

ASCSU Chair's Report
July 20, 2017 to September 12, 2017
Christine M. Miller

It has been my privilege to represent the Academic Senate of the California State University between our last plenary 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

July

- Meeting with CSSA liaison in Sacramento
- Meeting with EO1100 Revision Work Group (virtual)

August

- Meeting to discuss moving ASCSU offices (virtual)
- California State Student Association in Fresno
- Academic Council (virtual)
- Dreamer Ally training in Sacramento
- DACA Support event in Sacramento
- Meeting with campus Provost (virtual)
- Meeting with Christian Osmena (LAO) in Sacramento
- California Faculty Association Board meeting in Sacramento
- Alumni Council (virtual)
- Meeting with EVC Blanchard and AVC Van Cleve in Sacramento
- Meeting with CSSA Executive Director (virtual)
- Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee (virtual)
- Extended Executive Committee in Long Beach
- Leadership retreat (ASCSU, CSSA, CO, BoT) in Long Beach

September

- General Education Task Force in Long Beach
- General Education Advisory Committee in Long Beach

Upcoming

- California State Student Association in Fullerton
- Board of Trustees meeting in Long Beach
- Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates in Sacramento
- Interim meeting with Chancellor White in Long Beach
- Graduation Initiative Symposium in Long Beach
- Academic Council in Long Beach
- Campus Senate Chairs' Council in Long Beach
- ASCSU interim (virtual)
- California State Student Association in Sonoma
- Advocacy training in San Jose
- General Education Task Force in Long Beach

Key Issues

Senate Functioning

ASCSU Office Space: The ASCSU, CSSA, and Trustee Secretariat offices will be relocated, and a portion of the Human Resources department will take up residence in the space. The Munitz and Catalina meeting rooms will not be affected, nor will the area where we hold our socials. The Trustee Secretariat will move to the current CSSA office, and CSSA as well as ASCSU will be moving to the second floor. The bad news is we will not be as close to the Dumke Auditorium for our plenary meetings. The good news is we will be allocated *more* space. The move is expected to occur in summer 2018. The Executive Committee and the Committee Chairs toured the area last month, and learned that ASCSU must submit plans for our office suite as soon as possible, because currently there are cubicles in the space, and hard walls must be constructed. So, the Executive Committee will be making decisions about tearing down and building walls (there's a metaphor in there somewhere), and I will provide you with more information during my inevitable oral addendum to this report at the plenary.

Trustee Nominees: As reported to you via email, Senator Sabalius was granted citizenship, so I formally informed the Governor's Office that Governor Brown now has two eligible nominees for his consideration. I did not receive a response.

Budget: The Senate has received its budget allocation for this academic year. Essentially, it is a "flat" budget, meaning there was no increase to our base. However, one-time funds were allocated for the work of the GE Task Force and for coordinating the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates—it is the CSU's turn to host ICAS. I reported to you in July that we did not stay within our budget with respect to travel and "sunshine" (e.g., socials), and I asked for your cooperation in two ways, so I will renew those pleas again.

First, please try to minimize hotel costs. When there are rooms at the \$120 rate, please take them, even if you'd prefer to stay at another property. If you can't get that rate, get the lowest one you can within the maximum reimbursement rate of \$175 (the Chancellor's Office rate). My

back-of-the-envelope calculation provided in my last report was that booking at \$120 versus \$175 potentially could save \$30,000! Of course, it won't be possible for everyone to get the \$120 rate, but when you can, please take it.

Second, I mentioned in my last report that the Executive Committee decided to ask each senator for a \$40 contribution toward "sunshine" (socials, flowers, gift cards for those who perform services for ASCSU, etc.), since we were significantly "in the hole" with this dimension of our budget. The main impact on this line item last year was coffee self-service, so as the year progresses we will have to determine if it remains sustainable. Senators Krabacher and Collins are tasked with collecting these monies from you.

Leadership Retreat: On August 28, the Executive Committee, the ASCSU Committee Chairs, CSSA leadership, Board of Trustees leadership, and Chancellor's Office leadership met to discuss each stakeholders' priorities for the coming year. In addition, the group discussed shared governance: what has worked, what needs improvement, and how to proceed in an environment of an accelerated pace in shared governance. The standing committee chairs will report their priorities to their committees, and I will share here the priorities of the Executive Committee.

Last year, the Executive Committee agreed that the theme for the year would be "finding the balance;" this year's theme is "collective voice." Within the frame of the figurative entailments of that theme, the ASCSU Executive Committee intends to:

1. Protect and promote the culture of shared governance in the CSU
2. Monitor the implementation of the CSU's Graduation Initiative through the Workgroups and other entities responding to the imperatives of the Initiative
3. Engage in advocacy on behalf of faculty and students in the CSU

General Education

General Education Task Force: GE Task Force Co-Chair Ullman and I have convened the Task Force four times. I provided a summary of the first three meetings in my last report. The most recent convening took place over two days, and the Task Force generated a list of issues which each member will follow up on prior to our October meeting. These issues are moving us toward more specific consideration of what will likely be areas in which we make recommendations in our final report.

EO 1100 Revision Feedback: As I reported to you before, in July the Executive Committee met with AVC Mallon to discuss revisions to Executive Order (EO) 1100 before it was published on August 23, 2017. In addition, we shared our feedback with what was called the EO 1100 Summer Work Group, composed of the current and former Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Academic Affairs Committee and the General Education Advisory Committee (Senators Ullman, Schleivert, Creadon, Van Selst, and Baaske). Along with me, the Work Group met virtually with AVC Mallon in late July.

These formal discussions with the Executive Committee and with the Work Group were consonant with shared governance. The Executive Committee acts on behalf of the Senate when it needs to (e.g., during the summer), and the Summer Work Group was constituted in March

2017 based on a formal commitment between EVC Blanchard and ASCSU to consult with ASCSU senators over the summer. Those senators were compensated for their work. Of course, such circumstances *most certainly* are not ideal. But there *was* shared governance. I am dismayed that this formal consultation could not take place during the time when the 2016-17 Senate was in session so that more ASCSU input could be offered, and I sincerely hope these circumstances are never repeated. However, these two formally constituted entities representing ASCSU provided recommendations to the Chancellor's Office about a proposed policy, and their recommendations had an impact on that policy.

How do I know? Because AVC Mallon thanked me for our input, and indicated that the revised Executive Order was better because of it. As she said in an email exchange that included me and Senator Ford, "it was the EO 1100 summer Work Group and Senate Executive Committee that suggested we refine the definition of double counting, ensure policy consistency in citing unit totals (including 1-unit lab), extend the amount of time that a GE course can be certified without being offered, and modify language about embedded lab courses, the residency requirement, and Area E." There may be other elements of our feedback that also made their way into the revised EO, but I believe it is fair to report that without our recommendations, and the acceptance of them (never a guarantee in the shared governance process), the policy would have been different--and worse.

That sounds logical, right? Consult with faculty about curricular policy, and the policy improves. We have empirical evidence right here. The shared governance in which ASCSU engaged with the Chancellor's Office worked. Was it optimal? Absolutely not. Did it have an impact? Absolutely.

But let's not stop the logic there. It stands to reason that if consulting with 10 ASCSU faculty is good, then consulting with 53 ASCSU faculty is even better. While we're reasoning, let's stipulate that if consulting with 53 faculty is better, then consulting with roughly 28,000 is best. Of course, this last logic leap is impossible, so that's what campus senates are for. The problem is, they had no opportunity to review the EO in draft form before it was published, like ASCSU did. There was no time.

With the blistering pace of change, wider formal consultation suffers. That's not good. It's not healthy for the system. . . . It's not good for the students. [The ellipses reflect the logical dots I'm sure you can connect for yourself between shared governance and the best interests of students, most especially when it comes to curricular policy.]

Therefore, you won't be surprised when I repeat what I've been saying for months, in every venue when I get the chance: faculty need more time to consider and provide input on changes to curricular policies such as EO 1100. I've said it at Board of Trustees meetings, I've said it at Provost's meetings, I've said it in meetings with anyone whose job title includes the word "chancellor," I've said it to those in the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office, I've said it to reporters, and I've said it to legislators.

Let me pause for a moment to reflect on these venues: I think it's important to acknowledge the pressures from outside exerted on the CSU to enact changes to GE policy. I use the word "enact" quite specifically here, because it's no secret that a little over a year ago assembly

members discussed pursuing legislation governing general education, and Governor Brown was in contact with the Chancellor's Office regarding his concerns about GE as well. In addition, the Chancellor's Office was under intense pressure last Spring, led chiefly by members of the California Acceleration Project, to remove Intermediate Algebra as a pre-requisite in GE (see my last report for more detail). The press picked up on the issue, and OpEds began to fly, including a call for litigators to sue the CSU immediately for violating students' civil rights. I offer this perspective not as any sort of justification, but simply in the spirit of understanding the landscape surrounding changes to EO 1100. I also offer to you my speaking notes from both the legislative hearing at which I testified as well as the CAP meeting at which I represented CSU faculty. Perhaps they might give you a sense of how these outside pressures are manifest, how they can influence the shared governance process, and how I have sought to manage them on the Senate's behalf.

In closing, although I have heard faculty express support for the *goals* of the Graduation Initiative because it is aligned with their own goals to improve student success, I am also aware of widespread consternation among faculty specifically concerning the revisions to EO 1100. Significant frustration centers around 1) the timeline for change (Fall 2018) and 2) the desire--nay, imperative--to participate in the shared governance that brought about those changes. I reiterate the maxim that faculty consultation improves curricular policies, and I will continue my advocacy toward that aim. Only under such circumstances can our theme of "collective voice" (mentioned earlier in this report) be authentic.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine M. Miller