Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, November 4, 2015  
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.  
Munitz Room  

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

2. **Attendance**  
   a. The following ASCSU Executive Committee members were in attendance: Steven Filling (Chair), Christine Miller (Vice Chair), Robert Keith Collins (Secretary), Praveen Soni (Member-at-Large), Steven Stepanek (Faculty Trustee), Darlene Yee-Melichar (Member-at-Large) Tracy Butler (Academic Senate Office).  
   b. Extended Executive Committee time certain 8:30-10:00  
   c. Do we want Nathan Evans to visit (Loren is unavailable). Evans will meet between 10:30 and noon.  
   d. Liaison time 3:00-4:00  
      i. The items were discussed.  

3. **Approval of Agenda**  
The Agenda was discussed. Vice Chair Miller moved that the Agenda be amended to include a discussion on Faculty Fellows. The motion carried.  

4. **Approval of Minutes**  
The October 9th, 2016 Zoom meeting minutes were Approved as amended.  

5. **Announcements**  
   a. Chair Filling and Vice Chair Miller asked the Committee Chairs for their input on the effectiveness of working with Zoom.  
   b. Senator Yee-Melichar announced that the ASCSU *Faculty-to-Faculty* newsletter deadline is Friday, November 20, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. Discussion was also had on how to ensure efficiency in the posting of the newsletter online.  
   c. Senator Yee-Melichar also announced that San Francisco State University students are concerned with pouring rights.
6. Reports

Chair
The Extended Executive Committee heard a report from Chair Filling. Central in this report was a discussion of The Sustainable Financial Model Task Force. The task force has had another conference and attempted to respond to ASCSU concerns. The report is in final form now and will be sent to the Board of Trustees (BOT) as an information item. Chair Filling has spoken with Assistant Vice Chancellor, Gerry Hanley regarding Senate Bill (SB) 1052: Open Education Resources Council (OERC). Stateside funding has been used up. Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) was supposed to supervise this process. Governor Brown has signed Assembly Bill (AB) 798 and the CSU will become the sole supervisor of the project. OERC will cease to be the governing body. It is important to consider how this will impact the CSU. Campuses can apply for grants up to $50,000. Cost comparisons will be encouraged for record keeping. Chair Filling further reported on Legislative Advocacy Training and the silence on faculty participation that current bargaining issues have produced. The California Faculty Association (CFA) stated that they would not be involved this year. Proposition 30 is expiring. There are several alternatives being proposed to replace it. It is important to remind our colleagues that the CSU produces the majority of K-12 teachers in California. Bargaining between the CFA and CSU is not in fact finding. The California Community Colleges (CCC) is in pursuit of changing their accreditation requirements to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The CCC Chancellor is seeking support for the change. Work has begun on statutes for dual and concurrent enrollment and the awarding of college credit in high schools. Chair Filling visited CSU San Luis Obispo. During the visit, time was spent with students to understand their concerns about the cost of textbooks and fees. The Academic Senate asked questions regarding votes of no confidence. Caps on units for MA programs were also discussed. Chair Filling met with Executive Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard. The Executive Vice Chancellor will examine who will be the right fit as liaison for the ASCSU Fiscal & Governmental Affairs (FGA) committee. On the topic of the Academic Conference, State University Dean Leo Van Cleve will join us later this morning to talk about the proto-conference plan that was developed. The need for comprehensive reports was also discussed. The budget is the same as last year. It is important to discuss budgeting. The need for a campus climate survey, the background check policy, and Discipline Councils were also discussed. Lastly, the ASCSU was represented at Senator Frehlich’s memorial. Rather than send flowers, colleagues were asked to make a donation to the education fund for his children. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. Does the legislation state that campus senates had to approve the projects?
   i. Campus senates have to say that they are interested in participating in the project. It is important to remember that the campus senates speak for themselves. This issue will be on the campus senate chairs agenda.

b. The faculty is still interested in participating and this assertion was well received. The CFA has organizational resources in Sacramento. The lack of CFA involvement may be the reason why attention was not paid to faculty participation.
c. What if the faculty and administration have different goals during bargaining? How are we going to deal with these differences?
   i. It is important to assert the faculty voice, rather than what someone else is telling us to say.

d. To what extent might the Academic Preparation & Educational Programs Committee (APEP) and the Academic Affairs (AA) committee want to explore decreasing time to degree?

e. When students go from biology to engineering, there may be a significant increase in costs and unit load. Perhaps AA would like to explore the implications this holds for student success?

f. Prerequisite courses came into discussion at San Francisco State University’s graduate coordinators meeting.

g. How did you find out about the Intellectual Property group?

h. APEP Chair Fleming was also consulted on data needs.

i. The CSU Intellectual Property policy was also discussed. The Faculty Affairs (FA) Committee will meet with Assistant Vice Chancellor Zed Mason, CSU Counselor Jennifer Glad, and John Swarbrick. This is consistent with discussions of academic freedom. Is it necessary for FA to draft a policy? It is important for initiative on the policy to come from the faculty. Has this committee formed and met? Could FA have a copy of their guiding principles? It is possible to ask the question of whether or not the group will meet?

j. Should we issue an appeal to our ASCSU colleagues regarding donations to the education fund for Senator Frehlich’s children?

**Vice Chair**
The Vice Chair will report at a future meeting.

a. Liaison Report

**Academic Affairs (AA)**
At-Large Senator Soni reported back on Academic Affair’s discussion of Financial Sustainability Model Task Force Report. Questions regarding Student University Grants (SUGS) were raised. Employment numbers were requested. Committee members inquired as to whether or not it is possible to invite Lt. Governor Newsom as one of the speakers for the Academic Conference?

**Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP)**
Vice Chair Miller reported back that the first concern of the committee is that changes in B4 would lead to changes in admissions. We need to consider math from cradle to grave. These should span admissions and General Education (GE). Cross applications of math concerns may be beyond the scope of the task force. Is it possible to have a meeting that includes APEP members in January? The conversation being had with administrators suggests that math is being dealt with in a silo. The need for integrated conversation was suggested. The committee will submit the request in writing. APEP would like to invite
the Chair of the Math Council as a guest. The goals of these integrated discussions would be to break down the silos. Depending on the outcome of the meeting the B4 Task Force may not be needed. APEP engaged in another discussion on the outcomes of system-wide student success funding. The following questions were raised by APEP:

- Are the reports public documents that can be read by APEP and other committee?
- Can there be confidential access to the reports?
- Is it possible to mine data to determine how to do the student success projects better?
- Best practices and shared governance discussions should focus on the law.
- APEP questioned whether or not a Bullying Resolution should be coming from the Executive Committee.

**Faculty Affairs (FA)**

Secretary Collins reported back that Faculty Affairs continues to engage in conversations regarding the need for timely responses to ASCSU requests, the Chancellor’s Office (CO) response on background checks, and the need for a formal statement of shared governance. FA requested that Chair Filling make a formal statement regarding the importance of shared governance. FA will also continue discussions on the role of the CO Liaison to the committee and open presidential searches. FA questioned whether or not a Bullying Resolution should come from the Executive Committee and expressed interest in collaborating on such a resolution.

**Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)**

At-Large Senator Yee-Melichar reported that FGA met with Vice Chancellor Lori Lamb and Assistant Vice Chancellor Margaret Merryfield. The $11 million allocation may translate to about 100 tenure-track hires. FGA met with Legislative Analyst Jason Constantouros regarding Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 73 and will create a new resolution addressing the vision plan for ongoing CSU tenure and tenure-track recruitment.

**Academic Affairs (AA)**

Chair Nelson reported that Academic Affairs would meet with the Sheila Thomas, Dean of Extended Education. Angela Williams and Gerry Hanley were invited to talk about transfer credit issues. The committee will be in charge of the social. AA will also discuss the differences between the B.A. and M.A. in the CSU, follow-up on quantitative reasoning, and draft a resolution regarding the CO response. First reading item will include a resolution on Faculty Role in Evaluation of Transfer-Credit. This is not just for online courses but classes in general. Campus senate chairs will be consulted regarding the lack of policy on transfer credit, which includes Course Match. The open presidential search resolution will also be discussed. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- Is it possible to discuss the implication that upper division discussions may have on the CCC?
- Is it possible to discuss the open presidential search resolution?
**Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)**
Chair Fleming reported that APEP will cover several items and will be meeting with their liaison. Senior Director Ken O’Donnell will discuss quantitative reasoning, the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) concerns, and the conference on testing and quantitative reasoning. Assistant Vice Chancellor Eric Forbes will be consulted on common core, assessment, and the implications both hold for remediation and development programs in English and math. How better communication might be encouraged between APEP and public constituencies will also be explored and actionable items considered. APEP will meet with Assistant Vice Chancellor Sullivan. Multiple pathways to proficiency will be explored. Reports will be coming from English and Math Council representatives. Potential action items related to Smarter Balance and how to frame reformulation of the California Exit Exam will be examined.

**Faculty Affairs (FA)**
Chair Foroohar reported that the committee will be discussing and perfecting two second reading resolutions being brought forward during plenary: *Suspension of CSU Background Check Policy (HR-2015-08)* and *Addition of an Emeritus/Emerita Faculty Member* to the CSU Board of Trustees. FA will also discuss two first reading resolutions on shared governance and the inclusion of lecturers in orientation programs. The concerns surrounding these resolutions have been discussed with liaisons. Consultation and explanation was solicited for the Intellectual Property (IP) policy and the committee is still awaiting an answer. The 2003 Task Force on IP policy was faculty driven. The Faculty has not been consulted on the formation of new committee. Vice Chancellor Lori Lamb and Assistant Vice Chancellor Margaret Merryfield were invited to the FA committee meeting to discuss background checks. FA will also examine the Textbook dispute at CSU Fullerton and its relevance to academic freedom. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. It is important to ask our colleagues to do an environmental scan on textbook usage on campus. This will enable us to get a feel where the campus faculty stands.

b. To what extent are the American Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements considered?

c. To what extent was the issue of faculty-authored textbooks raised in the past?

**Fiscal and Government Affairs (FGA)**
Chair Krabacher reported that two resolutions are coming back to plenary: *Resolution of Commendation for Ron Vogel* and *Resolution on 2016-17 Support Budget Request*. The language of the latter resolution has been revised. Legislative updates include a final report on disposition on 2015 legislation and will be circulated to senators. A primary goal for FGA will be to increase in-district advocacy efforts. Four speakers will meet on the CSU policy on the acknowledgment of donors and a first-reading resolution may result depending upon the information received. Jay Stewart will speak to the committee on budget prospects for the coming year. This discussion will enable the committee to prepare for potential disadvantages in the lobbying efforts for more money. Vice
Chancellor Lori Lamb and Assistant Vice Chancellor Margaret Merryfield will meet with FGA regarding the committee on faculty personnel in the BOT report. The issue of comparing institutions and methodology will be questioned. The following concerns and questions will be raised:

a. It is important to ask Lori Lamb where the average pay data comes from?
b. Is it possible to get numbers regarding faculty hiring and departure?
c. Is it possible to invite Vice Chancellor Lori Lamb and Assistant Vice Chancellor Margaret Merryfield to the plenary?
d. It will be important to come up with a date to meet with legislator in Sacramento?
e. Vice Chancellor Lori Lamb will join Executive Vice Chancellor Relyea at the plenary at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday.
f. Is it possible to have a resolution on CSU culture?
g. It is important to ensure that ASCSU and CFA goals are not conflated.
h. It is important to try an informal method of communication (i.e., letter to Chancellor, etc.).
i. Is it possible to have more face time with the Chancellor? It is important to inquire about his changing – or perceived changing – stances on shared governance.
j. It is important to focus on the Higher education employer-employee relations act (HEERA).
k. It is important to interface with issues on the Chancellor’s radar?
l. Vice Chair Miller: How did Zoom work during the interim?

**CFA Tele-Meeting**

CFA President Eagan reported that the faculty vote - verified by a 3rd party - was a 94.4% yes. Tenure track hiring has not caught up with student enrollment. CSU faculty are losing purchasing power. Direct instruction spending continues to decrease, while managers and their pay continues to increase. Now, there is talk of increasing student fees. President Eagan asserted that the CSU is a public institution and should start by paying employees like the professionals that they are. To what extent is current practice consistent with the nature of a public institution? November 17, 2015 the CFA membership will gather at the CO in Long Beach. The following concerns and questions were raised:

a. What was the turn out? It is possible get this information?

7. **Appointments**

a. Study Abroad policy work group [email].
   i. Senator Sandra Chong was appointed to the Study Abroad policy work group.

8. **Old Business**

a. CO responses to September resolutions
Conversations were had with Executive Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard and State University Dean Leo Van Cleve regarding the need for timely responses to ASCSU concerns and greater faculty voice on quantitative reasoning concerns. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. To what extent is this circumvention of shared governance?

ii. To what extent is there a need for a resolution? Will a resolution be the best way to address ASCSU concerns? Can the discussion with Dean Van Cleve move beyond the Academic Conference? Is it possible that the Chair can have a confidential draft of works before they are shared?

iii. It is important to review resolutions.

iv. It is important to revisit this discussion in the future.

v. Is it possible to ask about the purpose of the liaisons at the standing committee meetings? This will enable us to outline our expectations.

vi. It is important to ask the Standing Committee Chairs about their opinions on their liaisons. To what extent are they helpful?

vii. It is important to remember that APEP deals with diverse areas and needs to be flexible.

b. Sustainable Financial Model draft report update
Chair Filling reported that feedback is being compiled and the report modified to address concerns. Another update will be given at a future meeting.

c. Academic Conference update
Dean Van Cleve met with the Executive Committee at 10:58 a.m. Central to this meeting was a discussion of past conference successes and the need for regular conferences so that CSU faculty, staff, students, and administrators could meet. Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 are options for conference times. Having the conference on the Golden Bear at CSU Maritime was also discussed. The committee has decided that it might be a good idea to combine the Academic Conference with CSU Maritime’s annual fundraiser. The first day would be a meet and greet and the second day would be the actual conference. Conference presentations, followed by breakout sessions, would structure of the agenda. The current conference theme is “Sustaining the Future of the CSU”. This theme maps on to the work of the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force. The Chancellor has suggested that the conference should rotate between the different campuses (i.e., North – South) over time. This rotation will ensure the showcasing of campuses and their uniqueness. Participants in last year’s conference wanted more interaction and discussion. It will be possible to have the data from the previous conference and compare it to this conference. A three-week deadline was given for the budget and it has not been approved. The budget was reviewed. budget option #1 would be fully paid. In budget option #2 the campus share in the cost with a 50% discount. Under budget option #3 the budget remains base. These costs do not include speaker fees. The following concerns and questions were raised:
i. How much was given last year for speaker fees?
ii. Is it possible to get approval soon so that hotels can be booked?
iii. This event will compete with “Day on the Bay”.
iv. Has the president of CSU Maritime been informed?
v. Legislators will be invited.
vi. The question before us is whether or not the “Day on the Bay” can be gratis.
vii. Is it possible to get CO responses in a timely fashion?
viii. What is the best course of reaction? Is a resolution or informal communication most effective? Is it possible to have draft responses shared with the ASCSU Chair and others that can be checked before reaching conclusions?
ix. It is important to remember that there are many voices and players in the responses.
x. It is important to remember that the curriculum is the purview of the faculty.

xii. How can we improve scheduling for designated liaisons? To what extent are liaison assignments discussed in the CO?
xiii. It is important for the Standing Committee Chairs to extend an invitation to liaisons to stay beyond the time certain on the agenda.

d. ASCSU budget report

Discussion centered on what will be presented at plenary and the protection of stakeholder anonymity while ensuring transparency. Senator promptness in submitting paper work was also discussed. The following concerns and questions were raised:

   i. To what extent is timely submission of reimbursement paperwork an issue? How can we ensure efficiency?

e. Tenure density follow-up

Discussion centered on the need for Provosts to discuss this issue and establish hiring targets. Hiring targets are in need of campus-based investigation.

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

Discussion centered on a review of campus-based concerns and their implications System-wide. CSU San Bernardino is still in flux. Campuses are considering votes of non-confidence. There is discontentment about current administrative practices. It is important to wait and observe the situation.

g. Shared Governance issues (FA resolution?)

Several concerns and issues were discussed. It is important to continue active examination of the extent to which faculty are being placed on committees. How
the ASCSU can address and ensure equity was also discussed. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. It is important to not have all rigid yellow widgets.

ii. It is important to pay attention to the Resolution on Slates. (Check and offer link.) It can be used a part of the rationale.

iii. It is important to have an exchange of information before creating a resolution.

iv. It is important to have a Resolution on best practices in shared governance. Such a resolution is less confrontational and does not single out one entity.

h. Bullying Resolution
Central in this discussion was the need to address local and national concerns over the unethical behaviors that create barriers to faculty and student success. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. To what extent might the micro-aggression language lend the illusion that mere frustration is not part of the educational process?

ii. It is important to consult widely on such a resolution.

9. New Business
a. Quantitative Reasoning Task Force
Central in this discussion was the need for the task force, directions for moving forward, and a supporting resolution. It is important to involve participants from GEAC, GEAC STAT working group, APEP, Math Council, Quantitative reasoning non-math affiliated, California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP), Entry level math, CO, Academic Senate of the CCC, and any interested faculty member. This group will specify quantitative reasoning content and it is important to have broad representation. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. Do we have to formulate the charge since this is a senate Task Force?

ii. Is it necessary to have someone from K-12?

iii. Are there additional stakeholders that should be included?

iv. What should be the appropriate content and how should it be delivered?

v. How diverse is Math Council? Will faculty from the social sciences be included?

b. Dual enrollment
Discussion of this item revolved around link learning. The following concerns and questions were raised:

i. To what extent might dual enrollment affect funding situations?

c. CSU Budget Advocacy
Discussion centered on the need to continue and expand on last year’s successful lobbying efforts to ensure increased state funding for the CSU.
d. **Presidential Search resolution**
   Discussion of this item centered on the revisions that have been made. The Resolution reaffirms the ASCSU support for open and transparent university President search processes. This resolution stands in solidarity with 21 of the 23 CSU campuses urging support for transparent searches.

e. **CCC Accreditation**
   Discussion centered on the CCC baccalaureate pilots and efforts to seek WASC accreditation.

f. **Plenary Agenda**
   The item was discussed.

g. **Faculty Fellows**
   Discussion of this item centered on the role of faculty fellows. The Simms/Mann Institute was also discussed. The following is a link to the fellows program. [http://simmsmanninstitute.org/education/community-college-think-tank-and-fellowship/community-college-fellows](http://simmsmanninstitute.org/education/community-college-think-tank-and-fellowship/community-college-fellows). This item will continue to be discussed at a future date. The following concerns and questions were raised:
   
i. How were these fellows chosen?
   
ii. What impact might this fellowship have on the type of work performed by faculty?
   
iii. To what extent can we be informed about assigned time being given to faculty fellows?
   
iv. Is it possible to ask for clarification on the Simms/Mann Institute?
   
v. Is it possible to clarify the selection process?

10. **Adjourn**
The ASCSU Executive Committee Adjourned at 5:00p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary