

Barry Pasternack
Chair, Academic Senate CSU

Academic Senate CSU Executive Committee
October 12, 2007

Minutes

Attendees

Barry Pasternack, John Tarjan, Mark Van Selst, Darlene Yee-Melichar, Rochelle Kellner, Marshelle Thobaben

Guests

Ann Peacock, Executive Director, Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee (via phone)

8:30 A.M. Meeting called to order

- 1) A broad discussion of *Access to Excellence* (A2E) addressed the format and style of the senate feedback on the latest A2E draft. In general many specific themes of importance to the senate were included in the draft (appropriate for some themes: sustainability, gradual/predictable fee increase, campus autonomy, and funding were explicitly identified) with an additional 2-4 items being flagged for potential resolutions currently being discussed by the various committees of the senate. The “one letter” approach has not been effective in the past, thus the idea of formal feedback via resolution on targeted issues may work better. It is still possible (likely) that the chair (with executive) would write a cover response to encapsulate much of the feedback. We need to have an idea how to proceed in time to develop an agenda for November.

2) Committee Reports

Academic Affairs — James Postma, Chair – AA will take the lead on the Textbook resolution; the committee is working on feedback in response to the DWIR report and is also examining the text of the proposed revision to the wording of the GE guidelines in EO 595. Other resolutions and potential resolutions are being processed in committee. At this time there has been no formal feedback from the campuses on responses to the Professional Business Fee Proposal; there has been a lot of feedback on the DWIR report.

TEKR — Bob Buckley, Chair – The lack of adequate preparation and thus the need for remediation are continuing issues for the CSU. The remediation report supplied to the Board of Trustees is not specific enough to act upon. Other issues under discussion include the role of technology in teacher education, the underlying pedagogy used in such programs, and the need for the Chancellor’s Office decisions regarding teacher education to be based on real data (outcomes, needs, etc.). A particular example provided was the lack of adequate assessment of the various teacher education initiatives in the system. A concern was expressed about a lack of information about an achievement gap summit sponsored by Jack O’Connell to be held in Sacramento in November. The TEKR chair should attend and perhaps the vice-chair. ASCSU will request an invitation to this event. Additional discussion centered on the need for a strong faculty role in the oversight of the Ed.D. programs and how to best make this work with the Chancellor’s Office. A joint meeting was suggested between Chair Pasternack, Bob Buckley, Gary Reichard, and Keith Boyum to discuss this committee and related issues. On remediation, there is a desire to look at what recommendations are likely to be considered by the Board.

FGA — Fred Hornbeck, Chair – The dates, plan, and coordination for the ASCSU legislative day (April 9th) are unfolding well. The intention is to seek out a CSU alumni staff person to recognize for their contributions to the effective functioning of government. There was a discussion of producing a “talking points” sheet to leave with the staffer/legislator after the legislative days visits. Additional discussion addressed: the senate approach to responding to the Professional Business Fee Proposal, the CCC ballot initiative, the potential resolution on distinctiveness and autonomy of the campuses within the CSU, the resolution on Budget Priorities, how FGA does and will track bills of interest to the CO and CFA. A longer discussion focused on the ASCSU non-response to AB 1413 (which we found out later that day was not signed by the Governor [Ed./MVS]).

FGA will take the lead on constituting an inter-committee workgroup on a professional business fee resolution. The direction of the resolution, as the fee itself, is somewhat contentious. The ASCSU ought to provide local campuses with enough information to provide feedback on whatever resolution is ultimately passed—perhaps a comprehensive rationale outlining all of the associated issues and viewpoints. Additionally, there is the broader issue of differential fees in general with specific notice given to high cost programs, accreditation requirements, and the ability to pay.

Other discussion items include the observation that preliminary resolutions could be posted early via inclusion in the minutes of the committee, that we need to get timely notice to the campuses about the CCC ballot initiative, and that a briefing document on textbook affordability (summary of system actions/initiatives) would be helpful for the campuses and students.

FA — Bernadette Cheyne, Chair – several upcoming resolutions and potential resolutions were discussed. These included A2E, professional business fees (which FA will take the lead), textbook affordability, internationalization of programs, protocols for responding to votes of no confidence, academic freedom, FERP rights and responsibilities, and campus autonomy and distinctiveness. The use of the Executive Committee and standing committee chairs’ listserv to alert other committees to resolutions addressing potentially overlapping areas of responsibility was discussed. The issue of faculty satisfaction and retention will also be addressed by FA. Particular issues include: MPP hiring practices versus faculty hiring practices, strategies for gauging faculty satisfaction, the increased or consistent use of exit interviews, and the possibility of more meaningful faculty attrition reports (from HR). It is likely that there will ultimately be an item on student evaluations of teaching effectiveness—Mark Van Selst is on the joint CSU-CFA-ASCSU committee and will make a liaison report after the Oct. 16th meeting. Three items on academic freedom will be joined. They are: the issues around the experiences of faculty in Middle-eastern studies at Fresno, systemwide initiatives, and the AAUP outside speaker’s statement.

