

**ASCSU Chair's Report
May 2018
Christine M. Miller**

It has been my privilege to represent the Academic Senate of the California State University between our last interim meeting and the present. I offer the following listing of my activities followed by summary and commentary on key issues that arose during that time.

Meetings and Activities

April

- Stakeholder Advocacy meetings in Sacramento
- Advocacy calls with Senator Glazer
- ICAS Legislative Advocacy Day in Sacramento
- General Education Task Force in Long Beach
- Academic Council meeting in San Francisco
- Shared governance meeting in San Francisco
- Intersegmental Coordinating Committee meeting in Sacramento

May

- California Assembly Subcommittee 2 meeting in Sacramento
- Assembly Select Committee on the Master Plan in Riverside, California
- Shared governance meeting in Long Beach
- ASCSU plenary meetings in Long Beach
- Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- ICAS meeting in Sacramento

Key Issues

Shared Governance

In accordance with the motion passed by the Senate in November 2017, the Executive Committee has met for two hours once a month during the last six months in face-to-face discussions to produce a document articulating "Tenets of System Level Shared Governance in the California State University." The meetings have included Chancellor White (the first and

last meeting), EVC Blanchard, and AVC's Mallon, Minor and Van Cleve. The resulting document will be released under separate cover along with its attendant resolution. The resolution will simply ask the Senate to adopt the jointly-drafted document. Both the document and the resolution are coming to you later because our final meeting occurred earlier today, so the Executive Committee is still working on the resolution.

I offer here several personal observations about both the process undertaken and the document produced.

First, you are all familiar with the circumstances which led to these meetings, resulting in the November motion. Those circumstances can serve as a backdrop, establishing the context in our minds. My hope, however, is that the "Tenets" document itself outlives this context. Thereby, it won't outlive its usefulness. It will not be time-bound, nor situation-specific. Important documents like this one, although they may arise from exigencies, should transcend them. I believe, working together, the Executive Committee along with the Chancellor and his leadership team produced a document that responds to its historical context, but ultimately transcends it.

Second, I am convinced that the process of discussing all the issues surrounding shared governance in the CSU was edifying for the leadership of both ASCSU and the Chancellor's Office. To provide one critical example, as a group we returned several times to the notion that consultation with ASCSU must take precedence and be considered differently than discussion with other faculty groups or individuals. In other words, the Executive Committee asserted strongly ASCSU's agency in the shared governance process; claiming agency was an incredibly important and powerful element of this process, and the document bears witness to this outcome.

Third, this claim of agency was articulated in various ways via paraphrasing. In other words, there was a conscious effort to remain grounded in what I consider to be canonical documents (e.g., AAUP's "red book,"), but not simply to string together quotations from other sources—otherwise, what's the point of constructing a new document? Instead, I believe one essential outcome of this process has been discussing, and then translating, so to speak, those other sources into meaningful precepts as envisioned and enacted specifically in the CSU.

Relatedly, fourth, I consider one core value of this document to be an articulation of the organizational culture of shared governance in the CSU. It is aspirational, to be sure, but then, all such documents are—a statement of "tenets" offers guidance and, if followed, can't help but affect the culture of the organization. Thus, the follow-up work for all involved will be to practice what the document preaches. In that way, the organizational culture will align with the tenets espoused.

Finally, it's important to return to the point that the "Tenets of System Level Shared Governance in the California State University" is a jointly developed product. That means it includes compromises. It's impossible to achieve a perfect document, because perceptions of perfection will differ, as will notions of how best to express those perceptions. However, a sentiment attributed to Voltaire is relevant here: we should take care not to let the perfect get in the way of the good. These "tenets" represent the good.

I'm grateful to have been part of this process, and I'm proud of the outcome of the deliberations with my senate and administration colleagues. Our discussions alternated between philosophic and pragmatic, past-focused and forward-looking, expectation-based and aspirational. I am firm in my conviction that everyone engaged in good faith with the task and with each other. I have no hesitation reporting that the Executive Committee conscientiously has fulfilled the directive of ASCSU's November, 2017 motion.

Advocacy

I have continued my efforts to advocate for full funding of the operating budget request of the CSU. These efforts have included CSU stakeholder meetings, weekly meetings with Senator Glazer's informal coalition for higher education funding, and ICAS Advocacy Day.

In addition, I testified on a panel with the University of California and California Community College Senate Chairs at the Assembly Select Committee on the Master Plan held at UC Riverside. The focus of the hearing was on faculty and staff primarily in the three segments, although some representation from private colleges and universities was also included. The Senate Chairs were asked to discuss faculty development efforts in the three segments. I was asked to submit a transcript of my testimony, so I will append it (and the powerpoint slides that accompany it) to the email distributing this report.

Final Report

It has truly been my honor and distinct privilege to represent the Academic Senate of the California State University for the past two years. Although it may not be customary to do so, I wish to dedicate these two years of servant leadership to my father and to my daughter.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine M. Miller