Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, January 20, 2016  
Munitz Room  

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

2. Attendance  
   a. Extended Exec time certain 8:30-10:00 - The following Academic Senate CSU (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), and Steven Stepanek (Faculty Trustee).  
   b. The following ASCSU Standing Committee Chairs were in attendance: Manzar Foroohar (Chair, FA), Denise Fleming (Chair, APEP), Tom Krabacher (Chair, FGA), Catherine Nelson (ChairAcademic Affairs).  

3. Loren Blanchard/Leo Van Cleve time certain 11:00  
With a time certain reached, the Executive Committee met with Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard and State University Dean, Van Cleve.  

The Executive Committee engage in discussion Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard and Director Van Cleve on the possibility of an Academic Preparation & Educational Programs (APEP) resolution on student profiles. This resolution would be meant to improve consistency between CSU assumptions about our students and the realities of their experiences. The phenomenon of workplace bullying and it relationship to Executive Order (EO) 1096 was also discussed. Jessica Darin would be asked for an update on Tobacco Free Campuses and CSU policy. This request was discussed within the context of legislation and how CSU may inform the legislation. Discussion also focused on improving efficiency in the scheduling of meetings with Chancellor White. The Executive Committee offered the suggestion that meetings be moved to the Tuesday before the ASCSU plenary. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard provided an update on the research position. The committee has met and interviews were conducted with three finalists. The first choice was recommended, agreement was made, and negotiations have commenced. The starting date will be part of the negotiations. The International Programs Policy was also discussed. There is still work to be done on the draft and finalization of the draft is forthcoming. Tenure track hiring and faculty density were also discussed along with the matrix for allocating the $11 million to campuses. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard informed the Executive Committee that Assistant Vice Chancellor Merryfield would be developing the matrix for increasing tenure density. The central question that will be engaged is as follows: Is the CSU making progress - campus
by campus to increase tenure density? A report has been requested from campuses on the allocation usage. Roughly 50% of the allocated funds have been used to hire faculty within the system. Evidence will be collected annually. The ASCSU budget concerns surrounding increasing hotel and airline costs were presented to – and discussed with - Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard. He reported that he is continuing to visit campuses. These visit have enabled him to understand the unique elements of each campuses. Campus-based students concerns regarding inclusivity will also be addressed. The Chancellor’s Office (CO) is working carefully with each campus to address concerns. This is a time to listen and educate about what resources are available. Student success and faculty excellence will also be examined. The Ethnic Studies Task Force Report will be finalized soon and potential misalignments will be examined to ensure that inclusivity is addressed. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard informed the Executive Committee that headway has been made with 6-year graduation rates. The CSU is at 57% and this is an 11% difference from baseline. This does not mean that four-year graduation rates have suffered. The CSU was at 15% of baseline and now is at a 19% four-year graduation rate. The closing of achievement gap is also being engaged. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. Is there a way to modify the process so that input can be made during the developmental phase?
b. There needs to be a joint meeting between the ASCSU, CFA, and CO on the topic of Academic Freedom.
c. The best approach to the Academic Freedom discussion would be for the ASCSU and CFA to meet together. A waiver needs to be requested so that IP policy is not part of bargaining.
d. How might faculty that is not part of CFA be impacted?
e. When the Task Force meets, how open will one be to changes and suggested revisions?
f. What were the criteria for appropriating the $11million to all 23 campuses?
g. The money was allocated to six areas.
h. How do we address discrepancies in hiring practices?
i. Is it possible to obtain data from specific departments? Is there a possibility to create an ascending order of tenure density to ensure a comprehensive discussion?
j. To what extent are the campus Presidents and Provosts aware of the needs to disaggregate these data on tenure density?
k. It might be important to show the correlation between how we hire faculty and student success.
l. It is important to provide a justification for the increase in expenses. It is important to have this justification and budget proposal ready for March.
m. Discipline councils are invaluable.
n. It is important for the Executive Committee to guide the senate chairs in the drafting of a response to Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard.
4. Liaison time 3:30 - 4:00

**Academic Affairs (AA)** - Academic Affairs Liaison, At-Large Senator Soni, reported back that the committee members would consider attending the meeting. The committee continues to discuss the difference between MA and BA degrees and make revisions to the Second Reading Resolution on “Faculty Role in the Evaluation of Transfer for Online Courses”. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. Will the Executive Committee discuss what will occur if there is a strike?

b. Is the tenure-track tenure density and employee data available (i.e., MPP, Faculty, and Staff)?

c. $720 million is going to SUGS. What can be done about that?

**Academic Preparation and Educational Programs (APEP)** - APEP Liaison, Vice Chair Miler, reported back that the committee met with HR, Ken O’Donnell, and Eric Forbes. APEP also receive a briefing from Joe Aguerrebere’s office. The committee also continued to discuss the First Reading resolution on “A Need for Analysis of the Data Related to Changing Demographics of California State University”.

**Faculty Affairs (FA)** - Faculty Affairs Liaison, Secretary Collins, reported back that FA had decided to pull the shared governance resolution and continued to discuss AB 798 and a First Reading resolution on “Restoring Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) Funds as a Line Item in the CSU Operations Budget”. The following questions and concerns:

a. It is difficult to work with some administrators.

b. The conversation on shared governance must include all stakeholders. Hierarchy should not be used to trump democracy.

c. It is important to pay attention to the need for course release for 1st year senators and third senators from large campuses.

d. Is it possible to have room-blocks for senators making hotel reservations?

**Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)**

Fiscal and Government Affairs Liaison, At-Large Senator Yee-Melichar, reported back that FGA has agreed to conduct a comprehensive review of online education, the associated whitepaper, as well as all plenary resolutions. The committee seems to feel that online education is being used as a compensation for resources. A study of the white paper and resolutions will be done to see if faculty will buy into the online education movement. AA will also be involved. At-Large Senator Yee-Melichar further reported that the Department of Finance is seeking a study of eligibility within the CSU. The study will be outsourced. April 12, 2016 will be the FGA Advocacy Day. All senators are welcome. FGA would like a spreadsheet on how the $11 million was allocated to the campuses. The Extended Education Economic Impact Pilot Study is due December 2016.

5. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved.
6. Approval of Minutes

December 4th Zoom meeting - the minutes were approved as amended.

7. Announcements

a. Senator At-Large Yee Melichar reported that four administrative searches were successfully completed at SF States University.

b. The following concerns and questions were raised:
   i. Is it possible to get on the Chancellor’s meeting schedule?
   ii. To what extent are campus senates encouraged to support ASCSU resolutions?
   iii. Is it possible to push for greater interaction between the ASCSU, the Chancellor, and his cabinet?
   iv. Is it possible to meet with Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard before the BoT and engaged in agenda setting? Is it possible to offer the CO potential meeting dates in advance?
   v. How effective is the summarizing of the Resolutions?

8. Reports

Chair

Chair Filling reported that Garrett Ashley was requested to include faculty representation on the University Relations search committee. The request was approved and Senator Tom Krabacher has been selected as the ASCSU representative. Chair Filling also reported that he participated in a conference call on the governor’s budget. During this discussion, representatives from the department of finance mentioned that the budget is in good shape; however, prudence is necessary, given the possibility of future recessions. Liability for Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) was also discussed. PERS continued to be a matter of concerns, as accounting standards have changed and unfunded liabilities are of issue. The CSU bond rating has not changed. Comments on higher education were also part of the discussion, particularly issues of affordability, alignment, as well as using technology to address budget issues. Particular attention was given to the College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015 (AB 798), the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report, and funding models based on student success. Strengthening pathways into the work place were also discussed. Chair Filling further reported that Udacity and the promise of a money back guarantee are gaining attention within the legislature. An allocation of $3 million dollars would go to connect k-12 to university on expository reading. $35 million of one time money on energy efficiencies would also be given high priority. In December the ASCSU and California Faculty Association (CFA) discussed Academic Freedom. The group met and Senator Foroohar drafted policy. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard has sent a response. The Academic Technology Steering Committee met last week. The CSU has decided to move forward with the shared student information system. Additional steering committees have been established that do not include faculty. It is important that the ASCSU pay close attention to the need for faculty and staff representation. Matrices for student success were also discussed. The Provost’s Council met and discussed four-year graduation rates and was informed that
they would see the Intellectual Property Policy in the near future. Chair Filling also informed the ASCSU that the New Presidents for Sonoma State University and San Jose University would be announced at the BoT and that Chancellor White would give the “The State of the University” address on Tuesday during the BoT. The allocation of $10 million for California Community Colleges B.A. pilots, the decline in the numbers of K-12 teachers, and the 30,000 denied eligible students were also discussed. Financial Aid and SUGS are embedded in the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report. Senator Glazer contacted Chair Filling regarding bill to increase four-year graduation rate. He suggested that the current 19% graduation rate should be increase to 25%. Chair Filling was informed that legislation would be introduced that would allow students to commit to a non-mandatory four-year contract. This contract would be supported by stable tuition, advising, and the student would be required to maintain acceptable grades (e.g., 2.75 and above.). Last week Chair Filling attended the ICAS coordinating meeting. SB 1440 Transfers and pathways were also discussed. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. What are the top takeaways for the CSU?

