ASCSU Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes
CSU Chancellor’s Office – Munitz Room
September 3, 2014
8:00 a.m.—5:00 p.m. and
September 4, 2014
Noon—1:00 p.m.

1.0  Call to order: 8:02 a.m.

2.0  Roll:
Members: Julie Chisholm, Steven Filling, Susan Gubernat, Diana Guerin, Christine Miller, Praveen Soni
Guests: Steven Stepanek, Ron Vogel

3.0  Time Certain: Extended Executive Committee 8:30 – 10:30

4.0  Agenda approved with additions

5.0  Approval of minutes
   a. August Planning Retreat minutes: approved
   b. Teleconference minutes of 8/14: approved

6.0  Announcements
   a. Excom is in charge of September social; a discussion of the details included the suggestion to ask committee chairs to help collect the $35 per-senator fee for social expenses; new senators’ payments to be solicited at orientation. Food shopping at 2 PM; set-up at 3 PM.
   b. Upcoming meetings: Miller attending CSSA Fullerton on Saturday; Filling and Gubernat at the BOT next week; EVC Search Committee Sept. 25; ICAS Sept. 26 at Sacramento
7.0 Reports
Chair: Is creating a series of lists with various levels of access.
Also: for all other reports see minutes of the Extended Executive Committee.

8.0 Old Business

a. September Plenary planning Thursday: The Chancellor will address the senate at 9 a.m. Eric Forbes, (on e-advising, other student success initiatives) at 11 during plenary. Thursday afternoon will be devoted to committee meetings. Sharon Tanabe of the search firm handling the EVC search will meet with the ASCSU on Friday to get the faculty’s input on the qualities most important for the EVC. The position has already been posted, though there had been expectations earlier that Excom would be seeing a draft. At 11 a.m. Friday Sheila Thomas will address the body, in place of the originally-scheduled Gerry Hanley her topics are CourseMatch, Cal State Online, and the Commission on Online Education. EVC Ephraim Smith is also scheduled to address the plenary on Friday at 10 a.m.

b. New senator orientation: Soni has prepared the first orientation meeting, and has asked Excom members to attend and discuss their roles and duties. There will be initial nuts-and-bolts topics for first-year senators, including such topics as the genesis of resolutions. In future, other orientation lunches will involve the nature of and service on committees, etc.

c. Plenary guests: see a) above.

d. Faculty Trustee Selection committee process: At 10 a.m. Thursday the Faculty Trustee Selection Committee process will commence, resulting in the election of that committee. IT folks from Fullerton will help run the election using clickers and posting the results on the screen as they occur for each position. The rules from past elections will apply.

e. Continuing issues with communications

i. Agenda-setting meetings: There were questions about how to go about scheduling and gaining some traction from “agenda-setting” meetings with the Chancellor and his cabinet. It was mentioned that the term “agenda-setting” itself is no longer applicable since the Chancellor cannot meet immediately after plenary or on Monday before the BOT, as has been done in the past. With the opportunity to meet with the Chancellor regularly at other times, perhaps in the intersession between the BOT and the next plenary, the question of what should be brought up was raised, and how to use such sessions if they are not about informing the Chancellor about recently-passed resolutions. It was felt that such meetings could allow for more pro-active conversations
and advocacy, in fact, to set the agenda, so to speak, apart from the plenary’s outcomes. It was agreed that the closer to the last BOT, but before the next interim, is the best timing, and that, if possible, meetings with the Chancellor and Exec should include “face time.”

The Chair will set up the next meeting after the BOT but before October 11. It was agreed that the Chair, meeting with the Chancellor, should always be accompanied by at least one member of Exec, preferably the Vice Chair. Soni, since he is the closest to Long Beach, is willing to make himself available at the CO for these meetings, as needed.

ii. Academic Affairs: The Chair has been informed that there will be a change in whom he will meet with regularly; Ron Vogel will replace Ephraim Smith in such meetings, which could be held as often as weekly. Ongoing problems in communication with AA were raised, particularly follow-up on senate resolutions. And we need to seek advice on how to respond to where A2E sits in the CO’s agenda and what would we need to do next about proceeding with discipline councils. Another issue was the late date by which the ASCSU has tended to receive the CO responses; these are needed before interim committee meetings are held. In terms of the AA liaisons: committee chairs need to manage their own agendas so that there is no need for extraneous liaison reporting; at times, a written report may be a good substitute, and it was recommended that the rule of thumb should be one AA liaison per committee.

