

**Academic Senate CSU Executive Committee  
February 7 and 8, 2008  
Minutes**

**Attendees**

Barry Pasternack, John Tarjan, Mark Van Selst, Darlene Yee-Melichar, Marshelle Thobaben, James Postma, Fred Hornbeck, Bernadette Cheyne, and Bob Buckley

**Guests**

Ann Peacock Executive Director,; Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee; Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

**Thursday, February 7**

10:00 a.m. meeting called to order

1. The Agenda was approved as amended
2. Approval of Minutes of Jan 16, 2008 was deferred
3. Liaison Reports
  - a. Alumni Council
    - i. Previous report
  - b. ATAC
    - i. Chancellor's Office is moving forward via Academic Transformation with two disciplines (Developmental Math, General Chemistry) – a subcommittee of ATAC helped select the faculty
  - c. CFA
    - i. There will be a meeting on Friday February 8<sup>th</sup>
    - ii. Executive had a discussion of the CFA lobbying message and the potential coordination with CSU lobbying message
    - iii. ASCSU first and second reading items
    - iv. ASCSU → CFA briefing and visa-versa
    - v. Is the ASCSU in the “CSU Family” vis-à-vis lobbying
    - vi. New Ballot Initiative (higher education in general); build on history of CCC initiative – needs earmarked funding source.
  - d. CSSA
    - i. Chair Pasternack was at the January CSSA meeting
      1. students opposed Proposition 92
    - ii. Senator Van Selst will be at the CSU East Bay meeting on Sat. February 9<sup>th</sup>
    - iii. Student rally at Sacramento (April 21<sup>st</sup>)
      1. Members of Senate Executive will attend
        - a. Chair Pasternack will definitely attend
        - b. Senators Tarjan, Van Selst, and Thobaben may attend if appropriate, given potential ASCSU role and budget

- c. Faculty Trustee Smith may be invited by CSSA
    2. What role intended for faculty / ASCSU
    3. It would be okay for the CSSA student liaison to distribute a flyer about the Rally at the March Plenary.
  - e. ICAS
    - i. See report – Where is this report?
  - f. LDTP Advisory Committee
    - i. Action continues from the CO without faculty involvement
      1. LDTP update fails to include faculty mention or any contact with LDTP steering committee
    - ii. LDTP may continue to be an increasingly staff-driven project
  - g. GE Advisory Committee
4. System-wide Committee Lunch Provision
  - a. CSU Policy is that meetings cannot begin or end with food.
  - b. Non-ASCSU personnel will not have their lunch paid for by the ASCSU budget
  - c. ASCSU may adopt a registration fee (reimbursable) for one day meetings
5. ASCSU 2008/2009 Budget
  - a. Discussion of approaches
  - b. ASCSU does not deem any cut to functionality as acceptable
  - c. Chair Pasternack will be in the presence of Executive Vice Chancellor Reichard several times over the next month; although these will not be formal meetings, the chair will reinforce the view that the Senate will resist any further cuts to the Senate budget
  - d. Regarding additional budget cuts to the Senate, the Executive Committee is reticent to paralyze the senate by considering constitutional changes to the senate
  - e. The Executive Committee will prepare statements to the senate regarding the current and ongoing budgetary issues
    - i. Up front funding is required – the reliance on carry-over cannot be supported. An increase to priority funding would produce greater funding stability.
    - ii. Our reliance on travel is much more substantial than any other entity paid for out of Chancellor’s Office funds
    - iii. What is the “real” cost of senate activity?
    - iv. What is the real reduction in Senate functioning with the continued budget reductions across time?
    - v. As a principle, we do not ask senators to do more for less or to continue with business as usual without adequate support
  - f. There are clearly new initiatives initiated and funded by the Chancellor’s Office. These initiatives reflect Chancellor’s office priorities
  - g. A resolution to go before the senate from Executive will be prepared for the March Plenary. It will be discussed with the standing committee chairs on February 8
    - i. A particular focus may be defining the core operations of the ASCSU.

- ii. Another part of the resolution may outline the history of ASCSU budgetary developments
  - iii. The resolution will likely contain a call for a permanent line item in the Academic Affairs budget and a reiteration of the past resolutions calling for yearly augmentations to reflect increased costs
  - iv. The content of the resolution will be determined pending budget developments
6. Legislative Days
- a. ASCSU (April 8<sup>th</sup>)
    - i. An invitation to CFA and CSSA to co-attend was discussed
    - ii. Development of talking points message (with FGA)
      - 1. Overlap with ICAS talking points
      - 2. Overlap with CFA talking points
      - 3. Overlap with CSU legislative agenda
  - b. Alumni (April 28<sup>th</sup>)—request that the Presidents be asked to include their campus senate chairs and ASCSU representatives on their campus teams
  - c. Suggestion to have visits to local member offices including all members of CSU family including ASCSU members and campus senate chairs.
7. Bylaw Changes
- a. Awaiting committee input
  - b. Executive discussed committee divisions and the size of the Executive Committee
8. Academic Senate Newsletter
- a. Currently unfolding
  - b. Mid-February goal
  - c. Academic initiatives might be a good topic for the May version
  - d. Discussion of the virtues of white papers versus newsletters
  - e. There will be a May newsletter
9. CSU Doctorate on Education Advisory Committee
- a. No update
  - b. Committee constitution is awaiting administrative action
  - c. We will follow up with Keith Boyum Thursday February 8<sup>th</sup>
10. *Access to Excellence*
- a. Revisions to A2E were largely not responsive to ASCSU feedback
  - b. First reading of A2E response for March
    - i. Referral to all four committees for update (collation by executive)
11. Troops to College
- a. Jim Blackburn will give a presentation on this initiative to all of the standing committees with the exception of Faculty Affairs on Friday.

Barry Pasternack, Chair  
Academic Senate CSU

12. CSU budget update and campus implications
  - a. ASCSU was given the talking points at the Budget “Advisory” Committee
13. New committee – system-wide guidelines for faculty hiring practices
  - a. Referral to Faculty Affairs to make recommendations for nominee.
14. GE Course Review Subcommittee
  - a. Additional math/science reviewers needed
  - b. The “online only” review process is another example of decreased quality in the review process (since cannot rely on one-to-one Q&A)
  - c. A mathematician was appointed to the subcommittee
  
  - d. No nominations have been received for a member representing the sciences
15. ICAS “Math Competency Statement for incoming freshmen” workgroup
  - a. Two CSU faculty representatives needed
  - b. Two appointments made — Joe Fiedler, CSU Bakersfield; LiPika Deka , CSU Monterey Bay

16. New members to be selected
  - a. C-ID
    - i. One appointment (Philosophy – Dennis Rothermeal)
    - ii. Two appointments – Child Development – Sharon Siedman and Toni Campbell
    - ii. Needed – English, History, Philosophy, Political Science (2), Physics(2)
    - iv. Additional information requested from CID for a potential History appointment
  - b. CCC-CSU Transfer Advisory Committee
    - i. Replace Senator Kellner with Senator Krabacher
  - c. CMS Project (alternate)
    - i. Replace Senator Kellner with Senator Tarjan
  - d. ICC – Student Friendly Services Oversight Committee
    - i. Will find a replacement for Senator Kellner.
  - e. Advisory Committee on Pre-Doctoral Programs mid-June
    - i. Senators Lord and Miller were selected
17. Plenary Invitees
  - a. Chair Achtenberg – confirmed for March
  - b. Trustee Fong – confirmed for May
18. AAUP academic Freedom
  - a. We are not currently in the AAUP supporters list for their statement on academic freedom
  - b. The chair will send a letter citing the appropriate resolution
19. Senate Faculty Funds
  - a. Referral to FA and possibly to campus senate chairs to suggest resolution supporting “faculty funds” for campus senates to cover flowers, etc. as required
20. Meeting with Faculty Trustee Craig Smith
  - a. *Access to Excellence*
  - b. ASCSU Budget
  - c. MBA professional fees
  - d. Proposition 92
  - e. Presidential Search Operations
  - f. Local campus senate visits to local legislative offices
    - i. BOT members may be open to participation

**Friday, February 8**

- Executive committee and standing committee chairs will have a conference call on February 20 at 9:00 am – subject is ASCSU budget
- Prior to the conference call, the chair will need to speak with the Executive Vice Chancellor
- Student oversight recommendation from TEKR committee
- Systemwide committee on faculty hiring guidelines from Faculty Affairs committee