b. The economic justice argument won’t work. Performance based funding discussions must be wedded with the need for continued lobbying in Sacramento.

c. How does collective bargaining intersect with Academic Freedom?

d. If the CFA has included Academic Freedom in collective bargaining, then how does this usage limit discussions on the subject with the ASCSU?

e. It seems that administration does not distinguish between the definition and principle of Academic Freedom and contractual language. It is important for the CSU to define – like the CSU mission – what the system believes is Academic Freedom.

f. It is important to send the CO information related to AAUP statements.

g. Does anyone know how the matrices for new faculty hires were created?

h. To what extent would this four-year contract impact first generation and underrepresented students?

i. Have we made any headway in IPED’s changing of the definitions of four-year and six-year graduation rates? This may be a way to ensure consistency between student lived realities and ASCSU observations. Is it possible to have a new portrait of the new student? Who is this new student? How might this contract impact the new student? What impact has the economy had on students?

j. Is it possible to adjust the four-year definition by one semester?

**Vice Chair**

Vice Miller will offer a report at a future meeting.

a. Liaison reports from committees (time certain 4:00)

b. Other
**Academic Affairs (AA)**
Chair Nelson reported that the Academic Affairs committee would continue discussing the importance of keeping track of CCC AA degrees and transferability. The committee would also engage in discussions of the differences between MA and BA degrees and differences between upper and lower division courses. The Academic Affairs committee would also edit the resolution on “Faculty Role in Evaluation of Transfer Credit for Online Courses” to be presented during plenary in Second Reading. The Honorary Degree Policy and Competency Based Learning Initiative would also be examined. Director Ken O’Donnell would meet with the committee to discuss the graduation initiative, high impact practices, and integrated courses of study. The goal of this discussion is to formulate seamless transfer between lower division and upper division courses. The roles that high impact practices, real world experience, whether or not industry representation will be invited to establish learning outcomes would also be discussed. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. What role might high impact practices play in transferability?
b. It seems that students are being exempted from background checks.

**Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)**
Chair Fleming reported that APEP would continue discussions around the role of quantitative reasoning in mathematics, a possible resolution calling for a 4th year of high school math requirement, the UC Articulation Conference, and the current legislative push for computer science as a viable course to meet the quantitative reasoning requirement. CSU Faculty Trustee Stepanek would meet with APEP at 2:30p.m. to share his insights on the computer science matter. In response to questions from the floor at last Plenary about a perceived underrepresentation of males in the teaching profession, Chair Fleming would share some research with the committee. APEP would also receive a presentation from Bechtel. Additional APEP discussions would center on the newly passed Student Success Act, the need for continued monitoring of this act, textbook affordability, and the need for a white paper to assist internal and external constituencies in understanding the changing profile of the CSU student. Regarding a possible white paper, the group suggested including contextual information on persistence and closing the achievement gap, four-year pilots, and remediation. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. It is possible to explore persistence and closing the achievement gap?
b. Is it possible to explore the four-year pilots?
c. CSU Faculty Trustee Stepanek will meet with APEP at 2:30p.m.
d. To what extent might the new student discussion be seen as rationalizing remediation?
e. Will the committee discuss the UC Articulation Conference?

**Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)**
Chair Krabacher reported that FGA would have quorum. The committee would have two resolutions returning in Second Reading on “Recognition of California Taxpayers for Their Support in Funding the CSU” and “Request for Joint Task Force to Develop an Action Plan for Increasing Tenure/Tenure-Track Density in the CSU”. The latter is co-
sponsored with FA. FGA would also prepare the “Commendation for Karen Y. Zamarripa, Assistant Vice Chancellor CSU Advocacy and State Relations”. The committee would also discuss strategies for in-district advocacy. Senate approaches would also be explored to ensure strategy effectiveness and packets containing advocacy strategies would be mailed to campuses. FGA would also continue monitoring new legislation to prepare for the March plenary. Best approaches for monitoring would also be part of this discussion. Details on the packet content and legislative positions would be presented at a future meeting. Chair Krabacher further reported that FGA would examine the Government Relations Report that is on the BoT Agenda and meet with Christian Osmena from the California Department of Finance. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. To what extent might donors want to deduct money from their taxes if they are recognized as supporting the CSU?

b. Is it possible to also address bills that do not have CSU in the title and may inadvertently impact us?

**Faculty Affairs (FA)**

Chair Faroohar reported that FA would present a Second Reading resolution on the “Inclusion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Campus, College and Departmental Orientation Programs” and another one on shared governance. FA would engage in extensive discussion of the latter resolution. FA would also introduce a resolution in First Reading on “Restoring Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) Funds as a Line Item in the CSU Operation Budget” and possibly another one on the rise of Islamophobia. The latter would ask for support for students and faculty that face this phobia in education and educational support programs for campus communities. Chair Foroohar further reported that FA would also hear reports from VC Lori Lamb and AVC Margy Merryfield from Human Resources (HR) and CFA President Jen Eagan. The committee would have quorum; however, two members would be absent and one would be late. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. Is it possible to obtain the information on employee compensation to be presented at the BoT meeting?

b. Is it possible to look into the language of EO 1096 and call for an expansion to include the issues of micro-aggressions behind Islamophobia?

c. Is it possible to ask Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard when the Task Force will be constituted? It is important to place discussion of the Task Force on the Agenda?

9. **Appointments**

a. **ITL Planning Committee** (Yee Melichar) - At-Large Senator Yee-Melichar reported that she has not been contacted and will follow up at a future meeting.

b. **Assistant Vice Chancellor State Relations Search Committee** (Krabacher). Chair Filling reported that Senator Krabacher has agreed to serve.

c. **Shared Student Systems Oversight Committee** - Chair Filling reported that a request has been made for two volunteers to serve on the Shared Student System
Oversight Committee. Senator Nelson and Senator Gubernat were asked to serve. Senator Neto has volunteered to serve. Senator Van Selst and Senator Holl are on the CMS student group and may also be consulted to serve. Appointments will be made at a future date.

d. **CSU Smoke Free Campus Group** - The CSU Smoke Free Campus Group was also discussed. Jessica Darin convened a group on tobacco free policy. The committee’s name has been changed.

vi. Is it possible to obtain an update on how many campuses are not smoke free?

e. It is important to consider the McCarty legislation.

### 10. Old Business


   With a time certain reached, the Executive Committee met with Director O’Donnell. Central in this discussion was the agreement on the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force membership, discussion of expansion beyond APEP recommendation, discussion of STATWAY, discussion of Computer Science as Mathematics, and associated remediation issues. It was noted that seven CSU faculty would be responsible for drafting recommendations. The committee goals would include examining what should be the prerequisites and co-requisites for math competency, STAYWAY meeting B4, and whether or not math competency can be gained through a rigorous computer science course. Five meetings would be established. The first meeting would take place in February for data gathering. Recommendations would follow, including a concluding discussion prior to editing. The final report would be ready for review in May. Several senators have expressed concerns that a group was not convened to discuss quantitative reasoning. Director O’Donnell noted that this lies at the intersection of the degrees needed by the state and what is required to produce the students. It is important that the group has a plan of action in order to have a probation course that runs out in 2017. Director O’Donnell reminded the Executive Committee that we are in this together and the May report should include definition, costs, and the implications this actions hold for curriculum revision. The following concerns and questions were raised:

   i. Does bifurcation address concerns raised about the size of the committee?
   
   ii. Who do we push forward to lead the Task Force and how do we make this work?

   iii. It is important to have a CSU faculty member chair this task force.

b. **Sustainable Financial Model draft report update**

   Chair Filling reported that the draft Sustainable Financial Model Task Force Report was on the BoT agenda and discussed. The following concerns and questions were raised:

   i. Will this report be informational?

   ii. Is it possible to have FGA weigh in on the report?
iii. Issues of tuition would have to come to a vote.
iv. Chair Filling requested that a draft statement be created to clarify the goals of the report.

v. It is important to offer the following review process: review, approve, and move forward.

vi. It is important to consider when this information will become public.

c. Academic Conference update

Central in this discussion was the committee meeting scheduled at lunchtime on 1/21/16. Committee members are exploring speakers that can attend on the new dates. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. Discussion item are on our February Agenda for crafting the statement.

ii. Is it necessary to collect data on hotel costs? To what extent are these data needed?

iii. Is it possible to put out an RFP to the campuses?

iv. To what extent will hotels be an issue if CSU Maritime hosted the conference?

v. Is the $75,000 still part of the conference budget?

d. ASCSU budget report/ Change of ASCSU Meeting Dates

Vice Chair Miller moved to add this as a new agenda item. The motion carried. Central in this discussion were raising hotel costs and the need to assess senator travel planning strategies to ensure that the $120.00 state rate and lowest possible airfares are obtained. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. It is important to think about the funding of GEAC lunches, as GEAC is not an ASCSU committee.

ii. It is important to point out that conference call charges are going down since Zoom is now used.

iii. Will we continue with the current funding structure (i.e., No funding for third senators, no summer stipends, and first year senators on committees.)?

iv. It is important to show how ASCSU activity over time.

vi. It is important to show that our budget has not changed but money to the CSU has increased. We have not gone into the red, as we have cut activities.

e. Presidential Search process

Central in this discussion was CSUEU’s position on presidential searches. The search process is still confidential. Various campuses have suggested that their views have been considered. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. To what extent are presidential search committees inclusive of faculty?

f. Campus issues (Chico, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, East Bay)

Central in this discussion was the point that the Chancellor has commissioned a consultant for a presidential search. It is important to clarify the implications that
the consultant holds for current faculty concerns. Updates will be offered during plenary. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. Is this consultant for one campus or for all campuses engaged in presidential searches?

ii. To what extent should consultants be encouraged to speak with the faculty?

g. Shared Governance issues (FA resolution)

Central in this discussion was the revisions that FA would be making to the resolution. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. To what extent does this resolution give the Chancellor a directive?

ii. Directives were removed from the previous draft.

h. Assembly Bill 798 / CA OER Council

Central in this discussion was the draft crafted by ASCSU Chair Filling and Vice Chair Miller. Funding for OER will continue.

i. Background Check Policy update

Central in this discussion was an update that the committee had been constituted. An update on activities will be provided at a future meeting. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. Is it possible as to know whether or not the group will be closed?

ii. To what extent will this policy be applied in an ethnical manner?

iii. This discriminatory policy may hinder faculty diversity.

iv. What information in a candidate’s background is relevant?

v. What will be done with the information after the background check has been conducted?

vi. There is a need for bias training for those administering the background checks.

vii. Free speech may be used against candidates

j. Bullying Resolution Discussion Item

(Secretary Collins moved. The motion carried.) The item was discussed and resolution draft revised.

11. New Business

a. Briefings in Sacramento

Central in this discussion were talks with finance.

b. Pending Legislation

Central in this discussion was what qualifies as OER? Discussion of legislation surrounding computer science as fulfilling math requirements has begun. Two frames of thought make up this discussion: the 21st century requires computer skill and this skill-set should be mandatory. The following concerns and questions were raised:
i. To what extent might FGA be needed to work on pertinent concerns and issues?
ii. It is important to clarify avenues of communication.

c. CSU Budget Advocacy
   Central in this discussion was the need to push for more money. Various units seem to be in favor of this push. Healing from previous cuts needs to be part of the rationale behind advocacy efforts. The following concerns and questions were raised:
   i. What happens if funding is raised?
   ii. What implications do the changes in the BoT meeting schedule hold for the ASCSU?

d. UC Articulation Agreement January 29, 2016
   Central in this discussion was the UC Articulation Agreement. UC has been allotted 50 seats to the CSU 50, 50 to the CCC, and 50 seats to K-12.

e. ICAS Resolution
   The Item was discussed and received. Motion was called to approve the ICAS statement. the Executive Committee unanimously Approved the statement.

12. Adjourn
   The ASCSU Executive Committee adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary