ASCSU Extended Executive Meeting
Interim Teleconference
Minutes
October 10, 2014
8:30-9:30 and 13:00-14:00

1. Call to Order: 8:33 a.m.

2. Attendance:Julie Chisholm, Bill Eadie, Steve Filling, Denise Fleming, Manzar Foroohar, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Tom Krabacher, Chris Miller, Praveen Soni, Steven Stepanek

2.1 Time Certain: 11:30

3. Approval of agenda: approved

4. Approval of minutes: approved

5. Announcements: none

6. Reports

6.1 Academic Affairs

Eadie reported that, since our last meeting, AA met for one hour virtually to discuss the student success fee issue. AA came up with some principles to communicate with the BOT’s task force; the committee’s consensus was that they would ultimately be looking for particular changes to the Executive Order and decided to draft some principles toward this end. Once the draft is completed, it will be forwarded to Excom and others.

On the committee’s agenda today is also the Excom referral re. EO 1065 (General Education). While changes were considered non-substantive by the CO staff, there is a concern that they are more substantive than originally reported. Other AA projects are in various stages of process; one such project, led by Senator Yee-Melichar, is reviewing the
A2E strategic plan, including the use of active learning and specific student success initiatives. Senator Ullman is leading another project on assessment; that group wants to look at ILOs and produce a report. A third group intends to follow up on the Ethnic Studies report when it becomes available, and another group, on the issue of Intermediate Algebra, may not yet have made progress, given attendance. Trustee Stepanek asked about those supposed editorial changes to EO 1065, which were also discussed yesterday at the campus senate chairs’ meeting. When looking at the language re: the golden four, a grade of C or better is required. But a change of language seems to wipe out the part defining that campuses have the right to set passing grades for the rest of GE; this is a concern. Senate chairs were concerned that this might suggest that everyone must accept a grade of C- or better. Is this so? Last year there was a discussion of aligning such expectations for transfer.

Unfortunately, neither the GEAC Chair Senator Van Selst, nor Ken O’Donnell of the CO, can attend the meeting; no answer to the question has been forthcoming, so far.

6.2 Academic Preparation and Education Programs
Fleming reported that APEP met earlier (on 9/26) because ½ of the committee reported having schedule conflicts. (The question raised here is what trumps what in senators’ scheduling.) At that meeting, the committee discussed the student success fees issue, and the committee response has been submitted to Chair Filling.

Update on the Bechtel grants: this is proceeding well. Some decisions made on that funding are coming in December. Fleming will discuss with the FA Chair offers to co-sponsor resolutions.

On the status of Math and English readiness measures: at the last plenary during the Wednesday meetings, ACT and SAT cut-off scores came in as did Smarter Balance scores. EAP questions were embedded in the pilot, so no new tests have been devised for readiness—that won’t happen next year.

The committee has two resolutions forthcoming: 1) a resolution to support/encourage high school students to take the SAT and ACT, making them aware of eligibility for waivers thereof; 2) a resolution calling for data and analysis of possible correlations among readiness measures. This resolution stems from anecdotal information from English Council and from committee members that students are obtaining readiness from ERWC with grad of C or better yet are still in need of remediation. So how well are these measures correlated and predictive? The committee will ask for that data.

Chair Filling noted that at the recent senate chairs’ meeting there was some concern about the relationship with Bechtel, who may be phasing out their foundation and so unloading funds, as much as 15M. Is the relationship with the CSU a “dog and pony show?” Fleming acknowledged that the Bechtel commendation was brought late to the committee, with some urgency, by Senator Chong and former Senator Postma. While acknowledging the
grant is a generous one, she also said that, as Chair, she didn't have the strongest grasp of the issue and wanted at first to hold off on the commendation; however, the will of the committee was to move forward, and Fleming said she thinks, in retrospect, it's well to have done so and to move on.

6.3 Faculty Affairs
Foroohar reported that the committee met virtually two weeks ago to discuss student success fees; they support the revisions that AA has proposed to the Executive Order. The committee still has concerns about alternative consultation processes since these processes are too often manipulated by campus administrators. The committee wants to see the process based on referendum, as well as to see more transparency about the purposes of the fees; that is, students need to be informed about their use and given a report on usage when implemented. The committee would also like to see more data on the impact of such fees and any category 2 fees. What is known about students on loans having difficulty paying such fees? Will the fees increase long-term student debt? Will they have a negative impact on campus diversity? In general, student success fees may be sending the wrong message to Sacramento: that when they cut CSU budgets, and fees can get higher. The committee plans to continue talking about what’s happening on campuses vis a vis these fees.

On the committee’s agenda for today are the two resolutions presented as first readings at the September plenary. The sexual violence resolution has been revised by the author, based on comments from the floor, as has the academic freedom resolution.

There are two possible new resolutions from the committee: one on the role of lecturers in shared governance; another on a statewide policy on academic freedom. Having learned from the General Counsel that the CO does not want to revise the current policy, the committee will be urging the CO to do so, summarizing points needed to be addressed in a new policy and welcomes any suggestions for what needs to be addressed.

6.4 Fiscal and Governmental Affairs
Krabacher reported that the committee held its virtual meeting last week on student success fees and has sent the results to Excom. The committee recognized that, given the state of state funding, such fees were perhaps an undesirable, but necessary, option. If they are student-initiated fees, students have the right to do so. There remain concerns over process and consultation, however. The committee felt that there needs to be transparency up front in use of fees and a regular, annual reporting to students of their use—this would involve revision of the executive order. While the levying of such fees should be left to the campuses, the CO should see to it that there is clarity in the consultation process and in the uses to which the fees are put and that there is transparency. Their conversation mirrored points brought forward by the other committees.
The committee will take up the Academic Sustainability plan, as described in the recent teleconference with CO staff. Ryan Storm could not make it today onto the teleconference, but he will meet with the committee in November for a more detailed discussion.

The committee also plans to review some legislative issues, including the governor’s actions, final dispositions of bills, etc.

The committee will discuss recommendations for advocacy, leading up to the election, and may look at the use of campus foundation funds. The info. Item re. a possible bill to dismiss students from CSU graduate programs for reasons other than academic is a “horrific” idea, not a good fit for the committee, and Krabacher will try to head this off.

The committee is finalizing a letter written to those legislators who supported the CSU’s requests for more funding. They may talk about how to go about initiating newly-elected folks, and may put on the agenda a “meet and greet” with them. ICAS will be doing so with the three senate chairs.

7. Old business
7.1 Academic Conference update: Miller reported that all conference activities have now been moved to the CO. There are still rooms to fill at the Hilton; we are committed to filling 80 rooms and are close to that now. She noted that the conference planning group has done an incredible job of making the agenda fit; the CO staff, likewise, in making it all work. During the last conference call there was a suggestion that we request a resolution to the CO to terminate their relationship with the Hilton. Which standing committee should take that up? What about process? Should it be a recommendation to Excom? Foroohar suggested that the issue be left until after the conference has ended when the planning group could put forward its conclusions and recommendations. There could be a broader issue involved, vis a vis what the CSU’s relationship with any organization having labor disputes might be, and more discussion of that is needed.

7.2 Student Success Fees Input: As reported, the other committees are echoing AA’s work. Now Excom is charged with summarizing what committees have reported on. Filling says that, in conversation with campus chairs, the need for rigorous accountability was emphasized. Long Beach and Fullerton wanted to put labels on what the fees support. Sometimes during “alternative there could be negotiation going on between admins and students as to what will work. But the chairs were more concerned that there should be sufficient course sections and labs. Chairs felt generally that there was a lot of transparency, that there were open forums and that students were directly involved.

Foroohar asked about state vs. student fees? How can we keep increasing fees if the message sent isn’t about state funding? Is there any way to clarify this? SLO currently has the highest fees in the system while its state funding has been cut.
Soni agreed: the message that the Governor, with his four-year plan of no increased tuition, has received, is that campus fees can, and will, be increased. And the problem remains that some campuses have such fees while others do not. SUGs go straight to the CO, based on aggregate number in the CSU, so, for example, if SLO has fewer Pell grants, then they should be adjusted accordingly. How is that happening? Krabacher noted that these are the very questions that the task force should be working on. Stepanek mention that the CO is putting together another new task force whose very purpose is to look at the sustainability of financial planning in the long term, to take two steps back and review how monies are being allocated and what the formulas for funding are. This group will be meeting every other week for the entire academic year, with a report due at the end of the year.

