Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, December 4, 2015
8:00A.M. – 14:00P.M.
Zoom Meeting

1. Call to Order
With a quorum being present, the meeting was called to order.

2. Attendance
   a. Extended Exec time certain 8:30-9:45
      i. The following ASCSU Executive Committee members were in attendance: Steven Filling (Chair), Christine Miller (Vice Chair), Robert Keith Collins (Secretary), Praveen Soni (At-Large), Darlene Yee-Melichar (At-Large).
   b. Loren Blanchard time certain 10:00
   c. Leo Van Cleve time certain 10:30 (if needed)

With a time certain reached, the ASCSU Executive Committee met with Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard and State University Dean Van Cleve. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard reported that recent attention has been focused on student matters (i.e., black students matter on racial injustice and the implications of the San Bernardino shootings for Muslim students, etc.). It is important for the ASCSU to understand that the support services are in place to ensure student wellbeing. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard has learned that students are facing many challenges (i.e., cost of living, food security, etc.). He further expressed concern about the demand letters being received and the need for more diverse faculty and staff with whom students can interact. It is important to remind students of existing financial support services so that they can take advantage of these opportunities. Graduation initiatives and campus-based preparation and student success efforts are also being examined. Specific attention is being placed on achievement gap groups. The following concerns and questions were raised:
   a. There is a system-wide health advisory committee. Is it possible to seek updates from them regarding the need for more counseling and psychological services?
   b. It is important to look at student success. Might we look at how faculty might be supported? How do we account for faculty success?
   c. How might we support the post-baccalaureate work of our students?
d. CSU Chico put forward a resolution of no confidence for the president, provost, and CFO. This seems to be a continuing issue. Is attention being given to faculty concerns?

e. Is it possible to get a response on the Academic Conference?

f. Conversations have been had with CSU Maritime. The CSU Maritime President would be happy to receive a proposal and work with the ASCSU. The Day on the Bay event will pose a problem. There is not enough space (i.e., 200 spaces) left for the Day on the Bay Cruise.


g. It will be important to come up with a “Plan B”.

h. Given that Assistant Vice Chancellor for Advocacy Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa will be retiring, how will this impact how we deal with legislative bills in the future? Do we have any plan for how we will move forward?

i. On the issue of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force, it is hoped this group will have robust faculty participation and consultation with relevant stakeholders. We need to be in agreement on how to move forward.

j. Travel costs continue to rise. Do you have advice for how to send these concerns forward?

k. The CCC posted a nursing education model, despite objection from CSU. There are lingering concerns over the lack of consultation.

l. There will be a report on the DNP in January 2016. Will it be possible to view this report?

3. Liaison time 12:00 - 12:30

a. Academic Affairs
   At-Large Senator Soni reported that the Academic Affairs committee continues to engage in conversation on Resolutions that follow-up on the honorary degree policy and explores the potential impact of SB1440 on majors.

b. Academic Preparation and Education Programs
   Vice Chair Miller reported back that APEP continues to discuss the importance of articulation concerns and what is required for quality assurance (i.e., assessment, common core, and high school exist exam.).

c. Faculty Affairs
   Secretary Collins reported that FA continues to discuss the implication of AB 798 on Academic Freedom and that senators were intrigued by the discussion of the Academic Conference. Several senators suggested that the lack of conflict with CSU Maritime’s “Day on the Bay” would open the door for less schedule conflicts with potential keynote speakers.

d. Fiscal and Government Affairs
   At-Large Senator Yee-Melichar reported back that FGA continues to discuss the revision for Second Reading Resolutions and advocacy planning in-district
as well as in Sacramento. The committee will also take the lead on a commendation for Assistant Vice Chancellor for Advocacy Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa.

4. Approval of Agenda
The Agenda was approved.

5. Approval of Minutes
   a. November 4, 2015 Face-to-Face meeting: The Minutes for November 4, 2015 will be discussed at a future meeting.

6. Announcements
   a. It is important to discuss the extent to which there a system-wide directive that Lecturers working that for multiple departments are not supposed to be paid for the 16th unit?
   b. Senator Yee-Melichar is working with Ms. Butler on the ASCSU’s Faculty-to-Faculty publication. The newsletter will be completed go live next week.

