

**CSU Council of Campus Senate Chairs**  
**Minutes of meeting on Thursday, April 12, 2018, 10:00 am-3:00 pm**  
**Anacapa Board Room**  
**CSU Chancellor's Office, Long Beach**

**Present in person:**

Stefan Frazier (AS Chair, San Jose State University), Mark Karplus (AS Chair, CSU East Bay), Chris Miller (ASCSU Chair, Sacramento State University), Norbert Schürer (AS Chair, CSULB), Julie Shen (AS Chair, CSU Pomona)

**Present by Zoom:**

Virgil Adams (AS Chair, CSU Channel Islands), Marcie Bober-Michel (AS Chair, San Diego State University), Cathlin Davis (Speaker of the Faculty, CSU Stanislaus), Nancy Gerber (Chair of the Senate, San Francisco State University), Thomas Holyoke (AS Chair, Fresno State University), Karen Kolehmainen (AS Chair, CSU San Bernadino), Suzanne Moineau (AS Chair, CSU San Marcos), Tom Nordenholz (AS Chair, Cal Maritime Academy), Veena Prabhu (AS Chair, CSU Los Angeles), Michael Scott (AS Chair, CSU Monterey Bay), Julie Shen (AS Chair, Cal Poly Pomona), Stephen Stambough (AS Chair, CSU Fullerton), Dustin Stegner (AS Chair, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo), Adam Swenson (AS Chair, CSU Northridge), Laura Talamante (AS Chair, CSU Dominguez Hills), Jed Wyrick (AS Chair, CSU Chico)

Guests: Tracy Butler (Director, Academic Senate CSU Staff); Reem Osman (Administrative Support, Academic Senate CSU), Alison Wrynn (State University Associate Dean for Academic Programs)

**Absent:**

Julia Alderson (AS Chair, Humboldt State University), Deborah Boschini (AS Chair, CSU Bakersfield), Julian Heather (AS Chair, CSU Sacramento), Carmen Works (AS Chair, Sonoma State University)

**1. Review of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved.

**2. Review of the Minutes from February 22, 2018**

The minutes were approved.

**3. Brief Campus Reports**

- At **San Diego State University**, a new president is coming in. Current president Roush's last decision will be what to do with mascot (Aztecs). A task force on the mascot will finish its work on April 30; then there will be a special Senate meeting on

the matter. With regard to EO 1100, Category C biggest problem: colleges are fighting over it.

- At **CSU Dominguez Hills**, the campus is excited about the incoming new president. The campus committee had a good experience in the hiring process and was happy with the process. A task force worked on best practices for lecturer faculty; now the campus is working with the president to implement the recommendations. With regard to EO 1100, there is a resolution from the GE committee to change the Category D requirement, but that will be controversial. The campus intends to keep the statutory requirement from the Chancellor's Office, but collapse other categories—so some departments will lose out. The Senate is moving forward on increasing the representation of lecturer faculty, perhaps with an incentive of stipends.
- At **Cal Poly San Luis Obispo**, with regard to EO 1100, the Senate is looking at migrating their current upper-division Category F (the individual and technology) into the new upper-division Category B. The campus currently has no Category E and will probably roll one area of Category D into E.
- At **San Francisco State University**, there is an issue with the presidential review. The ASI president has asked the CSU Board of Trustees to remove the president. Regarding EO 1100, the biggest challenge in the proposed Baccalaureate Requirements Policy is to figure out what to do with the second semester of writing—perhaps do writing in Category E courses. The interim Provost has become permanent, and two VP searches are going on. The campus is grappling with the challenge of housing in San Francisco.
- At **CSU Stanislaus**, regarding EO 1100, a new policy is close to passing. The biggest issue is the multicultural requirement, which is not going away, but probably moving into a graduation requirement that may be fulfilled through GE *or* in major courses. There is still a two-semester writing requirement: the first semester is a (stretch) writing class in Category E; the second is a (stretch) A2/English class.
- At **CSU Fresno**, shared governance is going well: the president consulted with the Executive Committee of the Senate and the deans about choosing an interim provost. The previous provost was stolen by CSU Bakersfield to become their president. Regarding EO 1100, the campus is moving the multicultural requirement out of GE and making it a stand-alone requirement.
- At **CSU Los Angeles**, Senate representation was expanded to include seven lecturer faculty and two staff (who are elected through the office of the Vice President of Administration and Finance). There are or have been retreats on diversity and inclusion; team-building; conscious steps to empower all committees; and faculty perceptions of administrators.

