Executive Committee Meeting
Munitz Room – CSU Chancellor’s Office
21 January 2015
Minutes
8:00-17:00

1. Call to order: 8:03 a.m.

2. Attendance: Julie Chisholm, Steven Filling, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Chris Miller, Praveen Soni, Steven Stepanek
   a. Liaison time [3:30]

3. Approval of Agenda with modifications

4. Approval of minutes
   a. Interim Teleconference December 5 approved as amended
   b. January 6 Teleconference approved

5. Announcements
   Search Committee results for the Associate Director of Academic Programs: There were 15 applicants. According to Assistant Vice Chancellor Chris Mallon, the search was cancelled due to the noncompetitive nature of the pool. The position will now be re-advertised.
   The ITL Director search was also unsuccessful, and an interim director will be appointed.

6. Reports
   a. Chair
   The majority of the time for this report was devoted to the ongoing developments surrounding proposed CCC baccalaureate pilot programs (via SB 850) as recently announced in the media and as received by the CSU. Filling first acknowledged that there has been some misreporting both about programs and where they were coming from. The
Sacramento Bee’s information, however, has been accurate, reporting on the same list received by the Chancellor’s Office.

After response from and consultation with Excom, Chancellor White has made it clear to CCC Chancellor Harris that the programs announced have not, at this point, been agreed to as non-duplicative by the CSU, as required by law, and that there is a need for additional materials to determine duplication. Filling noted that the law requiring the posting of agenda items for the CCC Board of Governors had to be adhered to, and so the list of programs went forward as “conditionally approved.” Apparently, some unspecified inter-segmental academic group had reviewed the proposals but that group did not, according to the Chancellor’s Chief of Staff Lars Walton, include CSU people. The list has gone to campus presidents and to provosts for their input. Some campuses wrote letters of support, though it remains unclear who was consulted and how. (For example, were all provosts part of this consultation?)

There was concern expressed about what, at this point, needs to be communicated to committee chairs. If more information were to come to Exec this afternoon, should committees minimize their conversations on other subjects and turn to the matter of how to respond to the community college proposals? Should AA, which has been working on the matter, continue to do so?

While the CCC Chancellor may not see a need to “negotiate” about these degrees with the ASCSU, as noted, Filling said that Chancellor White agrees that the ASCSU needs to do an evaluation of possible duplication, and that discipline faculty on campuses should be involved in a review process. One of the concerns is that while this is a system issue, the CCC administration seems to want to present it as a regional issue. The recommendations from AA say that the process should be administered by the ASCSU, but what remains ambiguous is the very meaning of the term “duplication.” Other issues, (e.g., programs planned but never implemented due to fiscal constraints and the two-plus-two model) remain vexed questions.

So far, based on the responses from campus administrators, all but the programs in dental hygiene and mortuary science have been found to be duplicative. Meanwhile, discipline faculty will need guidance; should constructive criticism to “tweak” a program so that it falls within the law be given, or is there really no conversation about such—the answer regarding duplication being either a definite yes or no?

It also seemed clear that UC faculty were not involved in reviewing these pilot programs; however, the UC Senate Chair reports that their president responded that she saw no problem with these programs going forward.

Members of Excom raised the issue of devoting the requisite time to this project: Has the ship already sailed? Is it worth spending all the time required if we have no political capital at this point? Ultimately, it was agreed that it is our responsibility to advocate for adequate
time and opportunity for discipline faculty to do a proper review; such is our responsibility in shared governance. Having done so, it will then be up to the Chancellor to use faculty input as he determines.

Other issues raised in discussion included: the potential perception of self-interest of CSU faculty in limiting the community colleges’ right to grant such degrees; the threat that exists if community colleges can offer curricula, including GE upper-division curricula, at a much more affordable price, thereby depriving us of FTES; the role of consortia in seeking to offer a single program but at five separate campuses—is the last consistent with the law?

It was determined that these and other questions would be put to Associate Vice Chancellor Chris Mallon and Lars Walton, with whom a last-minute meeting was scheduled at 1 p.m.

b. Liaison Reports
Issues brought back to Excom at the end of the day included FA’s wanting to be sure t/t ratio was a topic of conversation with the new Executive Vice Chancellor and continuing to pursue catastrophic leave donation for Senator Frehlich; APEP requested that the ASCSU plan calendars in future where the senate does not meet during the first week of a semester; FGA heard counsel from Yelverton-Zamarripa not to push back on SB 850, that the decisions are up to the Chancellor; AA will begin working on the definition of what constitutes an upper-division course.

