

CSU Council of Campus Senate Chairs
Minutes of meeting on Thursday, November 30, 2017
Anacapa conference room, CSU Office of the Chancellor,
401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802

Members approved the Agenda. However, Item 10 was moved up to accommodate those needing to leave early. In addition, our email input led to some additional items to cover.

The Minutes were deferred to our February 2018 meeting.

- Brief campus reports
 - LA: Looking to expand Senate membership.
 - Maritime Academy: Working on an administrative review policy; one key outcome will be generation of a “real” report that others can see. Senators see a need to totally rewrite the Constitution and Bylaws portions of the Policy File.
 - Fullerton: Dealing with some uncertainties as the Provost is retiring and the President resigned. Faculty and staff are dismayed to see so many interim administrators. The WASC review is underway, and a strategic plan is in play as well.
 - San Bernardino: Feeling that shared governance is in shambles. A campus climate consultant (external) may come to campus but the selection of people to oversee that process is odd (not enough faculty). Constitution and Bylaws revisions are on the way; Senators are exploring how to ensure they have the option to override a veto—something that’s more than ceremonial. Senators also want to increase lecturer representation. A positive is that the campus’ EO 1100 extension request was approved.
 - Long Beach: Feeling relieved that Norbert is doing so well. While Senators approved a Resolution decrying the EO 1100 implementation process, the President chose not to request a delay -- and that dispirited people.
 - Pomona: Feeling concerned about the CO’s interest in capturing some of the campus’ Summer Session funds.
 - San Francisco: Updating its administrative review policy and search policy as well. In addition, both the Constitution and Bylaws are under review, given how many sections are unclear and/or error-filled. The campus is in “search hell” (several VPs as well as the Provost); there are far too many interims in place. The campus owns several rentals but is now dealing with a number of rent control issues.
 - SDSU: Dealing with Area C and E issues relative to EO 1100 (no answer yet on our extension request), the search for a new President, and our effort to gain control of the Mission Valley property (where the Chargers formally played).
 - San Marcos: Also dealing with a variety of EO 1100 issues; it will take significant time to update student planners/maps/etc. IRB policy is being revised to comply with federal law

- San Luis Obispo: Dealing with some problems associated with blended programs offered by the campus; one has actually been suspended.
 - Sacramento: Changing its Chair policy so that lecturers can participate in voting; WASC recommendations are informing campus conversations on institutional effectiveness.
 - San Jose: Welcoming a new President; Senators are exploring a veto policy, and there's also a push to broaden representation.
 - Dominguez Hills: Broadening shared governance in an effort to be more inclusive. Senators also want to ensure lecturer representation on its Presidential Search Committee. A number of Resolutions are being considered.
 - East Bay: Expressing concerns due to problems with CalState Apply.
-
- Chris Miller
 - Issues with CalState Apply.
 - Quantitative reasoning. ASCSU seeks to ensure that the Task Force's recommendations are fully integrated into the EOs.
 - Shared governance. The November plenary featured a major Committee of the Whole discussion on this—which, in time, could lead to some action on the CO's part. She lamented the growing debate about varying definitions rather than getting to the heart of the matter, which is elevation of the faculty voice; the legislature is getting too involved in activities that are the purview of faculty. The CSU definitely wants to improve communications; everyone recognizes that it's a problem. Chris will forward two documents; one is the Sacramento campus' statement of shared governance, while the other is about "rules of the road" (meaning: how to enact shared governance). She sees the latter as a living document.
 - Project Rebound (incarcerated students). ASCSU approved a Resolution seeking more resources and recognition.
 - CID (course identification system). There is a review system for determining which community college courses "count." ASCSU approved a resolution to turn the process over to articulation staff (rather than faculty) due to the backlog—but she personally isn't pleased with this.
 - Sustainable Financial Model Task Force. Members are exploring low, predictable tuition increases – and we need keep a vigilant eye on this.
 - Hearing of the Senate Select Committee on Student Success (to be held at Santa Monica Community College). The focus is on the CSU's growing role in remediation.
 - Lobbying. She questions whether CFA is helping or hindering our process—and our ultimate success on a number of issues.