- At **CSU San Bernardino**, the conversion from quarters to semesters is winding its way through the process. The Senate determined that switching to a 3/3 teaching load would only raise the budget by 1% and therefore recommended the switch; the president rejected the proposal without an explanation. With regard to EO 1100, the biggest challenge is how to define (or subdefine) Category C. There has been a hitch with the size of programs: some deans are claiming that majors with 45-48 units are too large. Some deans are consulting with the programs, others are not. There is a problem with shared governance in that the president is no longer willing to talk with faculty unless students and staff are included as well. A task force is looking for a consultant to work with the various constituents, and any suggestions for a consultant are welcome. The Senate is working on a revision of its constitution and bylaws in order to include more lecturer faculty and plans to speak with the provost about the possibility of stipends.
- At **CSU Monterey Bay**, lecturer faculty are eligible for all positions on the Senate. Regarding EO 1100, there were two curricular models in front of the Senate, and the one that included a language requirement for all BAs (though not BSs) passed with a vote of 58% to 42%. In order to make that work, BA programs gave up up to nine units. The ethnic studies requirement was moved outside of GE; the world culture requirement is now a Category C course at the upper division.
- At **CSU San Marcos**, the Senate is struggling to fill seats. Regarding EO 1100, the campus had to remove three units from Category D. A language requirement of up to 11 units (maybe through a Category C3, Languages other than English) is still under discussion and had positive feedback on its first reading. There are still six units of diversity requirements on national and global diversity. With 1110, the campus is almost there and should make the fall deadline.
- At **CSU Chico**, the Senate is working on a policy on policies (based on the Humboldt policy) to give guidelines on what has to come through the Senate. There have been discussions about how the Senate should be involved in executive management reviews, and a campus lawyer has claimed that there is no legal basis for any participation. There has been a debate about stricter or at least more precise requirements for early tenure. Regarding EO 1100, a proposal for a language requirement failed. In response to EO 1110, the campus is extending an earlier pilot program for Category IV students (students most in need of remediation) to add co-requisites to B1 science courses.
- At **CSU Maritime**, there is campus unrest. The president has been in office for five years and the provost for three, and there is no more than a moderate level of satisfaction with their understanding of shared governance, their lack of focus on educational priorities in the budget, and their president's attempt to force all students to live on campus for all four years. The student government has passed a spot-on resolution against that last measure and is asking faculty to support it—and the

Senate is in the process of endorsing it officially. There was a contentious faculty meeting with talk about a vote of no confidence or at least a strongly worded letter about the state of affairs and dissatisfaction at the university. The campus leadership never communicated an invitation from the Chancellor's Office to participate in the president's review (supposedly because of a technical snafu) and only sent the invitation out after the Senate chair enquired. There will probably be lots of negative comments; however, there seems to be no procedure in place in terms of how they will be used.

- At **CSU Fullerton**, the policy on the review of MPPs is old, clunky, and has not been enforced for at least 15 years. MPPs are only ever reviewed by people *above* them in the organizational chart. Currently, there are lots of interim administrators. Regarding EO 1100, the Chancellor's Office said it was OK to create subcategories within C1 and C2. A 30-40-page report from the GE task force addressed bigger-picture questions such as funding, interdisciplinary classes, an explorer core, and promoting GE as a value in advising or through alumni.
- At **CSU Northridge**, the campus is looking for a new provost as well as an athletics director (who got into a fistfight with the basketball coach). Regarding EO 1100, the campus has said it will not comply. A separate committee was set up *not* to implement the EOs, but recommend changes to GE, but to bring GE in line with Title 5. One committee randomly took on EO 1110 and tried to cut out the Senate, or at least the Senate chair. Complying with EO 1110 will be no problem in English, but harder in math. All developmental learning is being shoe-horned into one course, creating an administrative and advising nightmare. The Senate chair has been in conflict with Faculty Affairs about changes to personnel procedures in violation of policy. There is no document control system that shows how, when, and by whom changes are made.
- At **CSU Channel Islands**, things are generally going OK, and there is progress in complying with the EOs.
- At **CSU East Bay**, there are challenges with the conversion to semesters in Fall 2018 and the implementation of the EOs (especially in Category C). The Senate is trying to promote more lecturer participation by allowing service on several standing committees.
- At **San Jose State University**, there is finally a full slate of permanent deans—but now the provost is leaving. 'Student success' is a huge issue because the process has been entirely administration-driven, with a consultant brought in from Georgia State University and faculty largely left out of the loop.
- At **CSU Long Beach**, student success is being defined as part of the WASC accreditation process. There is a question about how departments and programs can be created and dissolved. In terms of the EOs, there is fairly extensive consultation.

- At **CSU Pomona**, the biggest anxiety is about the conversion from quarters to semesters. Faculty in particular about the teaching load changing from 3/3/3 to 4/4. In response to the Chancellor's Office's tenure density report, the campus is adopting a strategy of increasing tenure density by 2% per year for the next two years. The president chose to make this a priority. There is a huge branding initiative (with a new logo, seal, and tag line) that came out of a strategic initiative a few years ago. The Senate is trying to extend the representation of lecturer faculty, partly with a stipend.

#### **4. Report by ASCSU Chair Christine Miller**

The Executive Committee of the ASCSU has been continuing discussions (monthly two-hour meetings) on shared governance with the Chancellor's Office (EVC Blanchard and others). A draft statement on shared governance is supposed to be issued tomorrow, and input on that statement will be collected before it will go to the 2017/18 ASCSU in its last meeting for an up or down vote. The statement will be more philosophical in nature, but there has also been progress on a more specific document on best practices and process guidance.

The ASCSU passed a resolution opposing California Assemblywoman Shirley Weber's bill AB 2408 to make ethnic studies a graduation requirement. In the lengthy discussion, there were three main reasons for the opposition: 1) another three-unit requirement would wreak havoc; 2) the legislature should not mandate curriculum (the American institutions requirement came from the Board of Trustees, not the legislature); and 3) every CSU campus already has some form of diversity requirement (for instance, San Francisco State University and San Jose State University embed and infuse ethnic studies across many courses across the curriculum). After conversations with Weber's staff, it appears the Assemblywoman is willing to take out the specific three-unit requirement and replace it with language that requires a 'demonstrated commitment' to ethnic studies and diversity studies and/or a reporting requirement for a document (maybe on each university web site) showing what each campus is doing). The Chancellor's Office has also been involved in the discussion, especially because of last year's task force on ethnic studies. Yesterday, Assemblywoman Weber pulled the bill from the agenda and said she would consult with sponsors—but she might still put the bill back on a later agenda.

It was been advocacy season, with visits to legislators requesting full funding for the CSU system and attendance in budget meetings.

Regarding the tenure density task force, it will fall to each campus to have a response. Miller recommended pushing for specific goals on each campus and agreeing at least in principle to push for higher tenure density and put a concrete plan in place.

- **Karplus** stated that Miller's meeting with the AAUP official was great news and referenced the draft joint statement from ASCSU Executive Committee and administration on shared governance. He expressed concern over proposed expedited consultation, that it was a dangerous concession, especially if applied to curriculum. Karplus asked if the ASCSU statement was the final word on the matter

and would be used to bind campuses as well. **Miller** responded that campuses were still the official voices of their campuses and could therefore have separate statements.

- **Schürer** asked if the talks on shared governance had included any discussion of consistent pay for Senate chairs over the summer. **Miller** responded that that would be mentioned in the procedural document, if at all. The procedural document would also address what counts as circumstances demanding expedited consultation and who arbitrates the matter. The Chancellor's Office had acknowledged that this might be a problem.
- **Moineau** asked if the ASCSU would be sharing a draft of the shared governance statement or the procedural document. **Miller** responded that it was mostly an ASCSU document, but there was no intent to exclude any party from the discussion. However, the statement could not be amended once approved by the Chancellor's Office, since otherwise there would have to be another back and forth.

## 5. Council of Chairs Guidelines and Practices Document

The discussion of last meeting on e-mail lists was continued with input from **Butler** and **Osman**. It was articulated that when one chair puts out a request for information, it is understood that the information in responses will be shared within the campus governance structure.

In Section 3 of the proposed document, "may attend" was replaced with "are invited" since it is unclear who would pay for travel. In Section 7, it was suggested to add a phrase or sentence instituting an annual notice of who is on the e-mail list (to help new chairs or administrative assistants). It was also suggested to take out the specific reference to the 2017/18 calendar and replace it with a link to the web site for the current calendar for any year. **Frazier** was elected caretaker for summer 2018.

## 6. Implementation of Executive Orders

Since Chris Mallon (Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs and Faculty Development) was out, the Council was joined by Alison **Wrynn** (CSU Associate Dean for Academic Programs) for this agenda item.

- **Wrynn** announced that there would be a memo coming out from EVC Blanchard that would probably say that there could not be any requirements in Category C beyond *one* class in C1, *one* class in C2, and *one* class in either.
- **Kolehmainen** explained that their existing GE structure requires four classes in Category C to be in four different areas—one in C1 and three in C2—for a well-rounded GE. **Wrynn** responded with a question about whether the four classes had to be from different departments. She continued that the requirements could not be more restrictive and that the GE structure would potentially have to be adjusted.

- **Schürer** wondered if the Chancellor’s Office could make up their mind if they want to be micromanagers or stick to the bigger picture and asserted that the probable memo would go beyond the Executive Order and constitute a new policy.
- **Moineau** said that the last nine units of GE were unclear.
- **Gerber** said that their GE pattern with subdisciplines C1, C2, and C3 (with exemptions for transfer students) was not precluded by Executive Order 1100. **Wrynn** contradicted that assessment and said that under the probable memo that pattern would perhaps no longer be possible.
- **Gerber** added that their campus also divided Category D into areas D1 (social science), D2 (history), and D3 (government). **Wrynn** responded that that situation was different since the campus was double-counting classes.
- **Wyrick** asked what the consultation process for this new policy on Category C was and asked if History 130 was acceptable. **Wrynn** responded that History 130 was acceptable as long as the campus had determined that it met the learning outcomes.
- **Wyrick** worried that their campus was out of compliance with EO 1100 by creating two subcategories in Category D: D1 (individual in society) and D2 (social institutions). **Wrynn** confirmed that that would indeed not be acceptable.
- **Wyrick** asked for more clarification and specificity on subcategories C1 and C2. **Wrynn** answered that the third class should be up to students and that the timeline on the probable memo was unclear.
- **Frazier** asserted that the restrictions on Category were a fundamentally new interpretation with no consultation or communication. This interpretation is overly restrictive and will create massive problems. It is furthermore surprising considering that the EO 1100 encouraged campuses to be creative with overlays (e.g., diversity, global issues). **Frazier** wondered why there was any concern from the Chancellor’s Office if categories are specified and if there are no bottlenecks for students. **Wrynn** worried that there may be different standards for native students vs. transfer students, but **Frazier** assured her that this was not a problem.
- **Kolehmainen** said that the Chancellor’s Office claim of not being aware of campus patterns in GE seemed disingenuous—their GE pattern has been in place for 37 years. Being told what to do at the very last minute was disrespectful to campuses.
- **Schürer** requested that the Chancellor’s Office reconsider their apparent position on Category C.
- **Moineau** asked whether administrators knew that an update was coming. **Wrynn** responded that provosts were aware and that the matter had been discussed at yesterday’s meeting of AVPs for Academic Programs.