7. Old Business
a. Periodic Budget Reports: Chair Filling reported that he received the latest report yesterday. A drawback to the information received is that data on travel is widely inaccurate (though assigned time and other expenses are accurate). He is working his way to more useful information. The end result for the year, depending upon the results of as-yet-unreported travel expenses, is that the ASCSU will be close to a small budget surplus. The question was raised if money for summer work could be projected for next year’s Excom. In fact, it was said that there could even be a possible stipend for Excom’s work last summer. Again, much relies upon the final travel numbers and some projections could be made about these in March. It was noted that this is a three-year-old budget; while the CSU has experienced increases, the ASCSU budget has remained static. The suggestion was made that the ASCSU ask for a budget increase, as has been done regularly in the past, since more work is being expected of us.

b. Performance Measures: Chair Filling has been asked by staff members of the Speaker of the House for examples of such measures, more nuanced versions than have been proposed, in order to help advocate for increased funding for the CSU. He has had conversations with Senators Krabacher and Swartz about this request and would like some further suggestions. Examples of metrics suggested by Excom included the percentage of spending going directly to instruction; Pell grant statistics; how, in reference to ACR 73, increasing t/t positions could increase access; defining more measures of quality and combining measures, such as accreditation, to tell a better story of what the CSU is
accomplishing. It was suggested that the metrics arrived at during the summer retreat discussions could be useful; Filling agreed to distribute those to Excom. Other examples: how over 50% of students are now being taught by lecturers; the hours students spend working (so that their course loads are not always full-time, affecting time to graduation); the persistence of native freshmen who begin in remediation; graduation numbers for those graduating in ten years or more. It will be important to come up with some solid responses in March; the bill’s trailer language is changing in May and June.

c. Veterans Affairs The Chair notes that Senator Swartz is trying to connect with Patrick O’Rourke, who is handling veterans’ affairs in the CO. This is one of three major areas that the CSSA is focusing on this year, so it is important to move forward on it. There is a need for support on campuses. Issues that have been pointed to are: actual space for veterans’ centers (which don’t exist on all campuses), special academic and psychological counseling, credits for career and experience. Should a task force be formed is a question that has arisen. O’Rourke and Swartz will be invited to address Excom soon on their ideas and proposals for moving forward.

d. SB 15 position

e. AA funding faculty consultants through ASCSU

8. New Business

a. Academic Conference outcomes review [Time Certain 10:00]:

• Minutes of November 5, 2014 were approved.

• Breakout sessions: To date, feedback has been received from only eight of 20 note-takers in the breakout sessions, so Chair Filling and Vice Chair Miller will remind those who haven't done so to send their notes. Senator Soni will then be able to compile them and prepare a full analysis of the breakouts in draft form for review.

• Survey results: both quantitative and qualitative. Among the themes was that problems emerged but without solutions. According to Senator Kaiser, there were 60 responses; and there was a big exodus after the first night when both trustees and students left. (All in all, the group was much more impressed with Mettler than with Finneran. Mettler’s talk interested people in her book, her ongoing research that suggests political implications much larger than the CSU).

It was suggested that not too much weight should be placed on survey results if only 60 out of 160 responded. The sample is limited.
• Need to provide a report of outcomes for both the Chancellor and others, including senators: What can be said? Those who stayed found it valuable. Now it is important to make survey results available online, but in raw form or edited? The hope is for the two or three “big ideas” the Chancellor asked for to emerge.

Suggestions and plans for moving forward:

• Getting information into the newsletter about the conference;

• Analyzing raw data (Guerin volunteered);

• Qualitative analysis (Chisholm volunteered);

• Planning on a two-year basis in the future;

• Involving more students, administrators, staff, and BOT members earlier in planning stages;

• Two different kinds/levels of reporting on the conference: internal (for ASCSU use in future planning) and external;

• Making Academic Conference planning team a permanent committee choice for senators;

• Photos and videos curated for web page and other display (Miller and Gubernat)

Miller will set up a Doodle poll in February to set up a meeting for the committee’s work to be continued/completed; it was agreed that it will also be important to get a member of the office staff involved to assist at this stage.

b. FGA vice chair: Senator Eschker as first choice with Senator Murphy as back-up

c. SB 850 program review resolution: No resolution to be introduced.

d. WICHE appointments:
Science: Childers, Krabacher, Murray
Emerging Human Cultures: Collins, Creadon, Peterson

e. CO Responses to Resolutions – timeliness and November responses
Chair Filling agreed to bring up concerns about lack of response
with Ron Vogel and will report back.

f. Developing a working relationship with EVC Blanchard

g. Sabbaticals

h. BOT

i. Senates and shared governance

9. Adjourn: 5:07 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gubernat
Secretary, ASCSU