1. *Access to Excellence*

- a. Committees will review the draft
  - b. Executive committee provided feedback on structure, grammar, focus
2. Academic Affairs committee
- a. Career technical education (a-g)
    - i. Coordinating between AA and TEKR
    - ii. Will likely have the courses end up in area E
    - iii. UC may have less concern than the CSU
    - iv. TEKR coordination
  - b. CAHSEE exam
    - i. New version of ICAS resolution
  - c. Honorary Doctorates
    - i. Ensure that campus shared governance procedures are in place and followed regarding the senate review of honorary doctorates
    - ii. Resolution suggesting elements of policy to meet BOT requirements (e.g., consideration of full packets, packets to include a letter from the senate chair)
  - d. Changes to Title V regarding graduate admission
    - i. CO proposal is less reliant on recent history
    - ii. CO proposal removes requirement of good standing
  - e. CLA
    - i. Long-standing commitment
  - f. Principles of Patent Technology and Transfer
    - i. There are some contractual limitations on the development of policies
3. Faculty Affairs Committee
- a. Committee on system hiring practices
  - b. Principles for funding reductions
    - i. With FGA
  - c. Priorities of the ASCSU
  - d. FERP rights and responsibilities
  - e. SFR System-wide computations
  - f. Online degree programs
  - g. Bylaw changes
  - h. International programs
    - i. Lack of mention in A2E
    - ii. Task force on international education
      1. It is likely that this task force has not met this academic year
      2. Invite Leo Van Cleave, Director of International Programs
  - i. CLA
    - i. Workload issue is one for Faculty Affairs (if added workload for administration of the exam)
    - ii. Faculty Affairs is intending to leave this for AA
  - j. Program discontinuance
    - i. FA requests executive send prior resolutions out to the senate chairs

- k. Patents and Technology
    - i. Collaboration with CFA on core principles
    - ii. Recognition of overlap with CFA and ASCSU
  - l. Statewide senator responsibilities
    - i. Campus specific policies regarding continuing obligations
    - ii. Campus communication from statewide to ensure campus notification
    - iii. Campus appointment of designated proxies
    - iv. Suggestion that organizational meeting and senator orientation include committee responsibilities
  - m. Faculty Fund (flower fund)
    - i. Collection of money for flowers, etc. as needed to be suggested as a good idea for local senates
4. TEKR committee
- a. System Ed.D. Carnegie program requirements
  - b. Troops to College
  - c. High school exit exam
    - i. Coordination with AA
  - d. Bylaw revision
    - i. Admissions advisory committee / TEKR relations
  - e. Pre-Baccalaureate program
    - i. The need for detailed information rather than marketing pamphlets
    - ii. Assessment of the actual impact of EAP on college preparedness
  - f. Remediation
    - i. Sharing of best practices (esp. with campuses at 90% success)
    - ii. Revisiting BOT remediation limits
      - 1. logic
      - 2. repercussions of changes to admissions requirement
  - g. Foreign language requirement
  - h. CLA
  - i. Impact of prioritization on outreach, remediation, admissions, etc.
    - i. What are the implicit priorities given funding
    - ii. Consequences of the “telegraphed” message to campuses re: prioritization given funding (e.g., Academic Technology initiatives with both funding and staff resources)
      - 1. prioritization to demonstrated value of cost effectiveness and impact (e.g., any of well known list of CO initiatives)
5. FGA committee
- a. Principles and practices for prioritization
    - i. Such principles have been effective in directing campus action in the past
  - b. Logistical work around legislative days (April 8<sup>th</sup>)
    - i. Developing talking points
    - ii. Coalesce visiting teams in advance
    - iii. Briefing by legislative affairs liaison (CSU, CFA, etc.)

- iv. Potential request to have campus teams go to Sacramento for alumni legislative days (including non-employees as well as faculty)
  - c. Bill tracking
    - i. Needs additional work
    - ii. Major focus on budget and the importance of the CSU
  - d. Local legislative visits
    - i. Wide-ranging constitution
    - ii. Need for unified message
    - iii. BOT, President (or staff), campus senate chairs
- 6. Prioritization of ASCSU core functions
  - a. This is a precursor to what the ASCSU ought to protect with the highest priority
  - b. The list of priorities would be used to determine what functionality to cut if required
  - c. Essential activities (top priority), 2<sup>nd</sup> level (some self-defense, some intersegmental), 3<sup>rd</sup> level (vulnerable: breadth of representation)
    - i. Which functions yield tangible results
    - ii. Separate questions: breadth versus depth of representation
- 7. Keith Boyum (largely based on Academic Council Agenda)
  - a. Faculty contract
  - b. Budget
  - c. Enrollment
  - d. DWIR
    - i. general policies will be discussed with provosts council
    - ii. EO draft will be shared extensively with senate prior to any such EO being distributed
  - e. HR report
  - f. Remediation
    - i. senate resolution may direct upcoming action
    - ii. EAP suggests a fourth year of math, school districts argue that requiring a fourth year of math would be burdensome. This seems to conflict with the goal of EAP
  - g. Academic Technology
    - i. Transforming course design
    - ii. Learning management tools
    - iii. Virtual meeting tools
  - h. VSA / CLA
  - i. Doctoral Education
    - i. Doctorate of Nursing Practitioner bill has been introduced
      - 1. DNP are not designed to generate faculty as generally implemented across the nation
      - 2. CSU programs may be targeted to educational outcomes
      - 3. A clinical doctorate yields fiscally lucrative career opportunities
        - a. There is a deliberate strategy to pursue only one degree title for both the practical and the educational orientation
    - ii. Doctorate of Physical Therapy

