

## Executive Committee Minutes

April 20, 2017

8:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Virtual

### 1. Call to order

With a quorum being present, the meeting was called to order.

### 2. Attendance

The following ASCSU ExCom members were in attendance: Christine Miller (Chair), Catherine Nelson (Vice-Chair) Robert Keith Collins (Secretary), Kevin Baaske (At-Large Senator) Tom Krabacher (At-Large Senator), Steven Filling (Immediate Past Chair), Steven Stepanek (Faculty Trustee).

### 3. Approval of agenda

The Agenda was Approved.

### 4. Approval of minutes of March 15, 2017

The Minutes were Approved.

### 5. Appointments

Central in this discussion was the appointments to the General Education (GE) Task Force and the nature of their work.

### 6. Liaison Reports

#### *Academic Affairs (AA)*

Academic Affairs (AA) Liaison, Vice Chair Nelson, reported that the committee discussed the responses to the graduate education resolution. The active learning resolution will be ready for Second Reading during the May plenary. AA also offered feedback on the IP policy feedback. AA Liaison Nelson also reported that the committee believed the FAQs timeline to be aggressive. The committee also discussed the need for faculty development in delivering developmental education, the use of ELM and EPT in the CSU, the need for shifting resources to classrooms, and equity for native students that have met standards to facilitate graduation. AA would also examine the potential damage to research and retention of new faculty.

*Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP)*

APEP Liaison, At-Large Senator Baaske reported that the committee is unhappy that they were not consulted or even informed of the changes implied or stated in the Academic Preparation FAQ. On the subject of IP, APEP supports the ASCSU referring to/forwarding/endorsing the San Jose State University White Paper as the ASCSU feedback.

*Faculty Affairs (FA)*

FA Liaison, Secretary Collins, reported that the committee considered that it is too late to be involved on the draft IP policy. This rationale is based in concerns this is a governance and bargaining issue. To ask for participation now – which has been denied from the beginning - would continue a false naïveté of our relationship with the University Counsel. FA is concerned with flouting governance, as defined by AAUP, and time sensitivity due to bargaining. It is important to not think of this as an opportunity. We have not been engaged. FA believes in faculty. The CO seems to have brought FA the bargaining policy and want our feedback. The only body for bargaining is the CFA. This is an opportunity for the ASCSU to say we have given up on the CO request for consultation. It is important for the ASCSU to act as a group that is working on including faculty feedback. Non-reaction is not a way to go. It does not take away from the anger or force or purview of the faculty. There is concern on FA that the CO is filtering this through committees. To what extent is it ASCSU responsibility to tell campuses that they cannot talk to the CO about academic freedom? We are not to be a filter for campus responses. Campus voices are not just through the ASCSU. Lastly, FA Liaison Collins reported that FA would examine the TA workload concerns. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. It might be important to give senators a walk-through of the situation in the fall on the continuing struggles regarding appropriate consultation.
- b. Is it possible to have a conversation with EVC Blanchard on consultation?
- c. It is possible to have a conversation on getting things done quickly and the problems it poses for consultation.
- d. Is it possible to show that we can also be expeditious? This may facilitate greater consultation.

*Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA)*

FGA Liaison, At-Large Senator Krabacher, reported that the committee was perfecting the resolution on veteran students, based on feedback from the ASCSU. The committee also engaged in a debrief on Advocacy Day activities and the need for follow-ups were discussed. FGA also met with AVC Sullivan based on his interests in English and math placement and academic

technology information would be shared with Christian Osmena, California Department of Finance. FGA Liaison Krabacher also reported that the committee discussed tenure density information sent to Shirley Weber's office, examined legislative positions and the need for updating current bill positions from watch to, for, or against. The ASCSU would be asked about their positions on AB 957 Levine, as this bill was not on the master list and information will be forwarded beforehand. AB 856 and AB 1386 are also new bills and FGA will forward new suggested positions to the ASCSU Executive Committee. FGA also would like a cake purchased for departing senators from the money being saved from the social and consideration of the issues raised by San Jose State University on IP. In a similar vein, Senator Lee asked that the installation of cameras in the classroom at San Jose State be examined and where or not this is happening on other campuses, for what purposes, and has this been discussed. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. There are particular classrooms where this is occurring, particularly for anti-theft reasons, etc.
- b. Is there a system-wide policy on the use of cameras in the classroom?

**7. Time Certain: Leo Van Cleve (12:30p.m.)**

With a time certain reached, the ASCSU Executive Committee met with AVC Van Cleve. He reported on the four areas mentioned in the memo from EVC Blanchard regarding consultations that have begun. The following concerns and questions were raised.

- a. To what extent is the information being reported consistent with the FAQs? Campus Senate Chairs have questions regarding the origins of the FAQs. It is important to have run this information past the ASCSU.
- b. It is important to have a meeting between the ASCSU Executive Committee Meeting and the Senior Strategist for Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence.
- c. Regarding process in the FAQs, on page 2, number 5, on workgroups, to what extent are selections based recommendation from the academic senate? Does this infer that the campus president will select faculty? Faculty selection is the purview of the academic senates. Does Academic Senate mean ASCSU?
- d. This information will be checked.
- e. On page 3, #5, it asks what will happen to students that do not pass their GE stretch math course. What policy is being referred to?
- f. What is the role that Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) will be playing? Additional information would be useful.

