CSU Campus Senate Chairs Meeting Minutes

April 7, 2016 from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
San Francisco State University Campus

Present: Debbie Boschini (Bakersfield), Betsy Boyd (Chico), Michael Hedrick (East Bay), Kevin Ayotte (Fresno), Emily Bonney (Fullerton), Julia Alderson (Humboldt), Praveen Soni (Long Beach), Nancy Warter-Perez (Los Angeles), Julie Chisholm (Maritime), Juan Jose Gutierrez (Monterey Bay), Ted Ruml (San Bernardino), Troi Carleton (San Francisco), Michael Kimbarow (San Jose State), Deborah Kristan (San Marcos), Richard Senghas (Sonoma State),

Virtually Present: Steven Filling (Academic Senate CSU Chair), Jeanne Grier (Channel Islands), Adam Swenson (Northridge), Sepehr Eskandari (Pomona)

Absent: Jim Hill (Dominguez Hills), Sylvester “Jim” Bowie (Sacramento), Douglas Deutschman (San Diego), Gary Laver (San Luis Obispo), Mark Thompson (Stanislaus)

1. Call to order at 10:04 a.m.
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of minutes of February 11, 2016 meeting
4. Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) Report - Chair Steven Filling
   a. Reported that there was concern about security of Research, Scholarship & Creative Activities (RSCA) Software.
   b. Chancellor put RSCA back into budget (2.5 million) but ASCSU trying to help trustees and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) understand that is a totally inadequate amount
   c. Quantitative reasoning task force met twice in February and March. Huge national and state interest. The Chancellor’s Office (CO) has been contacted by federal government to consider putting together a quantitative reasoning summit. Newsome has suggested computer courses could be considered as quantitative reasoning courses. The content of the courses may not be so far off the mark of what we would think of as quantitative reasoning and so Microsoft would fit into these discussions. Ideas is to come up with some set of recommendations as to what we think Quantitative Reasoning is and what students should have in high school and what B4 courses should look like.
   d. Access to the Academic Council meeting of the provosts has changed. In the past the ASCSU chair has attended all but the hour or so discussion of personnel issues but at the most recent meetings was excluded from most of the meeting.
   e. Last weekend at the national council on higher education conference in San Diego one clear theme was the corporatization or financialization with more focus on the budget than on the education of the population. Senate Chairs should be in contact with this group to reinforce what we mean by an educated citizenry, which is
certainly more than the ability to get first job.

f. ASCSU met in March and minutes are out. Board of Trustees (BOT) also met and there was a fair amount of discussion of the sustainable model report. This report has been edited three times since December, but the task force has not during that time so don’t know who had done the editing. Task Force now will meet in May but not clear why since report already been presented. See BOT website for report.

g. Number one issue is pending contract and possible strike. Expecting media event and tentative agreement with 9:00 tomorrow morning press conference. We will find out.

h. There are continuing concerns about Academic Freedom. ASCSU unhappy because counsel refused to discuss because part of bargaining and had asked for a signing away of rights before any meeting.

i. Phone conference with Lori Lamb and Loren Blanchard to talk about tenure density issue. ASCSU passed resolution earlier this year asking that there be a task force to figure out what to do about the issue and to set some targets. Seems to be an issue everyone agrees we need to address but also true that CO’s office averse to establishing targets or indeed a plan about how they will approach the issue. Last year allocated $11 million for hiring Tenure-Track (TT) faculty and has been trying to find out how tracking the spending but closest is to say folded into student success budget so can’t tell how much went to each campus. Also not tracking incremental hiring, that is how many faculty they hired. Can’t tell how many people they were going to hire. Some discussion senate will create a task force to put together a proposal. Then talk of convening task force with people from Senate, California Faculty Association (CFA) and CO’s office. Intend to accept the numbers for faculty and Student/faculty ratio (SFR) and not argue over how calculated because it’s more important to do something about the problem. Blanchard suggests we celebrate the successes, but Filling noted that tenure density has declined in every one of the last decade years so not clear what we would celebrate.

j. Campus issue about structural deficits. Filling does not accept that there is such a thing as a structural deficit. For example Chico claimed to have several million dollar structural deficit but also had accumulated surplus $3-4 million last several years and when suggested impossible to accumulate surplus while have structural deficit reassured happens all the time. Hard to believe this.

k. Council Higher Ed also conducting a discussion about administrators appointing faculty to committees, when process should be to allow faculty to select themselves.

l. As part of March meeting reviewed the campus climate survey at San Bernardino. Chair BOT accosted Filling and said rather politely deeply disappointed and that he was dragging San Bernardino through the mud presumably because don’t want to acknowledge there is a problem. Filling suggests this is typical of CSU resistance to admitting any failure. For example, Cal State Online required millions of dollars and ended up with 9 programs and 2000 students.

m. Talking to finance people and budget office. Having trouble getting info from CSU which seems to be a black hole. Not clear what CSU shares with policy-makers but they are not thrilled. Continuing attempts to help us do more with less.
5. Brief discussion of ASCSU identified legislative bills
   a. SB 1450 would require system to have each campus establish programs that would enable students to graduate in 4 years. Qualified students not need remediation, would sign agreement with campus, get privileged registration and guarantees fees not go up over course of tenure. If took more than 4 years because could not get courses fees would be waived. Big impact on 1st gen and under-rep students.
   b. AB 2163 would mandate open presidential searches. Senate overwhelmingly voted to support.
   c. AB 1914 would prevent faculty from making students purchase things that are easily available elsewhere.
   d. AB 1582 addresses conflict of interest. Doesn’t forbid anything, just that royalties be clear.
   e. Will send out legislative docs again today
   f. Filling terming out in 6 weeks.

6. Discussion about shared governance in the context of the strike.
   a. Campuses have different plans for scheduling meetings in the face of the strike.
   b. Affirmed that management can’t selectively dock wages, but faculty will, after the fact, have to report absences.

7. Shared governance and the budget
   a. Sonoma is reworking policy to establish more consultative process and impress upon new president how make process easier. Don’t get packet of materials in advance.
   b. San Francisco faces huge issue because told we have a structural deficit and we told to cut money from the budget. Ethnic studies blowup was a budget issue. Systemic lack of transparency. Transformed strategic issue committee into a smaller budget committee since big budget committee not used for discussions.
   c. Chico - University Budget Committee just about PowerPoints - executive memorandum states that we should have a voice - budgets are moral documents - happy to share different kind of executive memorandum
   d. San José passed a resolution creating a budget advisory committee with the Vice President of admin and finance, members from all constituencies and department chairs and vice-chair of senate. Senate Chair and Provost jointly chair strategic planning committee with Senate Vice-Chair, Associate Vice President of budgets and planning, 1 dean, 1 department chair, 2 senators, 2 at-large, an Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) person and Academic Affairs staff member.
   e. Filling suggested reminding administrators that faculty are not just another seat at the table but are mentioned in the Higher education employer-employee relations act (HEERA) as party to joint decision-making.
   f. Fullerton has Planning, Resource and Budget Committee (PRBC) with 10 faculty, 6 university Vice Presidents, two staff, two ASI reps.
   g. Fresno - no representation on cabinet as of yet but administrations is transparent and consultative. Faculty have been engaged - less anxiety about budget - equity programs and other spending decisions makes faculty more comfortable
   h. Long Beach - Provost and Vice President of administration and finance co-chair the
resource planning process - ten voting members but voting is intended to be highly consensual and no veto, and if there is disagreement then you talk it through - Chair of Senate and Chairs of four councils of the Senate - curriculum, University Resources and Program Assessment and Review Council and 5 non-faculty - one each division and one student - President of ASI, 5 faculty and 5 non - President CFA is observer and so are Associate Vice Presidents for planning etc. - information sharing does occur - what do we expect and so on - and when there is some extra one of two things can happen - allocate to divisions pro rata and figure it out or let’s ask for proposals from the divisions and committee decides how to allocate. 3 years ago actually had extra money - decided to pro rate and Academic Affairs got 75% - wish we could do more with allocation - working to extent that at least there is information and we are being told - University Resources Council deals with general fund budget and how allocated and utilized. Provost comes in and shares with the council how money was spent - encourage other groups to talk about $$ - benefit is that of Resources Council also a member of the RPP and can inform them about what is going on. Disadvantage would be that you could have similar situation but insist it be an action body -

i. San Marcos make recommendations to president re growth money but not regular budgets.

j. Los Angeles has the university research allocation advisory committee (Provost, Vice President administration and finance, Vice President of student affairs, Vice President of IT, Vice President of advancement, Chair of Senate and one other faculty, President ASI, non admin).

k. The real question is whether any of the budget committees can get beyond merely the growth part of the budget and address the overall budget.

8. Update on presidential and provost searches
   a. San Bernardino: President fired Provost. Issue was the failure of the search firm to provide adequate coverage
   b. Discussion about the issues that campuses have encountered in the search process and recommendations about how to follow.
   c. Search firms may fail to facilitate as they should but others may actually interfere.
   d. Discussion about whether the diversity officer is on the committee to certify that about pool is sufficiently diverse

9. Internship Policy - Executive Order 1064
   a. Long Beach is putting together a task force to prepare a policy.
   b. At Sonoma a non-senate person takes care of this because of the particular issue of certifying the sites in large areas such as Sonoma. How many campuses really are in compliance?
   c. What are the risks we are confronting at this stage - does the all-purpose solution work?
   d. How can we share this information?
   e. Increased interest in service learning and internships and engagement - effort to clarify what each of these are - civic engagement, internships, student teaching
10. President’s cabinet and Senate Chair membership
   a. In general Senate Chairs do not participate in the president’s meeting with the Vice presidents.
   b. Otherwise various other configurations.
      i. Chair is part of extended cabinet or similar group as well as other access: Fullerton, Monterey Bay, Northridge, San Bernardino (?), San Marcos, and Humboldt?
      ii. Excellent access to leadership team - San Marcos, San Jose, San Francisco, Bakersfield, Maritime, East Bay, Sonoma
      iii. Others “less comfortable” Chico senate removed from org chart; Long Beach shared governance has declined.

11. Discussion about student demand for mini-syllabi and mid-semester Statements of Qualifications (SOQ)

12. Adjournment