ASCSU Executive Committee Interim Teleconference Minutes October 10, 2014

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

2. Attendance: Present: Julie Chisholm, Steve Filling, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Chris Miller, Praveen Soni, Steven Stepanek
2.1 Times Certain: 8:30-9:30, 13:00-14:00—Extended Executive Committee

3. Agenda approved

4. Minutes approved for teleconference: September 24, 2014
   September 3-4, 2014 minutes: deferred for additions, corrections

5. Announcements: Sac State passed a resolution in opposition to “student success” fees a week ago and it will be circulated later today. The Faculty to Faculty newsletter: Chisholm reported that she had just received the last report from committee chairs and that there will be a draft ready for comment over the weekend.

6. Chair's Report: The Chair reported on the provosts’ meeting: Ryan Storm and Phil Garcia did the same presentation on performance measures there as they did during the Extended Exec teleconference with them. The measures for FTES (conservative vs. aggressive planning) were not the same. Storm asked the provosts what the biggest campus issues were. Long Beach and Sacramento provosts said compensation for faculty, followed by facilities and infrastructure needs. The $50M innovation award from the Governor was seen to be a reward for what campuses had already accomplished. Trustee Fagin will be sitting on the awards committee for the CSU.

The Chair will attend the Graduation Initiative summit on October 15; the plan at that time is to launch the dashboard that Eric Forbes has been developing. The Chair hopes to get a better picture there of what is going on at the campuses re: student progress.
Extended Early start is going on at five campuses and, according to Ken O’Donnell, is more successful.

During the E-advising report by Eric Forbes, he said that this is the “heart of deliverology.”

CourseMatch continues to be worked on, pushing it out for Spring 2015; that there are still unsolved issues of articulation was acknowledged.

The Chair reported that he met with the Faculty Development Council last Tuesday; they are searching for ways to assure themselves of funding. QOLT is going great guns. There was anticipation that it would solve cross-campus acceptance of course issues through batched courses that had approval as a mechanism for quality assurance across campuses. They were receptive to the discipline councils idea as a mechanism for getting the word out. In terms of strategic planning, the Council wants to develop outcomes measures to show what is valuable.

The Chair met with campus chairs yesterday; they talked about extended and enhanced communication among campuses and with the ASCSU. Senate chairs reported that they were suffering from information overload, that their senators were indeed diligent in bringing to their attention system-wide news and relevant items. But they said that unless we develop specific questions we are not likely to get a lot more feedback from them (though that was not what the Chair heard when speaking to Chico leadership last summer).

Senate chairs talked a lot about student success fees in general; they were in favor of more money for the CSU and not as concerned about where the money comes from.

The chairs hope to develop more guidelines on governance, to send out information that could prove useful through a compendium of which committees on various campuses do what.

When talking about Cal State Online, Humboldt raised the issue of the golden four. There the eight-week schedule has created problems in financial aid for students taking two courses a semester, one at a time. Fullerton says they have no such problem with CMS and their chair (Sean Walker) offered to share what he knew with Humboldt.

The San Jose situation was briefly addressed; their president seems not to be improving, even after the Cisco issue hit the press. San Jose senate leadership has asked ASCSU leaders to consider directing the Chancellor’s attention to this matter. In the past, a collegial approach had been taken and they were at first cheered by the task force’s work, but they do not feel there has been action taken since then. Chico, in bringing up a matter of their own, were told to “get in line” in requesting a review of their president; six to 12 campuses were said to have such a request, though not according to the chairs. There may be nothing
we can do at this point but to bring people’s attention to the past ASCSU resolutions on proper ways to conduct a vote of no confidence or a review of a chief executive.

Miller raised the question: Should Excom have a future agenda item regarding how to resolve local governance issues? Should we agendize this for November?

Soni asked if, in addition to provost and senate chairs, the ASCSU Chair, and the Faculty Trustee, could others be in attendance at the October 15 meeting? Could the ASCSU Vice Chair attend? There is a need for more faculty representation. While the grad rate may be going up, as reported at the plenary, the achievement gap is not closing. Could the senate chair bring this issue forward? There has been no CO analysis of why the gap exists. The ASCSU should have it as a priority. On the focus of the October 15 meeting: It has been reported that most of the work will be going on campuses so this may not be a plenary discussion. Ed Trust is expected to provide some context and then look at small groups. How will the campus commit to making its targets? There will be campus breakouts, sessions devoted to how to use the new tools. (Everyone was advised to bringing a laptop). So the emphasis will be on metrics not on the gap.

On the issue of MBA fees and the effects on the diversity of the student population in those programs. Refer that to FGA? Refer the issue of the achievement gap to AA, FA, and APEP.

7.0 Old Business

7.1 Academic conference update: Miller reported things are going well, now turning attention to the printed program, looking this weekend at templates that the CO has that can be used for our program. It’s possible for a quick turnaround using these templates, and the program subgroup (Guerin, Miller and Gubernat) will meet ASAP to get work completed on the program. Some minor issues remain, such as being sure there is money for swag and any extras, which there seems to be in the ASCSU budget.

Soni has been working with Tracy and Carrie about the allocations to breakout sessions. Carrie did an outline, fine-tuning and getting the diversity looked for at each table. Currently, there are more people for Friday than for Thursday. The initial suggestion is that the groups remain the same for both sessions. How important is it to be in different groups?

7.2 Student Success Fees Input [due 13 Oct.]: Summary from campus chairs, so far: San Jose has student input; the fees were said to have gone to student benefit; at SLO process was said to be above board, students were involved; Channel Islands: no clue; Pomona: sensitive to access but in favor of campus autonomy and the need for transparency; Dominguez Hills: troubled that the process is too nebulous as is, needing fixing. LA response similar to that of Fullerton in the need for students to vote; San Diego: has been divisive—fees have been used for course sections, tenure-track hires; Sacramento opposing; Fresno: need for a robust alternative consultation process.
Consensus is that serious issues remain that map to our own list of concerns. A general question is how do we charge such fees while convincing the state of CA to fund us? The Chair will compile and send a list of concerns that still need to be addressed to the task force.

7.3 Discipline Councils: Forbes and Hanley are the CO people to work with. How will we get the appropriate people to move the process forward? Should we go to committees, put out a call? Pilot tests seem to be in order, as noted in the September minutes, and Ron Vogel was receptive to pilot testing--pilot tests rather than punting the idea back to committees. What does a work group for discipline council development mean? A couple of faculty members? Send out a call to see who wants to work on it? Have APEP invite them to their committee? Is there an opportunity with respect to engineering – a discipline council? That would have been better. See who is interested, get their names first in order to proceed.

7.4 Modes of Instruction Workgroup: Mallon and Thomas. Same process as above. Julie Chisholm has already volunteered.

7.5 Debrief on Chancellor Meeting Timing: deferred

7.6 120/180 Information: For now, according to the Chair, to be shared with this group only: Last year Professor Siegel from Chico was hired to do some research on program size, but his report was never issued. CFA has gotten the report through a freedom of information request. According to the Siegel report, it doesn’t seem that truncating program size has had any consequences for graduation. Vogel said the summary to be given the Chancellor was complete, but they still haven’t gotten all the detailed “binders,” and that nothing would happen without our input. Members felt that the Siegel report needs to be forwarded to the Chancellor, making it clear that when, as AA Chair, Miller asked for this information, she was told that it went beyond the scope of the committee and the request was denied. The fact also is that campuses did not have the benefit of such a report, and this raises serious process issues. It was suggested that we need to be really firm about this; we could see “garbage in, garbage out” as a consequence. The question was also raised about how much (all?) of the documents that the CFA obtained should be shared with the entire ASCSU. The Chair is not inclined to do so at this point.

7.7 Monthly Budget Reports: There is a draft, but is not yet available in useful form; it is being put together. The Chair is working with Tracy to refine it.

7.8 A2E outcomes resolution follow-up: deferred.

8. New Business

8.1 Capitol visits in November: deferred
8.2 SB 850 Referral to AA. There is a need to take a look at the process by which similar degrees are determined, including the issue of upper-division GE and process recommendations. Filling will write to the Chair of AA (Bill Eadie) on what might be done, incorporating Excom’s understanding of possible processes from our discussion with the Chancellor during agenda-setting.

8.3 Attendance at virtual interims and alternative meeting days: deferred, except for comment about Fleming’s misunderstanding of and apology about not being available for the full interim since APEP had had its interim meeting already on a different day. There are questions about the advisability of committees meeting on days alternative to those in the annual calendar.

8.4 Medical leave: If Bill Eadie needs to take time off for more medical issues, there could be a need for the Vice Chair to fill in; it will be important to see if Senator Nelson is willing and able to do so. (In that case, would there be funds for her release time?). There may be further need for succession planning. Important to stay in contact with Bill throughout this time.

8.5 Financial Stability Workgroup. Guerin was recused from this conversation; she had been contacted earlier by the Chancellor about her willingness to serve on this group. There remain concerns about governance and process, however. It was felt that the Chancellor should have consulted first with the current ASCSU Chair, requesting that Excom make the appointment, if time was of the essence and there was no opportunity for a call to go out. The Chancellor’s asking Excom to ratify his choice of Guerin has created a difficult scenario, which could evolve into a “teachable” moment about governance and process for the Chancellor. Meanwhile, it is standard practice on campuses to ask for the Chair or his/her designee to serve, and it was decided that this should be the guideline in this instance as well. Excom voted to prepare a brief email to the Chancellor to this effect. In the interim, Excom members are asked to give some thought to how important it is for the Chair to serve on this task force, given other responsibilities. There will be a follow-up conversation after getting the Chancellor’s response.

8.6 Veterans Affairs Task Force: deferred until Chair communicates Excom’s queries to Senator Swartz for follow-up.

8.7 CCC unit limits lobbying to Legislative Specialist: In re. the Senate Chair of the CCC, David Morse’s, query at ICAS about the ASCSU reaction to changing unit limits in their TMC degrees, upward to 65 units or so, how would that affect us? Refer this to the Legislative Specialist for regular reports on what he hears being discussed among legislators, if anything, on this matter.

8.8 Response to Academic Performance Measures: Bill Eadie had made reference to short-term feedback from AA. How do we want to respond to these measures? If these are in AA’s province, then is a letter and/ or a resolution to be written? Miller remarked that it
was important that this come out of AA; it has time sensitivity, given the upcoming BOT meeting. FGA might also have a role to play, given issues of academic preparation and low-income students. Could there be a co-sponsored resolution? All committee chairs need to be alerted and sent the Powerpoint slides and four-page handout received during the teleconference with Ryan Storm et al.

**8.9 Resolution Summary for CO and senators:** deferred.

**9.0 Adjourn** at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gubernat
Secretary, ASCSU