and external.

---

[3] See the second half of this article for the issues involved http://www.nytimes.com/2014/09/07/magazine/so-bill-gates-has-this-idea-for-a-history-class.html?smid=nytcore-ipad-share&smprod=nytcore-ipad
One path for that this year will be the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates [ICAS], which includes Academic Senate leadership from the UC system, the CCC system and the CSU. This group has increasing influence at the state level with legislators and policy makers. This year we are chairing the group and we will be working on several of the issues you’ve heard reports on at this meeting, including facilitation of transfer between systems and online course sharing. You’ve heard reports on the CSU system, CourseMatch. The UC and CCC have equivalent systems and we will be sharing information at ICAS in hopes of learning from each others’ experiences and building a system that provides maximal utility to our students.

We are also engaged in continuing conversations with Academic Affairs staff on the creation of Discipline Councils, which would greatly enhance communication across campuses. Further conversations also address the challenge of finding common definitions for “online course”, “hybrid course” and other labels. One of the challenges we face in communicating about our efforts in the technology environment is finding common descriptors for what we do. We hope that developing a lingua franca of modes of instruction will enable us to communicate more effectively what we do.”
ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

OPPOSITION TO AB 46 (PAN) CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY: ONLINE EDUCATION

AS-3191-14/FGA September 4-5, 2014

Academic Senate CSU AS-3191-14/FGA

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) withdraw its support from AB 46 (Pan) California State University: Online Education; and be it further

Resolved: That the ASCSU urge Governor Brown to veto AB 46 (Pan); and be it further

Resolved: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to Governor Brown, Assemblymember Richard Pan, the Board of Trustees, Chancellor Timothy White, the Office of the Chancellor, CSU Office of Advocacy and State Relations, CSU Campus Presidents, Campus Senate Chairs, the California Faculty Association, the California State Student Association.

RATIONALE: The language of AB 46 (Pan) originated in an earlier bill SB 1325 (Yee): California State University: Contractors. SB 1325 required outside contractors (such as Udacity) to report to the CSU all data gathered on CSU students taking its courses. In March 2014 the ASCSU adopted a position of support for the bill. When SB 1325 was withdrawn, language from that bill was relocated into AB 46 (Pan): California State University: Online Education. Subsequent amendments to AB 46, specifically those requiring reporting on online courses with the CSU, have led the ASCSU to believe that the bill is no longer in the best interest of the CSU, its students, and its faculty. Specific concerns include:

1. The language of the bill is ambiguous in its definition of online courses; it fails to recognize the many modalities that online instruction can take;

2. The bill could impose heavy reporting requirements on faculty and the CSU, and these may lead to significant costs that are currently unfunded in the bill;

3. Many of the reporting requirements are already in place as a result of AB 386;

4. Given the detailed level of student demographic and academic data that could be requested, the reporting requirements could potentially violate student privacy protections;

5. Because the ASCSU would be requesting any such information from the CSU itself, it is an internal matter not requiring legislative action; to that extent, the bill is unnecessary.

The bill is currently enrolled and before the Governor. It is important therefore, that the ASCSU informs the Governor that the Academic Senate has withdrawn its support from AB 46 (Pan) and urges him to veto the bill.

Approved – September 5, 2014