iii. Student Fee Task Force: Chair of the BOT Lou Monville has convened this committee. Chair Filling expressed concern to Monville that no faculty had been appointed to the task force, and there had never been a BOT response to a series of resolutions passed by the senate on academic fees. Filling was told that this was an “organizational” meeting, with little accomplished of substance so far. Meanwhile, however, the task force plans to present some “preliminary” results to the BOT. It was felt that it was time for Chair Filling to respectfully request faculty inclusion, appointed through the ASCSU, on the task force. Filling will do so, presenting a copy of the latest resolution on fees to the BOT Chair, and cc-ing this request for a member of the faculty to be included on the task force to the Faculty Trustee and to the Chancellor immediately.

iv. Other: The Chair reported participating in Chico’s summer retreat; while there he was able to discuss with the Chico campus senators how the ASCSU functions, and is hoping thereby to build two-way communication between campuses and the statewide senate. He will visit Channel Islands and Sonoma soon, with the same intent. It was noted that it would be important to get the resolution about communication to senate chairs and to get them to subscribe to the Faculty to Faculty newsletter, perhaps through adding members of their list serves as subscribers. It was suggested that this be tried with Fullerton. At Sacramento there was an example of how an ASCSU resolution might be used to help solve a local problem regarding search committees and slates. The Sac State president wanted to be provided a slate, in violation of the principles of shared governance articulated in the ASCSU resolution (referring to AAUP’s governance statement). While the faculty council did pass a resolution referring to shared governance, it nonetheless forwarded a slate; this is not a practice we’d like to see going forward. Excom should have a future agenda item on how ASCSU could help campuses
resolve local controversies vis a vis shared governance. Other issues: there is a need to look at MBA fees and their effect on the diversity of the student population in those programs this is something that AA could be charged with.

Another idea was to highlight past articles that have been published in the newsletter that speak to long-term policy and system-wide concerns such as the op-ed by Gubernat about shared governance and the op-ed by Senator Ornatowski on the perils of centralization.

f. Academic Conference Implementation: There will be a planning meeting at noon. Topics needed to be covered include scheduling, breakout sessions, topics for poster sessions. Should topics be generated from trustees? It looks right now as if there will be three topics. Nine rooms will be scheduled. The Chair could have an informal conversation with Chair Monville to see what trustees might like to see covered. There was also the idea of open-ended sessions in the breakouts.

g. CO Responses to 3175, 3178: as previously discussed, and see below.

h. Technology: People seem acclimated to Dropbox. Chisholm has agree to act as technical support for ASCSU colleagues. The effectiveness of conference calls suffers when people are not on Collborate; people not on it have trouble being recognized. For some committees Zoom may be an alternative. In general, during interims, senators need to be on a computer. There is a need to have a preliminary tech meeting for people and to set up conferences an hour early to do some troubleshooting, as needed.

**Report from/Discussion with Exec Liaison AVC Ron Vogel**

Excom members asked Vogel how he thought it would be best to go about encouraging responses to those May resolutions not responded to or to get more robust responses. Both the resolutions about a student success fees task force and Access to Excellence were cases in point. Vogel said he had just found out about the task force himself and is also just learning about what they are doing; he could not be specific about their timeline and structure. There will be preliminary results for the BOT after as meetings/forums at three campuses, the first on Sonoma’s campus on the 26th of this month, the latter two on southern campuses, as well as webinars. When asked about adding a faculty member to the task force the Chancellor’s response is that it is Monville’s task force, not the CO’s. Meanwhile, AS-3175 still begs a formal response from the CO.

In terms of Access to Excellence: there will be annual updates, working out particular items. But as a strategic plan it had originally belonged to Keith Boyum, then Gary Reichard, then Jerry Echeverria, who focused on the part that was the graduation initiative. Access to Excellence, Vogel says, needs to be overhauled and a group will be put together to work on it. It will be important, according to Vogel, to have the many stakeholders initially involved.

Another question asked of Vogel was how to move forward on other resolutions, e.g., discipline councils? What would be the best mechanism to get started on them? Should the issue be returned to committees for more detail? And how might we work on system-wide on-line
descriptors? Vogel mentioned working with Sheila Thomas, Gerry Hanley, and Chris Mallon and getting input on campus experiences. It was suggested to include Chisholm in these efforts as she was the main author of the senate’s resolution. If the senate gets names to people soon, can Vogel seek Executive Vice Chancellor’s blessing to go ahead on involving faculty in these initiatives?

