Minutes
Teleconference
ASCSU Executive Committee
November 18, 2014

Present: Julie Chisholm, Steven Filling, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Chris Miller, Praveen Soni, Steven Stepanek

1. Approval of agenda: approved

2. Approval of minutes: deferred

3. Announcements

On a possible face-to-face meeting with the Chancellor and his cabinet: the will nudge the CO to see if he can get response for the December 5 interim to be held in Long Beach; otherwise, cannot justify the travel budgetarily.

On meeting in future with the CSSA: the Chair will discuss with Miles and will get back later this week with information about how to do so regularly, going forward.

Resolution summary: was not sent to campus senate chairs, not posted until yesterday so now will get it out to campuses.

The Chair noted that during the BOT meeting, Trustee Fortune’s comments on time to degree were of concern, particularly her speculation as to whether the first two years of the baccalaureate could be completed in high school.

COERC: Kathy Harris wants to push things forward and faster. The Chair is concerned that the group will go forward first and inform ICAS later, whereas the group needs ICAS oversight. COERC plans to bring a budget to fund people adopting texts to the next ICAS meeting, funding being derived potentially from Hewlett and Gates Foundation monies.
Wang committee: Diana reported on a phone meeting yesterday; the committee is reviewing for five awards, with the intent to announce in January. Timeline to review is a speed one; there are 58 campus applications. Additional email will go out today and a subcommittee call will happen the week of the first, with 10-16 applications per subcommittee. Dec. 15 is the target date for notification of recipients. Originally, the plan was to make the awards at the November BOT but the approval for them going forward just occurred recently. Should Diana and Steve S. write a report on the awards to the Senate?

4. **Debrief: Academic Conference**: There is general agreement that the planning committee did yeoman’s work. Especially difficult was dealing with all the changes and crises created by the BOT schedule (though it was acknowledged that both the Chancellor and the BOT Chair did their best to speed things up). Everyone pulled together, and particular kudos to Chris and her team. When to schedule the first follow-up of the conference group? The decision was during plenary in January, a concentrated hour at 5 pm in order to preserve people’s lunchtime. Need to send planning committee a note to that effect. Some disappointment was shared at the relative lack of interaction with BOT members, given the intent of the conference. It was suggested that, over time, BOT participation could evolve as the success and significance of the conference become clearer. The Chair will also add an agenda item to the next meeting of campus senate chairs to discuss the conference; he will send out a reminder to answer the survey, which closes in a week and the Chair will remind people to send their materials to Praveen. He will also get communications from photographer; a web link could be provided for people to get materials post-conference. We should solicit feedback from committees about their views of the conference through our liaison roles in addition to the survey. We should schedule a formal debriefing during January, up to an hour of our regular committee meeting for planning and focused discussion, right after meeting with committee chairs.

The Chair will use box of thank you cards to everyone who attended and solicit additional feedback beyond the survey. Julie asked about other materials the conference could generate: a brochure? booklet? An initial summary of the survey data will be provided by Praveen. Then the group will decide how to move forward. We will eventually need to produce a more formal report to the Chancellor and the ASCSU at large.

5. **120/180 update**: There was discussion about a draft letter from the Chair, written by Chris, to be be sent, with minimal edits, to the Chancellor, letting him know about discoveries made about the Siegall study. There are four documents that seem to be worth sending to the entire ASCSU and to the Chancellor, with an explanatory cover letter, and including a link to our related resolution re. unit limits for Engineering. Not everyone agreed to this approach. There was some concern that the Chancellor would not pay attention to the details of this issue (his desire not to “get into the weeds”) and this strategy may not achieve its end, possibly backfire. The counter argument was the need to establish a paper trail and to continue to apprise the Chancellor of what has been taking place on campuses in the exception process. At any rate, it was decided that it is important to keep the letter to the Chancellor short and to the point; the letter’s 3rd paragraph alone could be
sufficient. Another longer version could be communicated to the ASCSU. Chris and Steve F. will work on revision.

6. **Monthly budget reports**: not yet shared. The Chair will pursue getting CMS access. This item will be carried forward and travel issues put on the agenda for the next interim.

7. **Academic Affairs funding faculty consultants through ASCSU**: This involves the common practice on compensating faculty consultants who are not, or are no longer, senators (Jim Postma on his 1440 work, for example) and routing it through the ASCSU budget. Such consultancy is paid for by Ephraim’s office, not the ASCSU; our funds are not being used. However, is there the appearance of ASCSU consultation and appointment of such faculty? Could this issue be clarified with the new EVC, that is, the difference between hiring a faculty member to do CO work and faculty appointed through shared governance, and the ramifications thereof? There is need for more discussion of the issue of paid faculty consultants in upcoming agendas.

All other items on agenda deferred until December interim.

**Adjournment**: 10:07 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Gubernat
Secretary, ASCSU