Executive Committee/Campus Senate Chairs Minutes for February 10, 2005 10:30-2:00
Munitz Room

Senate Chairs/Designees: B. J. Moore (Bakersfield), Renny Christopher (Channel Islands), Marc Siegall (Chico), Michael Botwin (Fresno), Donald Sawyer (East Bay), Ken Fulgham (Humboldt), Margaret Merryfield (Long Beach), Raymond Garcia (LA), Bob Hammaker (Maritime), Dan Fernandez (Monterey Bay), Glenda C. Brock (Pomona), Cristy Jensen (Sacramento), Lloyd Peake (San Bernardino), Robert Williams (SF), Jacqueline Trischman (San Marcos), Melanie Dreisbach (Sonoma)

Executive Committee: John Tarjan, Cristy Jensen, Marshelle Thobaben, David McNeil, Robert Cherny

Standing Committee Chairs: Marvin Klein (TEKR)

Visitors: Ann Peacock (ASCSU Exec. Dir.), Kathleen Kaiser (Faculty Trustee)

1. Report from ASCSU
   a. The Chair welcomed the group and indicated how useful campus visits are. Campus chairs are encouraged to share issues, concerns with the ASCSU.
   b. The faculty trustee nominating process is underway. Four names will be considered by the ASCSU and 2-4 names will be forwarded to the Governor for his consideration.
   c. The Executive Committee continues to meet with our UC and CCC counterparts.
      i. We share a concern about “attacks” on public employee pensions.
      ii. Are monitoring potential changes to the structure and mission of CPEC. A joint letter is being drafted to express our concerns that independent information on a variety of higher education issues continues to be made available.
      iii. More Master Plan hearings will be held starting next week. The mission/charge of the CSU will likely be reexamined. Transfer-related issues are likely to get a lot of attention. The CSU will seek authorization for the offering of applied doctorates.
      iv. We share concerns about the support for graduate education with the UC.
   d. Academic technology advisory groups continue to meet. It is hoped that campuses are informed about these efforts and developments. Forums have been scheduled—the next one on the 23rd of this month. Faculty should be involved in these forums. One chair expressed the concern that “technology” may result in the eroding of the education experience in the
name of efficiency. The administration has expressed a desire for faculty input concerning technology decisions.

e. ICC (Intersegmental Coordinating Committee—with representatives from all segments of public education, K-18) continues to meet. The agenda seems to be backward, rather than forward looking. They give advice to the California Roundtable (Chancellors from CSU, CCC, President from UC) on intersegmental issues. Transfer and articulation continue to be a focus of this group. We should not underestimate the potential power of their recommendations to affect state policy. We should be concerned about any moves to administer the various systems in a common way or by common administration.

f. The CSSA continues to meet and deliberate on many of the same issues which concern us. Advising is getting a lot of attention but the students are still formulating a position on how they would like to see access/quality improve. Their resolution currently calls for a system-wide study.

g. Advising

i. We have had discussion of a possible system-wide conference on advising.

ii. The Academic Affairs Committee is working on a resolution on advising for the March plenary.

   1. we have made recommendations in the past regarding advising that have not been implemented
   2. resources to support advising have dwindled, need to be restored
   3. technology to support advising has diminished on some campuses
   4. we may wish to conduct a campus-by-campus survey of advising practices
   5. The Facilitating Graduation report and conference provided many worthwhile suggestions regarding advising.
   6. the role of advising in RTP should be reconsidered

iii. Campus chair suggestion: include a recommendation to recognize advising/mentoring in the RTP process.

iv. Career and graduate school advising seems acceptable to students. A continuing problem is that students don’t have access/don’t request advising about GE/graduation requirements early enough.

h. Facilitating graduation—several comments focused on other suggestions related to facilitating graduation (degree audits, roadmaps, etc.).

i. It was pointed out that anecdotal evidence may be driving many of these initiatives/concerns. We may be much better off being data-driven when we set policy/allocate resources.

j. Perhaps we should spend some time talking about a culture which supports advising, deciding which faculty should do advising, do a better job of marketing advising resources to students.
k. Question: do campuses still distribute the names of potential graduates to the faculty for review?
l. CSU Sacramento is funding proposals by faculty to improve advising/use release time to dedicate more of their workload to advising and to share/develop best practices.
m. Some colleges/campuses have “professional” advising for some types of advising such as GE/graduation/major requirements.

n. Best practices may have limited transferability across colleges/campuses.
o. DARS may be inferior to Banner in supporting advising.
p. Effective advising requires good communication across divisions/colleges/faculty and staff. There is often mistrust across groups.
q. Different modes of advising may require different delivery modes/providers.
r. GE advising may be too mechanical in terms of fulfilling requirements rather than advising students on their educational goals and how to fulfill them.
s. Chair McNeil and Vice-Chair Thobaben sit on the honorary degree committee. There is some campus concern about missing materials when names are sent forward for review/the lack of faculty involvement on the campuses. The time may be right to review these procedures.
t. Lynne Cook addressed the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning

i. Is led by faculty, administration co-chairs.
   ii. Originally was developed to support research/develop research opportunities.
   iii. Supports
       1. Teacher-scholar institutes/regional conferences
       2. Newsletter
       3. The on-line journal *Exchanges*
   iv. The main focus is on teaching and learning.
   v. ITL is moving into the technology area.
   vi. Service learning is starting to become a focus.
   vii. Funding problems have caused a reassessment of function/mission and a consideration of new funding sources.
viii. Campus centers vary in terms of scope/effectiveness.
ix. Dr. Cook solicited advice from the group to inform the ITL mission discussions/help guide the efforts related to teaching and learning.
   1. What do campuses most need to improve teaching and learning?
      a. Many local workshops on pedagogy, diversity, etc. were helpful.
      b. Even though only a few faculty may be reached by these centers, the "right" people (new faculty, those with interest) are being reached.
   2. What should the CSU ITL do to support these things?
      a. Perhaps some centralized resources (speakers) could be provided.
3. Perhaps this important discussion could be continued via e-mail.