Barry Pasternack, Chair  
Academic Senate CSU

1. Several joint programs already exist
2. Touro University (some content online; independently accredited) may be a joint program partner with CSU Sacramento

3. CSU Long Beach
  - a. Intermittent conversation with UC Irvine re: partnership
  - iii. Doctorates of Audiology
    - joint programs have mixed success
    - cost is a major factor
  - j. Technology Transfer
    - i. Patent Transfer
  - k. CSU virtual library
    - i. Review with the provosts the online information resources that have been developed systemwide
  - l. Textbook cost reduction strategies
    - i. Campus practices have been shared with state auditors
  - m. Student fees
    - i. Will be considered by the board
    - ii. MBA professional fees
      1. may be considered by the BOT in March
    - iii. Campus based fee policy notes
      1. may be considered by the BOT in March
      2. Commission on the Extended University (rfp)
  - o. International Education Executive Order
    - i. Discourages faculty-led student travel to areas covered by US State Department travel warnings
    - ii. International Education Task-Force
  - p. Teacher Performance Assessment
    - i. This is a large cost unfunded mandate to formally assess skills in the classroom
  - q. COACHE
    - i. Some presidents have expressed interest in such an assessment of faculty satisfaction
  - r. GE affinity group meeting
    - i. Feb 28<sup>th</sup> one-day meeting
    - ii. Not a policy body (does not compete with GEAC)
  - s. LDTP
    - i. Position hiring
      1. description shared
      2. review and selection will involve faculty input
    - ii. CSU Northridge is involving local community colleges within 2-3 academic fields to encourage TCSU approved coursework towards an AA degree which easily articulates to Northridge as progress to degree.
8. Senate Calendar
  - a. Board of Trustees (past practice suggests Senate meetings following BOT calendar)
    - i. Sept 16, 17; Nov. 18, 19, 2008
    - ii. Jan. 27, 28; Mar. 24, 25; May 12, 13, 2009 (tentative dates)
  - b. Potential ASCSU Meetings
    - i. Sept 3-4; Oct 10; Nov 12-14; Dec 4-5, 2008

- ii. Jan 21-23; Feb 20; Mar 18-20; April 17; May 6-8, 2009
  - iii. There was discussion about moving the April meeting away from the Long Beach Grand Prix weekend
9. Troops to College
- a. Jim Blackburn gave a Power Point presentation on the background and desired outcomes of the Troops to College initiative
  - b. There are five task force subcommittees chaired by Major Peterson
  - c. CSU outcomes to date
    - i. Veterans on campus support centers
    - ii. Increasing membership in service members opportunities college (SOC)
    - iii. Reviewing of credit transferability procedures and criteria
  - d. In response to questions:
    - i. Registration priority over incoming freshmen seems unsupported by data. The trade-off for the same seats seems unsupported by data/logic
    - ii. There are many areas within the Troops to College initiative that have proceeded very far into academic domains without meaningful faculty input. A faculty task-force may be appropriate
    - iii. The federal reimbursement for students under the Montgomery Bill yield substantially the same revenue for the CSU as attendance by any other student. Their resource demands are higher. Thus, disregarding the social contract, the fact that these students often have greater student service requirements yields a net additional burden on the CSU over “standard” students
    - iv. CSU is inherently playing “catch up” with University of Maryland, etc. where there is a 30+ year history of such programs
    - v. The military training schools ought to use descriptors familiar to the accrediting bodies
    - vi. Q: What is the status of the Troops to College budget? Does this initiative carry special status as an inviolate budget entity? How was the budget for this initiative developed? A: Certainly the original budget was backfilled without explicit a priori allocation. The bus tour is funded by donation. Future funding is not clear
    - vii. Bus Tour
      - 1. tour may not cover all 50 bases in the state of California
      - 2. timing of the tour is by the end of the year
      - 3. faculty interest is well received
    - vii. there are different needs for current versus retired members of the military
    - ix. there are different needs for online versus in person instruction
  - e. Prior to military retirement there are tuition assistance programs that have the effect of extending the effectiveness of the Montgomery bill support