 - Open letter regarding EOs

- EOs
 - Each campus recapped its EO 1100 experiences. Monterey Bay's request was denied, as was Fullerton's. Some campuses will face staffing issues and other problems that could negatively affect student progress toward degree.

- Senate Committee structure
 - Long Beach: Councils report to the Executive Committee at the end of the academic year.
 - Fullerton: Meets with Chairs regularly.
 - Northridge: Each committee must provide expectations, and then the Chair has a tool for assessing accountability; documentation is key. There is some mismatch between a committee's charge (mission) and what it really does. He meets with Chairs before each Senate meeting – which leads to more collegiality and support.
 - Dominguez Hills: In the process of creating guidelines on committee operations; Senators are also rethinking/updating committee charges (mission statements). Some committees that are now are classified as “other” should really be part of the “standing” group.

- Locations for meetings
 - February 22/San Jose

- Chairs / Constitution and Bylaws of our own (discussion of how formal a body we need or want to be)
 - Stanislaus: Advocated for an organizing guide; we need info to be truly prepared for our roles. Perhaps we need to elect our convener earlier than we do now.
 - San Bernardino: Advocated for an archivist; we have a real need for institutional history.
 - Northridge: Advocated for focusing on our purpose; clearly, we're trying to insert ourselves into a formal structure from which we've been omitted. We won't be "legitimate" without formal recognition.
 - Miller: Focused on the term *Council*. She reminded us that ASCSU Councils have Constitutions.
 - Maritime Academy and Monterey Bay: Argued against formality; we might overlap ASCSU and it would increase our workload.
 - San Jose: Indicated being on the line about this; it's better to err on the side of less formality.

- East Bay: Advocated for some sort of structure – a lean version, perhaps, of Robert’s Rules of Order. Without processes and procedures, no one is accountable or responsible.
- Sacramento: Concerned that if we're too formal, the CO will play us against one another.
- Miller: Reminded us that there may be negative aspects of our *physically* meeting more often.

Motion: Support formation of a subcommittee (amendment) to explore guiding documents (but *not* a formal Constitution and Bylaws). There was some dissension about the formality of having a motion—that this is something we can simply agree to work on.

- Shared governance: Best we remember that shared governance outlives any one person's tenure. We'd be better served by discussing how young faculty are acculturated into the concept/mindset.

- CFA president Jennifer Eagan
 - CFA responded to EO 1100 and 1110 with two resolutions (neither of them focused on curriculum).
 - CFA is in the midst of a meet-and-confer with the CO regarding working conditions associated with the two EOs. At the first meeting, CFA specifically clarified that its focus is on job impacts, not the content of the orders themselves. For example, the CFA is arguing that the CO didn't adequately investigate how these orders could result in job loss. The CO is supposed to address the union's information request prior to the next session.
 - Word is out, however, that the CO sees the meet-and-confer as done; its position is that the CFA didn't bring forward anything with negotiable impacts.
 - Mistakes made about courses changes could lead to lawsuits from lecturers; grievances could be on the horizon. The CFA sees this whole situation as a significant breach of shared governance.
 - CFA revised its Bylaws—specifically, racial and social justice are now part of its mission statement; the Board is expanding as well—with some changes in leadership composition. In addition, the overall language is now more gender neutral.
 - There is continued discussion around Article 22.7 (extended to 2020) which covers exceptional service to students. The intent here is partly workload relief but also cultural taxation. Faculty from underrepresented groups have a special cultural taxation—meaning, they take on work that others don't (mentoring, etc.). The CFA wants us to ensure that each

campus has stringent criteria in place—otherwise we will lose ground. There is concern that lecturers aren't being appropriately compensated for the service work they do. However, some campuses are arguing that the contract language is flawed—resulting in too much effort required to get awards approved while also creating unnecessary tension between lecturers and faculty.

- Other Council member input to Jennifer included the addition of scope of work guidelines in RTP (lecturers and faculty) and removal of unnecessary limitations about who can actually teach (staff and administrators excluded).