7. Reports
   Chair
   Chair Filling reported that CSU Chico is experiencing hefty budget cuts. A vote of no confidence has been made in first reading for the president, provost, and Chief Financial Officer (CFO). Chair Filling has also met with Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard. The honorary degree policy was discussed and suggested changes were not shared with honorary degree subcommittee. Background check concerns were also discussed. The ASCSU Chair reported at the Board of Trustees (BOT) that the CSU would review the policy and make changes. Reaction from the Chancellor’s Office (CO) was that this would not be done in November as alluded to in the meeting. A couple of representatives will be designated to work with Vice Chancellor Lamb on this issue. Information will be collected on the situation. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard’s plenary reports suggested that attention would be paid to ASCSU concerns regarding academic freedom. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard and General Council Framroze Virjee suggested that this was a contract issue. It is important to stay aware of – and keep open - communication avenues with the CO. The formation of a joint group to explore these issues will be possible. The Academic Senate Chairs met yesterday. Topics of major interest included background check concerns, presidential searches, tenure density (related to net loses and cost of living), and the CSU as a teaching-centered university system. Chairs may put out a statement on the mission of the CSU. The California State Student Association (CSSA) will not support open presidential searches. Fact-finding was observed and the California Faculty Association (CFA) presented its data. The CO will follow. After the CO presents its information, then the last best offer can be presented to the CFA. Discussion has begun with Executive Assistant Vice Chancellor Hanley on the possibility of creating a short letter regarding
Affordable textbooks that can be taken to Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). This conversation will continue. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. How will senators be chosen to participate in the joint group?
b. How will we approach the academic freedom issue?

**Vice Chair**
Vice Chair Miller will give a report at a future meeting.

**Academic Affairs (AA)**
Chair Nelson reported that AA is engaged in ongoing business on the role of faculty in evaluating transfer credit. Two potential resolutions are being considered. One follow-up on the honorary degree policy and the second explores the potential impact of Senate Bill (SB) 1440 on majors. The committee continues to engage in conversation on graduate programs, unit caps, pre-requisites, and financial aid. Conversation also continues on Community College dual enrollment and definitions of upper and lower division courses. Undergraduate research, workload, and graduate research space, and Assembly Bill (AB) 386 courses will also be examined. Discussion of the latter will center on the following question: Can students take all resident units online? The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. Establishing definitions for upper division and lower division courses will enable the address of California Community Colleges (CCC) baccalaureate issues.
b. It is important to review the *Access to Excellence* report, as it contains discussion active learning goals.
c. It is important for AA to examine textbook selection and Open Education Resources (OER).
d. The CSU Fullerton Academic Senate is creating a resolution that will address the textbook issue. Commentary was solicited from CSU San Luis Obispo math faculty. There seems to be issues of academic freedom. This is on Faculty Affairs (FA) committee’s agenda. AB 798 will also be discussed.
e. This should be on AA’s agenda for discussion of quality assurance in textbook selection and how we can have this conversation with Sacramento.
f. Is it possible for AA to talk about Nursing issues and concerns (i.e., doctorate and the CCC pilot degrees)? This will enable the Executive Committee to bring concerns and information to ICAS.

**Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)**
Chair Fleming reported that she attended the Learning Works Conference. The presentations were focused on revision of articulation protocol. The University of California (UC) is preparing a math summit. Constituencies will begin to talk about where the important articulation concerns are and what is required for quality
assurance (i.e., assessment, common core, and high school exist exam.). These will all be discussed today as part of the APEP agenda. Senator Van Selst will be consulted. The EdSource webinar on teacher shortage was also attended. It is important to explore what quality teaching means and how to move forward on a definition. General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) will be consulted and input from the Executive Committee would be useful. The committee will discuss how the best ways for faculty to weigh in on teacher preparation related to these issues. APEP will begin planning for the January social. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. These issues seem to be the result of the CCC baccalaureates and the need for remediation, rather than the CSU practice.

**Faculty Affairs (FA)**
Chair Foroohar and Vice Chair Roberts reported that three FA committee members would not be able to meet. The committee will discuss two resolutions that will return to the January plenary in second reading. One addresses shared governance and the second calls for the inclusion of lecturer faculty in orientation programs. The committee will also discuss the CO response on the resolution for a retired faculty member on the BOT and AB 798. The committee is concerned with the academic freedom issues that arise when different faculty members decide to use different textbooks. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. AB 798 is voluntary and not mandated. Campus senates can pass a resolution stating interest in using OER and applying for grant money. Faculty and students can work together. Cost savings are the goal.

b. It is important to pay attention to what problems this may pose for faculty and continue this conversation January.

**Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA)**
Chair Krabacher reported that he attended the teacher shortage conference. Central in the FGA agenda are two main items: revision of Resolutions that will return to the January plenary in second reading and advocacy planning. The need for a push for on in-district advocacy by senators and the budget augmentation initiative will also be discussed. Strategies in the advocacy plan consist of weekly visits weekly by faculty, students, and alumni. The ASCSU will be updated on advocacy activities. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Advocacy Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa will be retiring.

b. What is the FGA position on the Bonilla bill?

c. Will FGA be able to work with Assistant Vice Chancellor Yelverton-Zamarripa to develop talking points for in-district advocacy?

d. Who will step up to work on in-district lobbying?

e. Given our discussion, will FGA write a Resolution for Assistant Vice Chancellor Yelverton-Zamarripa?
f. Talking points will be discussed this morning in committee.
g. It is important to have a Resolution for Assistant Vice Chancellor Yelverton-Zamarripa that acknowledges her career and good works done.

(The ASCSU Extended Executive Committee Adjourned at 9:45 a.m.)

8. Appointments
   a. Assistant Vice Chancellor Research Search Committee [email]:
      Senator Ornотовsky was appointed to the Assistant Vice Chancellor Research Search Committee.
   b. Background Check Work Group [2]:
      Central in this discussion was the importance of the Executive Committee appointment of work group members. It would be important to have a representative from the Executive Committee and a senator. At-Large Senator Praveen Soni and Senator Deborah Roberts are to be considered.
   c. Quantitative Reasoning Task Force [definitions]:
      The Resolution on the formation of a Quantitative Reasoning Task Force was discussed. The following concerns and questions were raised:
      i. It is important to consult the UC.
      ii. It is important to consider Mark Van Selst (GEAC) and David Barsky (APEP), and a representative from AA.
      iii. It is important to consider the roles that they will play.
      iv. It is important to consult Ken O'Donnell.
      v. Is it possible to put out a call out to AA, APEP and GEAC on who they would like as their representative? Might it be possible to get these individuals started before January?
      vi. Is it possible to have the committees vote for or appoint a representative?
      vii. B4 outside of mathematics is an area in needs of representation.
      viii. Step II will be to tune the charge.

9. Old Business
   a. CO responses to November resolutions (and reconsideration of September response)
      Central in this discussion was the point that the CO response encourages the ASCSU to continue moving forward. The following concerns and questions were raised:
      i. What implications might these responses have on upcoming Second Reading Resolutions?
      ii. There needs to be a multi-level approach and follow-up to ensure effective communication of our concerns.
iii. Is it possible to ask the CO to change the policy? It is important to ensure consistency between policy and practice.

iv. What implications might these responses have on the working relationship between the ASCSU and CSSA?

b. Sustainable Financial Model draft report update

Central in this discussion was the ongoing editing of the current Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report. A report will be shared with the ASCSU upon conclusion of the next meeting. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. It seems that FGA input (i.e., grants and sponsored programs and student success fees) was included in the revision draft.

ii. In looking ahead, is it possible to ensure that the committee involves the ASCSU and faculty system-wide? Is it possible to get the message out that we need to be included?

c. Academic Conference update

Central in this discussion was a recap of the meeting with Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard and State University Dean Leo Van Cleve.

d. Academic Freedom, Intellectual Property, other shared concerns

Central in this discussion was the importance of creating a work group on Academic Freedom that explores the issues and can share information with FA. FA Chair Foroohar seems to be the best fit for the group. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. AA Chair Catherine Nelson and FA Chair Manzar Foroohar may be very useful to the conversations.

ii. It is important to have Chair Filling in the work group.

iii. Senator Tom Norman may be useful to the discussions.

iv. AA Chair Catherine Nelson, FA Chair Manzar Foroohar, and Chair Filling will be appointed to the working group.

e. Tenure density follow-up

Discussion centered on issues raised by the campus Senate Chairs. Opening up the conversation on this issue seems to be a good option.

f. Campus issues

Discussion centered on the reasons why some campuses seem to be settling down, while others are still dealing issues of academic freedom. There are discussions of surplus in tandem with structural deficits and data used to general rationales do not seem reliable. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. How involved has the Faculty Trustee been in campus issues?
ii. Unrest seems to stem from faculty concerns over the uniqueness of campus cultures and communities not being support.

g. Shared Governance issues: The Item was discussed.

h. Discipline Councils redux: The Item was discussed. An update will be provided at a future meeting.

10. New Business

a. Contingent Faculty in Governance Conference
   Discussion centered on the CSU Los Angeles conference to be held in April. The CFA and Association of American University Professors (AAUP) are providing funding for the event. It is important to send ASCSU representatives. The following concerns and questions were raised:
   i. When will this information be available?
   ii. It is important to have Senator Davis and Yudelson at the conference to ensure lecturer representation.

b. AB 798 process/documents
   Central in this discussion was the point that campus presidents and provosts will be preparing a document over process. This will be sent out as soon as possible. While student do not have a direct role, they are aware that selection of classes is not in their purview. The CSSA is most concerned with whether or not the information will be made available on the campuses.

c. ICAS agenda items
   Discussion centered on the following:
   i. The Executive Committee will send material on AB 798 process concerns, the quantitative reasoning task force, particularly the need for an ICAS appointment, and transfer issues on nursing. The following concerns and questions were raised:
      1) Is it necessary to include the background check policy on the ICAS agenda?
      2) Should this discussion be part of the Chair’s Report?
      3) Is it possible to ask the UC about their policies that differentiate between the baccalaureate, M.A. and PhD?

11. Adjourn
The ASCSU Executive Committee adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary