Minutes
Extended Executive Committee Meeting
November 5, 2014, 8:30-10 a.m.
Munitz Room, Office of the Chancellor, CSU, Long Beach

1. Agenda: approved

2. Minutes of October 10, 2014: approved

3. Committee Chair Reports:

Academic Affairs (AA) Chair Bill Eadie
Eadie reported that the committee is working on the three referrals from Excom. Among them, the committee is re-examining EO 1065 in regard to revisions to GE for transfer; originally it was thought that these issues had been settled in the previous year. There appears not much agreement on what the individual community colleges require for a passing grade in individual GE courses, so that even a D- may be considered passing. So long as the student receives a GPA of C, they have completed requirements; if the CSU campus requires a higher grade in a course that CSU, it seems, cannot require such as a condition of transfer. Other related issues on revisions to the executive order also remain to be discussed by AA.

Re. the academic sustainability plan resolution: there are currently two separate drafts that will need to be reconciled. The committee is also looking to see if FGA will be a co-sponsor and will come in with a request for a waiver of the first reading in order to place this before the BOT, where the item will be on their agenda. Eadie commented that Ryan Storm, among others, has welcomed such a resolution, and that it is an opportunity to work collaboratively with CO staff on this issue.

Advice to the Chancellor on consultation on SB 850: So far, there is not much information that is available. Chris Mallon will not be present at the committee meeting, and she is the person whose consultation would be most helpful. Mallon reports that the CO hasn’t done much so far on SB 850; instead the CO staff are waiting to see what the community colleges bring up. Eadie found on his own campus (SDSU) that individual community college campuses are being allowed to make proposals (such as a baccalaureate
in dental hygiene, or in health information systems) and that one will be advanced. Nothing has yet emerged in nursing. There is concern about a “regional” issue—something that may be advocated for, as noted in Chris Miller’s ICC report re. Shasta. The law, however, is clear on regionalism not being a rationale for offering a degree that a CSU already offers. The committee will stay vigilant on the matter, in case there is some regional push. While the Chancellor’s office of the CSU waits for the community colleges to come up with their proposals, it remains unclear as yet as to what Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office process will be—where and how issues of academic quality will be determined and how consultation with the UC and CSU will unfold in order to determine similarity between a community college baccalaureate and one offered by the other systems.

The committee will present a commendation for Wayne Tikkanen, upon his retirement, at the plenary on Thursday afternoon. Eadie still needs to clarify the timing since the commendation is not currently on the agenda.

Other projects being worked on: active learning and student success goals in A2E; and assessment, particularly of ILOs.

The committee is still waiting for a final report from the Ethnic Studies task force to determine if there is a possible resolution and/or follow-up. Meanwhile, they can begin to speculate as to what might be needed.

Another topic on AA’s agenda is the requirement of Intermediate Algebra, one that remains controversial since even the Math Council reports that members remain split on it.

There was discussion of a possible resolution (with a first-reading waiver) regarding Engineering unit limits that Miller might provide for the committee’s consideration, based on documents obtained in a CFA Freedom of Information request. It was revealed that, in October 2013, a faculty consultant’s report to, and commissioned by, the CO, mirrors the ASCSU’s resolution recommending higher-unit limits for Engineering curricula, system-wide. Guerin mentioned that the Fullerton Engineering Dept. has requested eliminating 9 units of GE in the meantime. It will be important that any disciplinary panel the Chancellor puts together to review exceptions include expertise in GE.

Academic Programs and Education Preparation (APEP) Chair Denise Fleming

Fleming reported that APEP is continuing to look at the status of English and math readiness measures and to get input from many sources to determine how, or even if, to take a position. One of the challenges is connecting with individual campuses in order to get data that can be collected and analyzed.

Currently they are working on a resolution to recognize the role of ACT and SAT cut scores in establishing readiness, as well as to emphasize getting the word out about the fee waivers available to students electing to take these tests. The committee will also consider a resolution asking that the CO gather data on the four types of readiness measures: the ERWC, ACT/SAT, EAP STAR, and Smarter Balance.

Extended Early Start, a relatively new initiative, is also of interest to the committee, and they would like more information on how it is being implemented on campuses, as well as how campuses with various Early Start programs will be able to articulate readiness measures for incoming students who take Early Start elsewhere than at their home.
Fleming raised the following issue on protocol for discussion: To what extent can a statewide committee include a faculty member not on, or no longer on, the senate but who is still active in, or brought into, committee business? Is there a history of such participation? There was some disagreement on the matter—with comments ranging from being grateful for help from former senators with expertise and institutional memory, to concerns about honoring a campus’s election processes. It was noted that while some projects may require a multi-year commitment beyond a particular senator’s term of service, former senators should not be shaping current standing committee agendas; also that it remains important to distinguish between faculty elected or appointed through faculty governance to represent faculty and those who are hired as consultants by the CO.

Faculty Affairs (FA) Chair Manzar Foroohar

CFA liaison Andy Merrifield isn’t able to attend in person; there is the possibility of setting up a phone conversation with him.

There will be a short discussion with General Counsel, for ½ hour, on academic freedom.

Margy Merryfield, who is out of town, sent a written report to the committee on the results of tenure-track searches throughout the system. Foroohar noted that the numbers are interesting: Campuses reported about 750 recruitments for the past year, the largest number since 2007. Current searches for tenure-track lines in the coming year number about 900. However, last year’s net gain, given retirements and separations, was only 124. The gain is clearly well below the ACR 73 target; the tenure density, that is, the system-wide ratio of tenure-track to lecturer faculty is 56.3%. The number of lecturers has increased by 1,100 and by 6,056 FTES.

The committee is nearly ready with the two resolutions introduced as first readings during the last plenary, having worked on them, in response to suggestions from the body, during the interim; they will finish the work today.

Two more resolutions are being prepared: a first reading on the role of lecturers in shared governance; a draft has not yet been presented. Another possible resolution will be on principles needed to be included in a policy on academic freedom. While the General Counsel during their last meeting said that there was no need for a revision of the current CSU policy, the committee felt it important to provide bullet points on what should be included in a revised policy—that is, not writing the exact text of such a policy since that should be a joint effort. Issues that are not in the current policy include communication via social media and other communication formats, faculty communication about institutional policy, etc. System-wide academic freedom policies, such as that of the UC, include such detail, and should be familiar to the Chancellor, given his history in the UC. This resolution will require much discussion, so the final disposition of such a resolution remains uncertain at this point.

Also on the committee’s agenda is the role of faculty diversity in helping to close the student achievement gap, and a revision of the 1987 report on RSCA, where the formula of support needs to be updated/recalculated.
Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA) Chair Tom Krabacher

Following up on the recent teleconference on the academic sustainability plan, the committee will review the materials distributed, including the Powerpoint, and report back. In addition, Ryan Storm confirmed a related meeting with the committee today, time certain at 2 p.m.

During the October interim, the committee’s liaison, Chris Miller, brought to the committee’s attention a need to look at the achievement gap, and in particular, how the MBA fee may or may not be affecting it. Ron Vogel will consult with the committee about how to get the data to make an assessment.

An earlier referral in September asked FGA to look more regularly at LAO reports and report back to the Executive Committee and the full senate. They are looking at the most recent report.

Krabacher noted that the committee is adding final touches to its report on the final disposition of all legislation, now that the governor has acted; this will be distributed tomorrow as part of the FGA report to the plenary.

Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa will report on the outcome of the state elections and what to be alert to, going forward.

On the committee’s fall advocacy initiative: it took more time to get things up and running than originally thought. The earlier idea was to get senators to speak to candidates in their districts in order to emphasize public higher ed as an important issue, to insure it is on their agendas next year; it is too late to do so with candidates. Now the idea is to concentrate on the second part of the advocacy plan and get senators to speak with elected legislators in their districts between now and the start of the January session. Over the weekend, Krabacher plans to get material out to senators, that is, guidelines for a “meet and greet,” how to introduce the CSU to new members of the legislature and to begin a discussion of budget issues relevant to higher-education.

Possible resolutions to be brought to plenary include the standard fall resolution supporting the BOT budget request and a co-sponsoring with AA of AB 94.

Senator Pasternack has suggested urging the BOT to look at how foundations use funds; there could be a resolution on the issue, but it is doubtful. The idea was spawned in response to a Daily Clips article about L.A.’s president; however, it was noted that foundations regularly augment a president’s compensation. This might be a resolution without traction at the BOT, though it is important to stay alert to such issues. Bill Eadie offered a recent report on the SDSU’s foundation as a model of transparency.

The committee is also holding a 3 p.m. phone meeting with the new LAO staff member who is replacing Judy Heiman, Jason Constantouroos. Krabacher has already had a meet and greet with him; the committee will be discussing what to anticipate from the LAO for the rest of 2014.

Chris Miller asked if there were any updates on Susan Eggman's idea for legislation that would allow graduate programs to dismiss a student without cause. Krabacher reported that he has spoken with her staff person; Wes Larson is also trying to get some information on the dismissal issue. It seems as if this may have come about as a result of Eggman’s own experience as a faculty member in the Social Work program at Sacramento. But it does suggest a lawsuit waiting to happen. (It was noted that students have a right to
fail).

The Chair asked that either Jay or Tom get a list to him of newly elected legislators to send cards/and info about the ASCSU.

**Senate Chair Report: Steve Filling**

The Chancellor has assured Excom that he will not act on the 120/180 unit waivers without our input.

On SB 850: there will be faculty involved in any review of similarity among programs offered by the CSU and proposed by the community colleges.

A written Chair’s report will go out to the Senate.

Changes in the Academic Conference program are due to very recent changes in CSSA leadership; the student trustee has agreed to represent students on the panel.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gubernat
Secretary, ASCSU