3) Liaison Reports

- Newsletter
 - i. Committee chairs are encouraged to submit brief summaries of the issues facing their committees
 - ii. Mark Van Selst will coordinate the submission of reports from chairs
 - iii. Darlene Yee will coordinate the theme-based articles
 - iv. The next newsletter content focus is likely to touch on the finances of the CSU.
- Academic Council / PTSC — focus on academic transformation, online degree programs developed jointly across several campuses, a dissatisfaction with aspects of CLA, and the commitment to pursue the voluntary system of accountability.
- Alumni Council — no response to invitation to attend ASCSU plenary sessions

- ATAC — focus on academic transformation geared towards identifying bottleneck courses for reform — both using technology to reduce cost and as an extra element to increase learning. Work will be undertaken to prioritize where the compact academic technology money ought to be allocated.
 - Campus Senate Chairs — the structure and style of interaction with the ASCSU changes by the year. Because it is problematic, the Executive Committee will request that if a 2008/09 joint meeting with Provosts is scheduled, it does not fall on the first meeting date of the Campus Senate Chairs.
 - CFA — Senator Yee will liaise on Oct 19th. AB1413 will be discussed.
 - CSSA — Discussed Exec vs. non-Exec committee attendance. Next meeting in Humboldt.
 - Facilitating Graduation — what is the status /life/expected outcome of the Provost's report?
 - ICAS — Discussed at the last meeting.
 - ICC— Education Roundtable – the meeting discussed the need to begin at the middle schools in terms of making students aware of the importance of a college education. At the meeting Michael Brown, Chair of the UC Academic Senate, asked Chair Pasternack if the ASCSU was interested in possibly forming a joint UC/CSU faculty task force to look at applied doctorates..
 - LDTP Advisory Committee — focus is on keeping the process moving and looking for successful ways to facilitate transfer.
 - GEAC — The Executive Committee is likely to receive a referral from GEAC on EO 595.
- 4) **Ed.D. Committee** — There was a discussion (see TEKR report) about duplication of effort in developing effective faculty oversight and how to alleviate the structural components leading to such duplication. A joint meeting of the TEKR chair Buckley, ASCSU Chair Pasternack, EVC Reichard, and AVC Keith Boyum will be requested.
- 5) **Task Force Updates**
- C-ID — four disciplines have been chosen to pilot C-ID development efforts. Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Psychology were chosen. An appointment is still needed for Physics.
 - LDTP — future possibilities for LDTP were discussed.
 - Nursing Doctorate — no substantial action, UC is supportive.
 - DWIR — discussed in the AA report.
- 6) **Socials** — The November ASCSU social will be hosted by AA, in January by FA, March by FGA, and May by TEKR.
- 7) **Gary Reichard**, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
- Academic Transformation — focus on clarifying and separating the policy vs. implementation roles of ATAC and the PTSC, respectively; preparation for infusion of projected additional fiscal resources into technology as part of Compact in 2008; identifying baseline needs to permit effective use of such resources; and the identification of bottleneck and other courses appropriate for the Transforming Course Design initiative
 - ITL Advisory Board — The ITL Advisory Board is scheduled to meet on October 19 to discuss possible future actions
 - online degree programs update — first call for bids to conduct marketing survey was unsuccessful; a new call is going out; ATAC will be asked for advice as to general policy on development of online degree programs
 - transfer AA degrees — Academic Affairs staff will be meeting with leadership of CCC Chancellor's Office in late November to discuss possibilities for "transfer degree" pilot programs
 - the professional business fee — consistent with ASCSU's request, and the Board of Trustees' intention, the proposal for such a fee is now the subject of consultation on campuses, involving Academic Senates and students

- procedures and policies around votes of no confidence — no consensus emerged as to whether "general" procedures were likely to emerge within the Chancellor's Office with respect to such occasional events
 - scheduling the joint meeting with the Provosts/senate chairs after the first meeting of the year for the senate chairs — at the suggestion of Senate chairs, such a meeting in 2008-2009 might be scheduled later in the academic year
 - the continuing commitment to the voluntary system of accountability (and the optional “public good” page for the report) update - CSU Executive Council has formally approved principles of CSU participation in the VSA, including a projected second year of use of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) instrument; otherwise, commitment is the same as indicated earlier
 - *Access to Excellence* update— first draft is available on web site for comments to be posted on steering committee's password-protected web site; to be most valuable, comments should be received by November 7, in advance of Nov. 14 steering committee meeting
 - Current status of the Troops to College initiative – Referred to Assistant Vice Chancellor Jones
- 8) **Liaison with Committees**
- increasing the amount of time available to liaise with the committee was discussed.
 - updates were presented regarding resolutions being considered by the committees.
 - an off-agenda discussion touched on the isolation of the members of the executive committee from many of the other senators and the need to clearly indicate the “on the ground” responsibilities of members of the Executive Committee to those who might run for the position(s).
- 9) **Potential Bylaw Revisions** — The possibilities included: reducing the size of the Executive Committee to a stable five person group (versus the alternating five or six person group depending on the existence of a “past chair”), designating one of the Member-at-Large positions as the communication director, and recasting the responsibilities of the committees to give TEKR a more explicit charge related to remediation, etc. and thus shift some workload from AA to TEKR. The later revision of roles received conceptual endorsement from the Executive Committee.
- 10) **Faculty Trustee**, Craig Smith — The committee discussed the need for data driven decision making in general and in particular around the possible implementation of the DWIR Taskforce recommendations and the possibility of rebenchmarking the BOT goals for remediation. At this point the BOT is awaiting ASCSU review of the DWIR Taskforce report. Additional discussion touched on online degree programs (housing and implementation – largely off the radar of the BOT at this time), MBA fees (Board in favor), various “solutions” to the transfer problem, and the general issue of board involvement in shepherding particular initiatives.
- 11) **Invitees** — for the November Plenary we will invite Senator Jack Scott. For the January Plenary, potential invitees are — Honorable John Garamendi, Lieutenant Governor; Honorable Jack O’Connell, State Superintendent of Public Instruction; Assembly Member Fabian Núñez; and Trustees Ricardo Icaza and Peter Mehas.
- 12) **Unaddressed Agenized Items** include — A review of the guidelines and responsibilities of the Executive Director, officers, and members of the senate; summer expectations for Executive Committee members and senate standing committee chairs; assigned time policies; and the coverage of senate responsibilities during the Chair’s absence.

2:45 P.M. Meeting adjourned