As regards discipline councils, there may be a way forward through a pilot test using the “eight” disciplines normally reported on and this would involve working with Nathan Evans, Eric Forbes, Chris Mallon and Vogel. (Disciplines cited were STEM; social sciences; education; health and human services; humanities; arts; business, math and English, the last two already having councils established).

Further discussions on the formation of discipline councils is still needed, with the problem of funding still to be solved. Funding needs to be based on benefits–how much, and who should pay. The current English Council, it was noted, meets less now because of funding problems; deans are not supporting it. This is an issue requiring some collaborative work with Vogel and for the next Excom agenda.

Another issue raised was the role of CO liaisons to standing committees: How did Vogel perceive their responsibility? Should they come and report or stay throughout and take an active role? How have they been designated and paired up? Vogel said that the liaisons themselves had concerns about communication and how they were perhaps being perceived as “spies” of the CO; in that context, they may be holding back from participating out of such a concern. When two people have been assigned a committee, according to Vogel, it is generally because the 2nd person is there as an alternate to provide coverage if needed. But, in truth, he CO has never come up with prescribed roles and responsibilities for these liaisons; that is still open for debate. Should they be on call? Serve as a clearinghouse for questions? Vogel is amenable to whatever suits the business of the senate. Senators themselves need to think about what we want from liaisons and include such a conversation in committee meetings. Vogel would like senators to talk among themselves and provide him with some suggestions going forward.

He noted that the interviews for Marsha Nakanishi’s position were done; two candidates are left in the pool and a decision is due after the BOT meeting. For the research position (Beth Ambose’s former job) the search was reopened, and it was a failed search. It has been opened again. Vogel expressed surprise that there wasn’t more interest; it was a national search.

Meetings with the Chancellor or formerly, the agenda-setting meetings: Vogel confirmed that these are not working for the Chancellor when scheduled before the BOT, given the extensive preparation now expected, a “dress-rehearsal,” in fact, before each BOT. In the past, the Chancellor and his cabinet used to meet with Excom and the CSSA. It’s time, now, to start a new practice. Vogel was asked what his strategy might be to ensure more face time with the Chancellor. He agreed that two weeks later might be a better schedule, and the time could be used to discuss resolutions before a formal response to resolutions is crafted.
In response to questions about the ASCSU budget: there is work going on to unpack it, including how much was spent last year, how much went to campuses, vs. what we were budgeted for, and whether or not there is any money left over. The 910,000 dollars or so this year includes the Academic Conference. Excom would appreciate seeing a regular report, at the interim if possible.

9.0 New Business (September 4, 2014 noon)

a. ELM, EPT appointments: Chair will contact Sugie Goen-Salter (SFSU) to see if she wants to continue on Early Start Implementation committee. If not, need to consult with English Council for a recommendation to replace her. Chair will first speak with Committee Chairs to get their perspective on the six needed to for these appointments. Eric Forbes says these appointments are needed soon and Exec will consider candidates at the interim meeting.

b. GEAC appointment: Barry Pasternack; if he is unable to serve, Chair will send out a call to the senate for volunteers.

c. CourseMatch/CSO/COE issues: deferred.

d. Legislative issues:
   i. AB 2324: as previously thought, this is not connected to the request for staff trustee. Chair is sending a letter in support of the bill’s being signed into law and will circulate it among Exec before sending.
   ii. SB 850: Let’s work on some parameters up front about how to deal with this legislation and make sure that AA starts to work on it right away; need to make an official referral regarding how to find out what the processes will be to determine whether there is duplication of a CSU program by a community college pilot. Will discipline faculty need to be involved, and how? There are significant issues here of transfer and accreditation. Discuss with Ron Vogel who is the important liaison in the CO to work with.
   iii. AB 2619/2153 n/a

e. Veterans’ Issues: Senator Swartz and Patrick O’Rourke (CO) made a presentation to the Chair about the possibility of a special task force to look at returning veteran’s issues. Could there be one liaison from each committee to form an ad hoc task force? Excom needs to meet with Swartz to get more information about what such a task force would accomplish. Could we see a written summary of the issues? The proposed membership of such a task force? If it starts with the ASCSU, could also include CSSA membership and others and focus on activities, outcomes. Need to discuss this with Ron Vogel as well.

Any remaining agenda items were deferred to the next interim.
The meeting on Wednesday was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gubernat Secretary, ASCSU