2. Campus Reports
   a. Survey of campus facilitating graduation progress—this is the main focus of the academic administration
      i. Monterey Bay provost is pushing for a degree audit. Has placed a moratorium on new courses pending a process for course approval. The faculty are resisting this "intrusion" into faculty areas.
      ii. At Pomona there is a recommendation that students with excess units would get the lowest priority for registration—the president did not approve it. There is some checking up on these students in an effort to get them advice on moving to graduation. Are looking at multiple majors and eliminating minors.
      iii. Long Beach is taking this seriously. It is high on the provost's agenda. Are looking at mandatory advising prior to the first 2 semesters and "almost" mandatory advising prior to the 3rd semester. Orientation has been improved. More course offerings for freshman, more advisors, identification of students who are close to graduation. Are rewriting the catalog to make it more readable, among other initiatives. Resources are being devoted.
      iv. San Marcos: Examined majors with > 120 units and several were reduced in units. Have had roadmaps for a while. No upper-division GE double-counting led to a lack of course offerings in this area—communications solved the problem.
      v. SFSU—we have a bad graduation rate. There is some resistance to this initiative across the campus. There is resistance to "push out" underrepresented groups.
      vi. East Bay: Had a visit from Keith Boyum. Looked at recommendations from the facilitating graduation report. We are a high transfer campus with people from low SES backgrounds. These folks often get poor advising at CCs. The faculty feel that penalizing these students would be discriminatory.
      vii. Los Angeles: We had a visit from Spence. Graduation audits seem like a far away dream. There is a lot of frustration. We have a task force on advising. How can we move people along if we can't even get a grad check?

b. Request from Chair McNeil: Please let us know about any problems being posed by facilitating graduation.

3. Discussion:
   a. Academic Freedom/Student Rights updates—response to SB 5
      i. Our ASCSU resolution calls for campus reports by March 15, 2005 so that we can present evidence to the legislature about how the CSU handles complaints/problems. We have been alerted that we may have to be ready to give a strong response in hearings. For
this reason, we will likely need reports from the campuses about policies/complaints/accessibility by March 1st.

1. There was emotional testimony from students in the past.
2. Faculty will be expected to testify.
3. We need to publicize our policies to our students.
4. If we are not prepared, the outcome of something like SB 5 may be something that would be very undesirable.

ii. The CSSA is opposing the bill.
iii. CTA is also opposing the bill.
iv. Department chairs should be aware of policies and alert to issues of process in dealing with student complaints.
v. Faculty evaluations do not seem to reflect the concerns expressed in individual student’s testimony.
vi. Q: What is the administration’s position on this? They are deferring to the faculty. Comment: the need to take a leadership position in opposing the Morrow bill.

b. CMS Reports/Petition/Update
i. Q: are there “back channel” requests for relief from CMS on your campuses? A: YES. The wrong people are being polled. Presidents, others deny problems even if they are evident.
ii. Some campuses have to borrow funds to implement.
iii. The technical types resist in private but are positive in public. They don’t see the need to implement.
iv. There may be a groupthink mentality at the top.
v. Implementation makes the budget process much more complex.
vi. Pressure from the top seems to have stifled debate.
vii. CSUCI—this is our first DP system. We have almost no functionality. Most work is done on paper. The costs are crippling.
viii. Maritime—thanks to Sonoma State, things have gone very smoothly. It is a good system.
ix. We may want to share rules, courses in the LDTP patterns.

x. Long Beach—things are improving. We are getting good data, developing very useful reports. It has taken quite a while but things have seen improvement.
xii. Sonoma—data entry is a problem. Grade submission is a problem. They are being processed late because of confusing commands/applications/data loss.
xii. Humboldt—our system works well, why change? Public and private attitudes among administrators are very different. Other universities outside the CSU are expressing similar concerns to those inside the CSU.
xiii. San José—we save money by using lots of internal consultants. There are some complaints but it seems to be working better and have some new functionality. Financial reporting seems enhanced.
xiv. The Banner campuses don’t want to proceed.
1. we are cash poor
2. the Oracle situation is unsure
3. we are still implementing the other two modules
4. what we have now works

c. Marvin Klein (TEKR)
   i. The committee is conducting a Teacher Education Survey.
   ii. There is an item in the Chairs’ packet on evaluation.
   iii. We hope to have a CO presentation on this initiative at your next meeting.
   iv. The committee is interested in improving relationships/collaboration between subject matter instructors and teacher education faculty.
   v. The Education deans are united in support of requiring the CSET prior to entering credential programs.

d. Faculty Hiring Process Discussion: Issues of Concern
   i. Reference checking prior to visits
   ii. Restrictions on advertising
   iii. Background checks
   iv. Fingerprinting
   v. Etc.
   vi. Where are these changes coming from?
   vii. The ASCSU need to follow up with the CO regarding background checks, degree verification, etc.

e. YRO Best Practices from a Faculty Perspective—a discussion of pay, side agreements, different campus arrangements was undertaken.
   i. Experiences vary greatly.
   ii. There are many unintended consequences of moving to YRO, changing the parameters of YRO.
   iii. At LA, there is no summer teaching for extra pay; faculty who teach in the state supported summer quarter do so and take another quarter off.
   iv. There is uncertainty/confusion on many of the campuses regarding how faculty would be paid, how this would affect their workload, etc.
   v. Trustee Kaiser: your campus should have a YRO implementation committee with both faculty governance and CFA representation.