- g. This language is pointing out the kind of technology that can move students along.
- h. There seems to be confusion about the FAQs. Will there be phasing out of ELM (Entry Level Mathematics) and EPT? Early Start is still in the language and one way to get out of ELM and EPT (English Placement Test). Who will go to Early Start?
- i. Is it possible to get someone to address the FAQs? Language on page 4 suggests that ELM (Entry Level Mathematics) and EPT (English Placement Test) will be replaced.
- j. Greater communication is necessary.
- k. It is important to understand that the document reads as if decisions have already been made.
- l. APEP could have offered useful feedback on the FAQs and is in need of consultation.
- m. The concerns expressed are not meant to suggest that the substance of the information is bad; however, it is important to talk to people first about whether these are good ideas.
- n. On Senate Office Staff, hopefully the job will be posted soon, and we may have to be creative to give support. Resumes for temps will be reviewed soon.
- o. How is the budget being received and when might we hear back?
- p. Once the budgets are put together and EVC Relyea has been consulted, it will be reviewed. A response could be expected in June.
- q. Is there any sense where the budget is and when will it be communicated to campuses?
- r. We hear in our advocacy about a conservative budget and one time moneys, is the Chancellor's Office (CO) strategizing about how one time moneys will be used? Any ideas about how these funds would be used?
- s. Discussion at the campus senate chairs revolved around TAs clocking in their hours. Have you heard anything on this practice? Is it connected to a grievance?
- t. There has been discussion and it seems to be related to the new minimum wage law.
- u. AVC Sheila Thomas, Self-Support Strategy and Partnerships and Dean of Extended Education, reported to Academic Affairs (AA) that TAs have gone to exempt status.
- v. There seems to be curricular implications in this TAs issue.

## **8. Chair's report**

ASCSU Chair Miller reported that she attended Hill Day in Washington, DC with the Chancellor to advocate for the CSU. She wasn't slated to do so, but the Executive Committee met with the Chancellor after plenary and he mentioned her attending, so she followed up shortly thereafter and an invitation was extended. Chair Miller also reported that she attended the CSU Alumni reception before Hill Day and met with alums living on the east coast. Her meetings also included Congressional representatives Ami Bera and Doris Matsui, and the Policy Advisor for the House Workforce Committee; then she, the Chancellor, the Chair of the Board of Trustees (BoT) and the Student Trustee met with the California Democratic caucus, Senator Camilla Harris, and Congresswoman Susan Davis. At each meeting, year-Round Pell was discussed. Chair Miller also reported that she will work to make sure that the ASCSU Chair is included in future Hill Day advocacy activities and she and At-Large Senator Krabacher will attend the upcoming legislative reception on Golden Bear in Sacramento. These advocacy activities are part of concerted efforts in both capitals and is the result - in large part - of ASCSU legislative work. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. Was there any coordination with our CFA counterparts?
- b. CFA had their own advocacy day.
- c. During the Sacramento CSU advocacy day, the delegation included: ASCSU Chair Miller, the Chancellor, the Student Trustee, and a representative of SEIU.
- d. Advocacy stakeholder groups have included CFA representatives.
- e. It is important for the CFA to be part of these new advocacy efforts.

## **9. Resolution responses**

Central in this discussion was that the nature of the CO responses to ASCSU Resolutions. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. It is important for Academic Affairs (AA) to consider continuing their discussions of graduate education.

## **10. Quantitative Reasoning**

This discussion centered on the extension and expansion of the search for the Center Co-Director and the maintaining of the same start date.

## **11. General Education Task Force**

This discussion centered on updates from General Education (GE) Task Force. The task force has met once and the meeting centered on shared governance and engaged the concerns regarding UC, CCC, and BoT. The task force also discussed the importance of centering decisions about GE more locally. The May meeting will focus on the philosophical ideas surrounding GE through an examination of the

learning outcomes from Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP), and the June meeting will examine the CSU data. BoT Chair Eisen has requested data. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. Is the data coming in useful to task force goals?
- b. No. It is important to pay attention to the nature of the data. For example, campus websites may be limited and it may be necessary to look at other areas that show best practices in the CSU.
- c. There seems to be some mapping occurring that was inconsistent with what campuses do (i.e., local requirements, Ethnic Studies, etc.).
- d. It may be important to have holistic articulations of what campuses do.

## **12. Intellectual Property (IP)**

This discussion centered on the importance of the review deadline, possible extension of the deadline beyond plenary, and the differences in responses to the draft IP Policy. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. It is important to pay attention to the differences in response to the IP policy related to size of campuses and research activities. Responses may be college dependent.
- b. It is important to pay attention to campus reactions, why we are providing feedback, and why faculty may be resistant, etc.
- c. It is important to pay attention to the perspectives offered, faculty unity, and the need for this information to be shared between CFA and ASCSU.
- d. It is important to for the ASCSU to go on record.
- e. It is important to pay attention to what is the purview of the faculty and collective bargaining.
- f. It is important to consider the San Jose State University responses to the draft policy.
- g. It is important to pay attention to our shared interests. Given the way this process has played out, it is important to share our thoughts with our colleagues, with particular attention to the 3rd Resolve in the resolution.
- h. It is important to consider the San Jose State University statement and offer a link to this document in the resolution.
- i. It is important to pay attention to the possibility that this policy may be used as a wedge issue between the ASCSU and CFA.
- j. It is important to think about the curricular and pedagogical implications of IP and making a clear statement.
- k. It is important to consider the viability of the extra time being offered by the CO.

- l. Would the senate consider not using the June deadline?
- m. It is important to have a resolved clause that asks the AAUP to opine on the draft and associated documents.
- n. It is important to take advantage of the gesture from the CO related to the extended deadline.
- o. It is important to pay attention to the variations that colleges and departments may represent on the issue of IP.
- p. It is important to keep open the opportunities for input.
- q. It is important to find ways for faculty to engage all trustees.
- r. To what extent is the for-profit mentality of concern in the IP policy?
- s. FA is considering a resolution.
- t. It is important that FA consider bringing in AAUP to discuss the implications the policy holds for shared governance.
- u. FA's position is that formal comment will not be offered at this time.

### **13. Plenary guests for May and September**

This discussion centered on invitations that have been extended to the Student Success Network (SSN), EVC Blanchard, Chancellor White, Liaisons, Lark Park, Senior Advisor for Policy in the Office of the Governor and Christian Osmena, California Department of Finance have all indicated that they would like to attend. Trustee Day has been tentatively scheduled to attend and confirmation from Ms. Tracy is being awaited. Hans from Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) has not yet been contacted and an invitation will be next September. Mary Anne Petrisco from WASC has also be invited. The following concerns and questions were raised.

- a. Is it possible to invited Mike Mauer from AAUP for September, as he would be good on topics of shared governance? His discussions would bring new senators up to speed.
- b. It is important to pay attention to budget and not set a precedent of paying people to attend the ASCSU plenary.
- c. Immediate Past Chair Steven Filling will examine possible joint efforts to reduce costs.
- d. Chair Miller will follow through with Hans and Mary Anne Petrisco.
- e. It is important to consider the benefits of the information that each guest will bring.

### **14. ASCSU Budget**

This discussion centered on the submission of the 2017-18 ASCSU budget request. Chair Miller and the Executive Committee thanked Vice Chair Nelson for her hard work.

### **15. Senate staff**

Central in this discussion was the need for more Academic Senate Office Staff and for senators to understand that Ms. Butler is covering two positions until additional staff is hired.

### **16. ASCSU Calendar Resolution**

Central in this discussion was the ASCSU Calendar for 2017-18 and the need to pay attention to any potential conflict with ASCSU business.

### **17. Budget and legislative advocacy**

This discussion centered on recommendations to reinstitute a legislative specialist in 2017-18, the pending budget, and the continued importance of ASCSU advocacy. Chair Miller reported that she would attend as many meetings as possible. These include the reception on the Golden Bear in Sacramento and the Assembly Sub-Committee II on Wednesday, which will be considering SB 677. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. It is important to have a presence in the capital on a regular basis.
- b. It is important to support the work that went into setting up the different meetings.
- c. It is important to discuss the ASCSU position on AB 393.
- d. It is important to have more substance (i.e., specific campus examples, etc.) behind talking points.
- e. It may be important to work with the same team all day and consider the implications of assigning work based on geography.
- f. It is important to give serious consideration to the responsibilities of the legislative specialist. During an election year, it may not make sense to have a legislative specialist in the Fall. FGA is doing research and developing work for the spring. It is important to be proactive, rather than reactive.

### **18. Reed scholarship**

Central in this discussion was the \$400.00 collected in contributions for the Reed scholarship.

### **19. Trustee nomination process revisions**

This item will be discussed at a future meeting.

### **20. Academic Conference feedback**

This item will be discussed at a future meeting.

### **21. Departing Senators**

Central in this discussion was the importance of having campus delegations create a commendation for their departing senators and to be resources in finding

information on senator service. Chair Miller asked Vice Chair Nelson to take charge of contacting senators to inform them of this protocol and that it is important to know that some senators do not want their home campus delegations to write a commendation. It is important to pay attention to these concerns. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. Who is departing?
- b. It is important to have next year's Executive Committee look into Senator Reggio's service and release time.

## **22. Academic Preparation FAQ**

Discussion centered on the need to extend an invitation to James Minor, to discuss consultation process. It is important to pay attention to the unintended consequences of limited consultation. The following concerns and questions were raised:

- a. It is important to also have a conversation with University Council.
- b. A resolution may also be necessary.

## **23. Adjournment**

The ASCSU Plenary adjourned at 2:00p.m.

**Respectfully submitted by Robert Keith Collins, ASCSU Secretary**