- **Moineau** wondered when the memo was coming out and how detailed it would be. **Wrynn** responded that the answer was not exactly clear, but that the memo would probably come out next week.
- **Frazier** commented that his campus was already precisely in conformance with EO 1100, so they did not have a problem. However, as a linguist, he felt obliged to point out that the final parenthesis in the sentence, “Students would be instructed to take 3 semester units each in C1, C2 and C3 with the 3 remaining Area C units to be taken in either C1 or C2 (as specified by the campus)” (FAQ on EO 1100 Revised, updated 4/20/18, #14/p.4) allowed only one interpretation, namely that campuses *may* make such a specification.
- **Talamante** noted that the interpretation of the Executive Orders diverged between the Chancellor’s Office and the campuses and that the more restrictive interpretation of Category C constituted an additional policy without consultation or discussion.

After Wrynn’s departure, **Miller** announced that she would notify the Academic Affairs committee of the ASCSU of the discussion. **Bober-Michel** added that the communication chain was challenging, especially with the blizzard of constant new information. It remains unclear what actions are required and under what timeline, and there is clearly little respect for faculty workload and time. There are mixed messages about governance of the CSU system coming out of the Chancellor’s Office—on the one hand, the CO claims to be interested only in the bigger picture; on the other hand, the CO seems to be trying to micromanage campuses—which complicates the situation. For instance, overlays are encouraged by the Executive Orders, but then the goalposts keep moving. There was consensus that the March 23 memo was *not* an interpretation of the existing Executive Order, but a *new* policy.

## 7. AAUP Letter Regarding the Executive Orders

ASCSU chair **Miller** reported that she had a meeting with Hans-Jörg Tiede from the AAUP on Monday before Hill Day in Washington, DC, and was joined by Chancellor White. Miller is optimistic about a resolution to the situation. Tiede is still responding to the discussion, and the ASCSU can still approach the AAUP.

**Karplus** reported that CSU East Bay is working on a resolution to spread more knowledge of the topic. The resolution mirrors the ASCSU first reading item and links to other resolutions and responses. It also includes a criticism of the Chancellor’s Office for still not understanding the underlying issue and thanks the AAUP for taking notice. Karplus encouraged other campuses to write similar resolutions. **Talamante** suggested that the AAUP letter was causing trouble in discussions about shared governance. **Miller** responded that the resolutions from the ASCSU and CSU East Bay threaded the needle of expressing gratitude to the AAUP for their interest but discouraging (or not asking for) any further involvement.

## 8. Presidential Review

- **Moineau** reported that at CSU San Marcos, the president was last reviewed in April 2017. The Senate chair was interviewed, but there was no public comment period, and feedback was only presented with six months' delay.
- **Nordenholz** expressed shock that process is not more robust.
- **Gerber** reported that at San Francisco State University there was no evidence of the supposed review except for a one-page letter.
- **Karplus** summarized that the perceived lack of consultation or participation was a large problem and wondered if the process was more robust in the past.
- **Schürer** asked if the matter of presidential review was mentioned in the shared governance talks with the Chancellor's Office. **Miller** responded that this was more of a personnel issue, while the talks were more about curriculum.
- **Shen** reported that CSU Pomona's president was reviewed late last year. There was an all-campus e-mail, good communication, and a final report by January.
- **Holyoke** added that his experience at Fresno State University was similar to Shen's at CSU Pomona. However, the final report was pretty thin and had no real consequences.
- **Bober-Michel** said that at San Diego State University the Senate plays a significant role in the *hiring* of high-level administrators, but only a limited role in reviews. However, those reviews are real and have real consequences. The review process is often idiosyncratic and was no better in the 'good old days.' To her knowledge, there is no document at the CSU level that prevents faculty from being involved in review processes.
- **Nordenholz** suggested it might be a good idea to collect information on how reviews are being differently implemented.
- **Talamante** wondered if reviews are perhaps better implemented with presidents who are doing well and added that reviews need to be equitable (across the system) as well as transparent.

## 9. Presidential Searches

- **Frazier** reported that presidential searches at San Jose State University used to be open, but have been closed at the Chancellor's Office's behest. The current president, who has been in office now for two years, was the first brought in through a closed search. Now, the assessment is that there would have been a different (and better) choice if the faculty had been given the opportunity for input.
- **Shen** reported that the current president at CSU Pomona, who was previously provost at CSU Bakersfield, was brought in through a closed search. There was one faculty member on the campus committee advising the search committee. The

campus committee was surprised by the candidates chosen as well as the final choice for president.

- **Holyoke** reported that there was lots of angst about the closed search at Fresno State University, but now campus likes the new president. There was an op-ed in the Fresno newspaper to that effect. The Board of Trustees claims that there is a better applicant pool if searches are closed, but opinion is divided on whether that claim is true.
- **Bober-Michel** reported that in closed searches shared governance structures, and particularly faculty, have to be much more proactive and invest lots of time and work. At San Diego State University, the advisory committee on the presidential search (which included two faculty members and the Senate chair *ex officio*) held 15 listening sessions by advisory committee. The Chancellor's Office and the search committee listened particularly to the input on desired characteristics for candidates and brought in good finalists.
- **Stambough** reported that at CSU Fullerton the search felt a little more open than it was before at the beginning. He asked what the best practice (open vs. closed) was in universities across the country or if there was any official position from national committees or councils. He wondered if people wouldn't simply assume that most candidates are searching for new jobs anyway.
- **Talamante** reported that at CSU Dominguez Hills they took the open forums (listening sessions) at San Diego State University as their model. There were three pre-meetings, a well-attended open forum, and lots of discussions with the consulting firm.

## 10. American Institutions Requirements

This topic was partly discussed under other agenda items.

## 11. Extended Education Budget Decisions

**Moineau** asked if there were any policies, procedures, or oversight on other campuses managing the tuition, enrollment, and profit margin of extended education units. She said that on her campus the landscape was regularly changing without any clarity about the financial structure and indirect costs. **Schürer** responded that at CSULB there was a board for the extended education unit (College of Continuing and Professional Education) and that he had just requested information on the finances of CCPE. **Moineau** added that she would send out an e-mail requesting more information.

## 12. Control of Student Success Initiatives

**Frazier** reported that San Jose State University the student success initiative was being taken over more and more by Student Affairs and administrators, and that faculty were being by-passed. **Gerber** responded that at SFSU the situation was similar, but not quite as bad: the

initiative was jointly led by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. It used to be largely faculty, but once more money was involved administrators took over. **Karplus** noted that at CSU East Bay the initiative was in flux: there were ties with Enrollment Management; mostly it was an administrative committee under Academic Affairs. **Shen** explained that at CSU Pomona faculty were very concerned that ‘student success’ mean more than just passing students quickly, and that lots of advising was involved. **Schürer** added that ‘student success’ used to mean nothing more than graduation rates at CSULB, but now the Highly Valued Degree Initiative involved various campus stakeholders—even students are now encouraged to participate in discussions over student success!

### 13. Executive Order 1064 (Student Internships)

This agenda item was not discussed.

### 14. *Ad hoc* Business

**Talamante** asked about ‘university hours’ on other campuses. CSU Dominguez Hills has encouraged students to bring a proposal forward, but the Senate is undecided because of space issues. **Karplus** responded that at CSU East Bay the schedule presented a problem rather than space, but that the hour was a positive development with lots of support across campus. **Kolehmainen** reported that there was currently no university hour at CSU San Bernardino, but that the campus was instituting one when it was switching to semesters. The university hour will be two hours per week. It presents a challenge for the schedule, but with the exception of lab courses (because of space) no instruction will take place during these hours. **Shen** contributed that at CSU Pomona the overall schedule was extended to make time for university hour, and that during that hour many classrooms are booked by student clubs. **Moineau** noted that at CSU San Marcos the Vice Provost came out with a schedule blocking out the university hour.

Respectfully submitted,



Norbert Schürer.