Minutes
ASCSU Executive Committee Interim (“Zoom”) Meeting
February 20, 2015

1. **Call to order:** 8:10 a.m.

2. **Attendance:** Julie Chisholm, Steven Filling, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Chris Miller, Praveen Soni, Steven Stepanek
   a. Liaison Time [11:30?]

3. **Approval of Agenda:** as amended

4. **Approval of Minutes**
   21 January ftf meeting: deferred until March meeting

5. **Announcements**

Gubernat reported on the quarter-to-semester conversion process at Cal State East Bay, due to be completed by fall 2018. She remarked that the process was moving speedily, in particular, in the attempts to complete the revision/transformation of the GE curriculum by the end of spring 2015. Many of the deadlines being worked with seem impossible, but the campus is moving forward.

Miller reported that at Sac State a building contract with the Foundation has enabled a for-profit institution, California North State University, to lease space to run an academic program that looks duplicative of, and could be confused with, a Sac State program in Health and Human Services. When the issue was raised in the Sac State senate, they were told that this arrangement was a legal one. Miller wanted to know if there was a way to find out if the CO knew about this situation, and could something be done about it. The name itself could be misrepresentative of the relationship between Sac State and the for-profit institution. It was mentioned that at Fullerton a similar situation had occurred when a group on campus was providing TESOL classes.
Should this be an issue brought to the Chancellor’s attention and/or to that of the General Counsel? The decision was to give the campus time to sort this out; there will be an update in March on the situation. (It was noted that SB 8 opens up foundations for scrutiny.)

It was noted that Bill Eadie has recently received good news from his surgeon.

6. Reports

   a. Chair: see minutes of Extended Exec meeting
   b. Liaison Reports:

Academic Affairs (AA)

Eadie reported that the committee discussed their various ongoing projects and what form each of these would ultimately take. There could possibly be three first-reading items in March emerging from these projects, and committee members are aware that they will have to do a good deal of writing for the plenary. March will be a busy time for AA.

The committee is frustrated that the CSU cannot do much to stop the community college baccalaureate pilot going ahead as it is now. They found Chris Mallon’s perspective helpful in their discussion. They also discussed various campuses’ reactions to the revisions in the MA, but according to Mallon, no changes are going forward on these in Title 5 this year. Two readings of such will be needed, and that timeline calmed some concerns. The provosts don’t seem well-informed about these changes to MA degrees; the changes seem to be coming from the graduate deans. This is an AA item that will wait for next year.

Eadie said that there was sharp criticism by committee members of Excom’s overstepping its bounds in driving the discussion of, as well as in determining the ASCSU’s involvement in, the WICHE Passport project. It isn’t clear to the committee what Excom’s objections or reservations are. There is a strong request that Excom meet with AA in March to discuss WICHE in order for the committee to become more conversant about what could be both positive and negative about it; it is seen to be in AA’s domain.

A sustainability group in Sacramento consisting of content experts may develop SLOs. The possibility of a collaborative minor between the CSU and community colleges has raised some questions about campus autonomy.

The committee also asked that Excom please share what is being discussed at ICAS: what are the hot topics among the community colleges and the UC? What about the community college’s request for help with developing upper GE requirements? (Van Selst has mentioned that it is too big a project to embark upon.)
Academic Preparation and Education Programs (AEP)

To respond further to a question about the viability of the Ed.D. brought up in January, Fleming reported that Bev Young says it is a money-maker on all campuses, despite different program patterns. There are 14 independent students; 272 in the community college strand, and 490 in pre-K through 12. APEP will find out how many will be graduating.

On the matter of the Title II regulations: it is still too early to know how things will go. According to *Ed Week* there have been 4,000 comments, mostly negative ones. Positive responses are coming from Teach for America and Ed Trust, both known for their stands against public education. It will be up to Arne Duncan to make the final decision on the regulations.

Lamar Alexander has legislation on elementary and secondary education that could be looked upon favorably, given its language around testing requirements. There is talk about going to a block-granting model, which Bev Young opposes, since the CSU writes good proposals and has been getting 34% of the grants in the nation.

During the meeting, Young asked for APEP’s collaboration on a resolution or a statement seeking an end to credentialing that is based solely on someone’s eminence in a field. The committee may follow up on this request for the March plenary.

Faculty Affairs (FA)

Foroohar reported that the committee is drafting a resolution on the “Need for a Comprehensive Plan to Increase Tenure Density in the CSU” involving many details, and requiring much work; they hope to bring a first reading to the March plenary.

The committee has two requests of Excom: the first of which is to ask for a clearer response to their academic freedom resolution. According to Leo Van Cleve, there has been serious internal discussion about this at the CO, but he could not report on any details of such. There are positive signs that there can be action this year, not next year. The issue needs to be pressed at the March plenary. The second request is to help FA get information from campuses on their policies on non-tenure-track faculty, and any potential revisions thereof.

Foroohar cannot attend Lobby Day, but Deborah Roberts is willing to go in her place to represent FA.

The committee is experiencing problems with Collaborate and would like Zoom training for use in their meetings in the future.

Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)

Krabacher also reported that a number of FGA members have had trouble with Collaborate and ultimately had to participate by phone. Senator Benavides set them up with Zoom on a trial basis; that worked much better and should be used in future.
FGA covered its agenda items as planned. The online journal bundling resolution will return in March, having received recommendations and feedback from library personnel on campuses and now awaiting such from campus senate chairs. The status of the resolution on the Time-Warner merger, however, is uncertain, since its primary author, Senator Benavides, was not able to attend the interim meeting.

The main resolution that will be presented is the omnibus resolution currently being worked on. The committee is looking at legislative priorities for higher ed; summaries of and recommendations on relevant bills will be sent to senators ten days before the plenary.

April 14 was been firmed up as advocacy day. FGA is pleased that Excom has included committee chairs. It looks as if there will be eight or nine two-senator groups to be formed. The major lobbying concern will be the budget request. There seem no other hot-button issues on the calendar, though that could change. A question was raised in committee: what if we involved CSU students in our legislative visits, through CSSA and through Sac State? Legislators tend to welcome students more so than they do faculty. This is something that FGA is willing to explore.

Also: re. the budget advocacy initiative: FGA voted unanimously that ASCSU be involved. Collaboration and cooperation are important. There seem to be no reasons not to, and people could counter the budget ask with the argument that we in the CSU are not unanimous in our support of more funding.

7. **Appointments**

   a. Search Committee Senior director of HR: Tom Norman (DH)

8. **Old Business**

   a. **SB 15: position**: This seems a fairly fluid piece of legislation. At this point Toni Atkins is not taking a formal position; the ASCSU is not taking a position until we know what is being proposed. FGA has been asked to keep us abreast of developments. At Advocacy Day, both Excom and FGA members will participate. It was asked if this were a choice based strictly on cost. Guerin mentioned that a smaller group can be more powerful if more familiar with the issues. But what about involving other standing committee chairs or vice chairs in order to build capacity in the organization? Soni noted that if all members of FGA attend together with Excom, that would be 16 people. If it starts expanding to 20 or more, then the organizational task gets daunting, the group sizes could become unwieldy. In the past when all senators were invited, regional offices were targeted. Senator Eadie has mentioned being a constituent of Atkins. Ultimately, to build capacity, the decision was to also invite him and the Chairs of APEP and FA (Fleming and Foroohar). During lunch at the March plenary there should be an orientation for the lobbying group on Friday, planned by FGA.

   (In response to a related question about new senator orientation, there will be one in May; it will be important to get new senators the forms for choosing committee assignments before that
session so that they can discuss and hand in their forms then, rather than at the end of the plenary.)

It was noted that it will be important to also have members at the budget advocacy group, not just the FGA Chair (Soni and Gubernat were there last year when strategy and tactics arose). Right now the point is that there should be more money in the budget ask; last year we joined the process quite late and timing was part of the issue, whereas now we are on the ground floor. Guerin mentioned that there should be more conversation with the senators about the budget ask; meanwhile, it is important to be a signatory to the ask, working closely along with CSSA. It could reflect badly on the ASCSU if we are not full partners.

Excom voted to be a signatory to the budget ask and to make a formal request that we participate. Next Tuesday, Krabacher and Filling will have a meeting with Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa on the matter. The vote will be announced at the March plenary, or perhaps even earlier, noting that Excom was acting on behalf of the ASCSU. It was said it was important to let the senate know that FGA’s recommendation was to sign on, as well.

On a related matter, that is, membership in the System Budget Advisory Committee: The Chair and Vice Chair of FGA and Chair and Vice Chair of the ASCSU should be serving on it. These are the members traditionally in attendance. Care needs to be taken in the misuse of titles (such as “budget analyst”) that have not been granted in these budget matters. Though David Hood has been attending the phone meetings, he has not been appointed and needs to be disabused of the notion that he should be attending. Filling will discuss with Krabacher, and will clarify this.

b. AA funding faculty consultants through ASCSU: When exploring the 120/180 process at the CO, it looked as though a faculty consultant (Seagal) had been reimbursed through the ASCSU. Tracy is tracking the process. His fee and other stipends, such as those for faculty (non-senators) working on SB 1440 and COERC matters, have gone through the ASCSU budget system, which has been used only as a conduit and not as a source of funding. There is a concern, however, about the CO finding their own contractors and then paying them through the ASCSU, especially if the contractor’s work is found to be at odds with ASCSU policies and positions. These are not faculty representing faculty as those appointed by the ASCSU do. It is important to have an audit trail, and it still isn’t clear why this payment process is occurring as a matter merely of accounting.

(As a side note: Guerin asked that maybe Excom could add to its agenda the shared governance and faculty representation issue. An important conversation to have is how the ASCSU might take a more pro-active role among campuses, maybe through faculty development. She alluded to Bowen’s book *Locus of Authority* and suggested a book review of it for the next newsletter. She asked if the issue of shared governance, and how differently it functions on the various campuses, could be an issue that Filling and Miller raise when meeting with the new EVC Loren Blanchard.)
c. WICHE Passport Project discussion: Filling has been exchanging emails and had a phone conversation with Senator Van Selst, pursuant to Van Selst’s email on Thursday seeking additional faculty to attend Passport meetings. Filling is attempting to find out what the ASCSU’s participation in the project ultimately means. Would all those involved in these consultations be expected to sign on to the competencies that WICHE arrives at? What are the implications for GE competencies? Outcomes? Transfer? Van Selst has sent a draft letter attempting to get Debra David to walk back from public statements about the CSU’s going along with materials developed by the Passport project.

Guerin said that at the last meeting that she attended on the WICHE project together with community college faculty last year, she made it clear that faculty will have many concerns about this. She recommended that the ASCSU learn directly from Ken O’Donnell, in a formal report during the March plenary, exactly what our involvement means.

A discussion arose about what it would mean to wait to populate the WICHE project meetings until after the March plenary and O’Donnell’s report. What do we lose in not being at the table? It was felt by some that not appointing anyone now makes it public that the ASCSU has unanswered questions about WICHE and our involvement therein. Finally, after much discussion, it was decided to respond to the request for three faculty to attend upcoming WICHE meetings (on Critical Thinking and Creative Expression) by appointing one each instead, and for those representatives to come from Excom, not from a general call to CSU faculty.

d. SB 850 proposal recommendation process: as disposed of at meeting of Excom on Wednesday, February 18, 2015.

e. Sabbaticals and ASCSU business: Senator Brodowsky, who is on sabbatical, asked to participate in his committee meeting and in the plenary, but was told not to by the APEP Chair, without any consultation. What, then, is the policy on senators participating while on sabbatical leave? There are campus processes for replacement. Minimally, chairs need to be informed. If someone is on sabbatical, are they not still considered senators? The issue needs to be referred to FA to develop a policy. There may need to be a bylaws change. The current practice has been that they can participate if they choose to do so.

f. Veterans Affairs task force. There will be a liaison, not a task force per se. The liaison should be appointed just as, for example, the Legislative Specialist is appointed by Excom, and could be given duties that go beyond merely liaising with Patrick O’Rourke of the CO. No assigned time for this role is planned, but the position should be listed on next year’s committee preference form where senators can opt for such.

g. Responses to resolutions by the CO: Filling needs to pursue the Chancellor further on his statement about forming a task force to explore a revision of the academic freedom policy vs. the absence of such a task force in the formal response to FA’s resolution at the January plenary. (At the next meeting with the Chancellor and his cabinet it was decided that the secretary will take [handwritten] notes.)
9. **New Business**

   **a. Statement on CCC BA degrees** There are many concerns re. quality, viability, affordability. The issue will now return to campuses. KYZ has cautioned that the ASCSU not push back on SB 850, that is, not comment too negatively. Do we want to follow that advice? Or do we want to speak to the nature of postsecondary education? To keep trying to insure quality in the CCCs?

   The Academic Affairs committee is working on defining what upper division is. Also there is the question of transferability—how to determine that? Title 5 language, with its residency requirement, was brought up. Will the CSU automatically take nine units of upper-division GE from the community colleges when they develop such?

   The question of what a baccalaureate degree is arises. Or perhaps, to frame it differently, what is an *applied* baccalaureate degree? It was suggested that perhaps answering the second question is a way to proceed. Excom needs to make this a referral to AA: the committee needs to look at the process of reviewing the SB 850 proposals and to do some debriefing on what has happened. Did we like the process? Can we make suggestions for ways the process should be taken in future when the next wave of proposals occurs? This should be on the March agenda. This is an ongoing issue; it is not over.

   **b. Distributing competency statements for comment:** The draft competency statement from ICAS on the sciences will go out to campuses chairs to ask for campus feedback in a month.

   **c. New Outstanding Faculty website submission schedule:** deferred

   **d. March Plenary Guests:** Chancellor White, Ken O’Donnell, Trustee Norton (waiting to see if he can come). To invite: Gerry Hanley and/or Eric Forbes.

   **e. 2015-16 ASCSU Calendar of meetings:** deferred until March

   **f. faculty hiring plan - work with Lori Lamb:** deferred

   **Adjournment** at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gubernat
Secretary, ASCSU