Since the student success fee task force is doing its wrap-up now, it is very important for the ASCSU to put together a statement about concerns and problems identified.

8. New Business
8.1: Capitol Visits in November: deferred

8.2 Standing Committee Liaison Reports: See Executive Committee meeting minutes

9. Adjourned this portion of meeting at 9:32 a.m. Re-convened at 13:00 p.m.:

Follow-up reports:

Academic Affairs (Eadie)
On the EO 1065 referral: the committee cannot make much progress without GEAC weighing in and the GEAC Chair, as noted, was unable to be present. Eadie will forward to Van Selst a summary of their discussion and finish this up at the November meeting. The committee had a good discussion with their liaison from the CO on assessment; they seem to be working on the same page and will continue to do so in November when the committee will also have working sessions on its four main projects.

The committee discussed the task force on student success fees and the other committees’ feedback as well as the SF State resolution circulated by Yee-Melichar. Of particular interest to the committee was hearing of the new working group on financial sustainability that the Chancellor is forming. There was strong opinion that there be adequate faculty and student representation on such a group; the committee had considered drafting a resolution to that effect. But the timing is not right, given the sustainability group’s quick formation and moving ahead. The committee also heard reports from Chris Mallon as well as from the Institute on Teaching and Learning, and others. Chair Eadie will provide these as written reports to the secretary.

The committee would also like to continue to be briefed by FGA about any developments in the proposed bill on graduate student dismissal.
Also, in relation to performance measures: Gubernat suggested to Eadie that such data as the CSU is being asked to accumulate may not be useful; AA may want to explore this and potentially draft a resolution to that effect.

**Academic Preparation and Education Programs (Fleming)**

No follow-up report at 1:30 since the committee had met on an earlier date. Fleming did not join this part of the teleconference.

**Faculty Affairs (Foroohar)**

The committee discussed and revised the two aforementioned resolutions, which are ready to send to the floor for second reading.

On the matter of sexual violence on campus: there is an executive order in June now being revised and being brought up to date, given the new laws. The system is putting together new training for faculty, but the committee is concerned that not enough faculty are involved in this at the CO. How can the ASCSU be involved in such system issues? The committee would like Excom to grapple with the need for such faculty involvement.

There will be a possible first-reading item on the role of lecturers in shared governance; a draft is being prepared for the November meeting.

There were continuing discussions on student success fees, with more to come at the November meeting since the committee ran out of time on this matter. They are learning that on some campuses the student success fees are being approved as replacements for old category 2 fees, while on other campuses, there is a new layer of fees on top of the older ones.

The committee also continued to discuss the necessity of a new comprehensive policy on academic freedom. The General Counsel could only spend a ½ hour on this topic previously, but there is need for much more dialogue. The committee will present him with a list of points that should be represented in a new policy. It was also suggested, again, that this could be in the form of a resolution so that the administration would have to respond publicly. The majority of the committee feel, however, that it is important to continue these discussions within committee for the time being.

**Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (Krabacher)**

Chair Krabacher and Vice Chair Browne reported on Academic Sustainability planning, in particular the recent teleconference on such. They will circulate the Powerpoint presentation from the meeting and take up the issues therein in full during Ryan Storm’s visit to the committee in November. Miller mentioned that there might be need for input before then. Input will definitely be needed to give to Storm for the BOT in November.

Ron Vogel as CO liaison reported that the search for the EVC is up to date.
The committee focused on advocacy planning before the election, identifying key races in consultation with Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa. The committee looked at specific districts and identified campuses associated with those districts; they laid out a rough strategy over the next few days, including getting camps govt. relations officers and senior senators to arrange for informal meetings in district offices in order to alert legislators to the CSU, to our budget issues, and to our legislative engagement.

Late in the meeting, Senator Pasternack raised an issue from Daily Clips regarding the use of campus foundation funds. There could be a resolution developed in November in order to ask trustees to devise formal guidelines in these matters, but there wasn’t yet a consensus of the committee on this issue.

9. Adjourned 14:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gubernat
Secretary, ASCSU