Minutes
Extended Executive (“Zoom”) Meeting
February 20, 2015

1. Call to order: 8:31

2. Roll call: Julie Chisholm, Bill Eadie, Steven Filling, Denise Fleming, Manzar Foroohar, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Tom Krabacher, Chris Miller, Praveen Soni, Steven Stepanek

3. Approval of agenda: approved

4. Approval of minutes
   a. 21 January f2f: deferred until March meeting

5. Announcements: none

6. Reports

   a. Academic Affairs (AA) – Bill Eadie, Chair

   Bill Eadie reported that with the committee’s projects nearing the year-end deadline, the discussion would involve how to proceed. In studying the high-impact practices in the CSU, for example, the members have some preliminary campus data, although at this point it looks to be based on pilots; much of the information has come so far from Fullerton.

   The first half hour will be devoted to other concerns, including a conversation with Ken O’Donnell. They are currently reviewing ongoing changes in the requirements for master’s programs, one of which would have classes open only to MA candidates. This has caused consternation among smaller campuses. Humboldt, for example, has said that their MA programs would be ruined as a result, since most of their graduate students are taking courses along with their undergraduates. His understanding is that this discussion is being driven by graduate deans, with Academic Affairs in the CO consulting. Chris Mallon has said it is all right to move slowly on this matter, which could eventually result in a Title 5 change.
Miller noted that this also came up last year in AA. How are provosts involved? Other campuses have shared Humboldt’s concerns in the past. Gubernat raised the issue of course caps and fees in grad programs: how do these underlie the discussion? Can’t the viability of these programs be judged on a different standard from that leveled at the undergraduate programs?

Also on the AA agenda this morning is a placeholder on the community college baccalaureate issue, to be discussed, as needed.

Among other projects needing to move forward is one on math/Algebra, which is also being dealt with in GEAC. It will become clearer today where that project is. There will be little or no discussion of the project on assessment since the lead on that project could not attend the meeting. While the group seems to know where it is going, Eadie has yet to see a written report.

On the issue of the Ethnic Studies Task Force, they have consulted with Senator Kensinger, who says that the task force is not yet ready to share details about their findings. They are poised to follow up, with the expectation that April will be the earliest time the task force will have a final report. It is unlikely that there will be a resolution on the matter this year unless something urgent comes up.

Finally, Eadie expects a report on the sustainability committee from their liaison.

**b. Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) – Denise Fleming, Chair**

Fleming said she only had a brief report this morning. The committee will be meeting with Bev Young for an update on the status of Ed.D. programs in response to a query at the January plenary. They may start work on a resolution for the March plenary on the use of evidence in the Education Act.

**c. Faculty Affairs (FA) – Manzar Foroohar, Chair**

Foroohar expressed her concerns about the committee losing three of its members, either to illness (Frehlich), or resignation from the ASCSU (Eudey), or the decision to join another committee (Wheeler to FGA). Senator Davis is prepared to step in and assume the duties of Vice Chair for now. Foroohar asked Excom for some help with the committee’s responsibilities for the social in March.

The committee is working on the following: Informing campus faculty of the new policy on travel to high-hazard regions. A section of the FA report for the newsletter has also focused on this issue. A second issue is the ongoing reduction in tenure density: the committee will work on their rough draft today and bring a first reading to the floor in March. The resolution would ask the CO to put together a plan that would increase density to 75% and reduce SFR to 18. Both goals are in ACR 73. The Chancellor has already said that he would not go that route, so the resolution would ask for a new plan to be put together and for an annual report on the new plan’s progress, including a cost analysis.
Having just now gotten the CO response to the January resolutions, Foroohar noted that the CO said nothing of substance in response to FA’s resolutions. (It was noted that there was a mismatch between the official CO response to the academic freedom resolution and the Chancellor’s saying he wanted to be “part of the conversation” on academic freedom and to convene a task force on the subject during a meeting with Excom. Filling will follow up on the mismatch between the official response and the Chancellor’s comments.)

d. Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) – Tom Krabacher, Chair

Krabacher said he was pleased to welcome Mark Wheeler to the committee; Wheeler had, in the past, been interested in legislative matters.

He reported that a second reading of the resolution re. Wiley’s bundling of journal articles would be coming back in March. The committee is watching this carefully before putting the finishing touches on the resolution, as it is a fluid situation, apparently, with some campuses coming to some kind of agreement with Wiley.

Another topic of discussion will be the Time Warner merger resolution, though it may not be ready for March. There will be the customary report from Senator Hood on SBAC where he had represented the committee. There remains a question as to whether a budget specialist should be formally appointed by FGA.

FGA’s main focus will be the analysis of legislation being proposed this year that would be relevant to higher ed; today happens to be the deadline date of submission of bills for legislation. The committee will be preparing their usual omnibus resolution to bring to the plenary in March, so the work today will largely consist of setting up the process and allocating responsibilities to review particular bills and preparing summaries. The committee will have another interim phone conference to discuss results of these summaries and develop draft recommendations within the next 10 days. The goal, like last year’s, is to get the omnibus resolution circulated 10 days in advance of the March plenary so that senators can review and provide informed feedback.

The committee will also begin planning for spring Advocacy Day, Tuesday, April 14, the second Tuesday of April being traditional for such. The timing is fortuitous since both the CSU and CFA will have been lobbying the week before, and the ICAS lobby dates is April 13. Krabacher asked Excom to consider who should participate; it used to be both Excom and FGA members—a tightly-knit group, if focused, but FGA is open to changes. An orientation at lunch time is something that would be necessary to have organized at the March plenary for those going to advocate in Sacramento.

During the Friday session of the January plenary, Krabacher attended the initial meeting of stakeholders re. the CSU budget, a meeting, as previously noted, organized by Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa. Excom decided not to attend last year, he said, and were invited again to participate. There were two meetings: a briefing on the budget situation and who wanted to participate and the second for possible strategies. Krabacher sent a summary of the sessions to Chair Filling this
past week. He would like Excom to consider having the ASCSU formally participate in the budget ask this year; it seems important to have everyone on board—CSSA, ERFA, etc., and it would look strange if the ASCSU is not involved. He said it would be important for the senate to have a place at the table. Doing so does not involve lots of resources—having our name on lists of participants and periodically participating in Capitol events and appearing at committees.

Krabacher spoke with two people in the advocacy office who expressed their gratitude for the ASCSU’s resolution appreciating their work on SB 2324. He noted that it was important for the senate to continue to strengthen its relationship with people in this office.

Miller asked if, as liaison, she could be a “fly on the wall” for that interim phone call.

Filling cautioned that Excom appoints a budget specialist, not FGA. While Senator Hood may be attending these meetings, it really should be the FGA Chair and Vice Chair doing so. The more people listening, the more details will be noted and concerns brought forward. Krabacher said that he was under the impression that Excom had suggested Senator Hood. He (Krabacher) will participate in the spring meeting; earlier, he didn’t want to be overloading the call.

Eadie mentioned that, as a constituent of Toni Atkins, he would be happy to be of help in lobbying/advocacy, as Mark Wheeler might also be, too. Krabacher said he had no objection, but this would be Excom’s decision as to who attends.

Miller asked if the committee were going to discuss the so-called “Committee of Two.” Since the legislative calendar is not especially busy for CSU, it will be important to see what else comes up; perhaps as the UC goes, so will the CSU?

Krabacher asked Fleming if APEP were interested in the topic of denied eligibles? She responded that APEP had not planned to take the lead and wondered if FGA were going to do so. Krabacher said that interest in the matter was initiated in the fall in APEP, so FGA thought they were the lead, and there had been meetings on the subject when both committees had members attending. Fleming said that nothing had been initiated through her as Chair, but she will consult with members of her committee and return with some further clarification.

**e. Chair – Steven Filling**

Filling received a note back from Vice Chancellor of Human Resources Lori Lamb, addressing points raised by the senate a few weeks ago. Lamb is demonstrating a new approach to working with the senate; she has expressed continued interest in discussing the details of a new faculty hiring plan. While this matter is on Excom’s agenda, it may be something that FA should rightly concern itself with.

Progress is being made on cross-campus donations of sick time to Senate Frehlich. There will also be good reason to pursue this matter in the next contract negotiations.
At the campus chairs meeting yesterday, chairs bemoaned the lack of financial information on campuses, and they plan to pursue a series of campus resolutions for best practices for financial reporting. It was discussed that, as custodians of public funds, we have accountability. Filling reported lots of discussion on upper-division GE, and in particular, as related to CourseMatch, which is still paper driven. Articulation officers are being relied upon to determine what qualifies, but chairs reported that on some campuses students are being told that they met GE, even if it has not been approved on their home campuses. There is a request to discuss this situation further with Gerry Hanley, who says that CourseMatch is in the final stages of being automated.

Campus chairs also plan to draft a statement about the community college baccalaureate degrees.

Re: the Wiley e-journals bundling issue: some campuses are negotiating lower rates for subset of the 1800 journals in order to be affordable; Filling will report information on these campus strategies to FGA as it comes in.

Re: faculty hiring: Filling said that most campuses are planning cautiously for hires.

There have been some issues reported with logo licensing and there was discussion of the relationship between governance and being custodians of the image of the university.

Filling had a conversation with Senator Van Selst on the WICHE Passport project: there is now a request for two more groups to be populated, and this will be on today’s Excom agenda. What has started out as a discussion item, however, seems to be becoming more and more a curriculum issue and may need to be looked at in AA.

A final question was posed: Given the amount of legislation and regulations not informed by research or faculty thinking, do the standing committees want to consider joining together in a statement or resolution calling for decisions to be informed by evidence-based research and collaboration among the target constituencies? In this regard it may be important to be ahead of, and not always be writing in response to, an action or initiative.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gubernat
Secretary, ASCSU