EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

Tuesday, May 1, 2018
2:00 – 4:00 pm
Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

Guests: Doug Haynes (UCI Vice Provost)

1. Called to Order at 2:02 PM
2. Approved Agenda
3. Approved Minutes: Meeting of April 24, 2018
4. Announcements and Information
   4.1. ACTION: VP-Academic Planning will have an as needed time slot on Senate agenda next year.
   4.2. Search cmte for AVP Financial Planning requests a faculty member, meets in summer—ACTION: Nominated R. Frear by unanimous consent.
   4.3. Campus calendar cmte met today—RyF. Will have calendar for AY 2020-21 next week.
      REQUESTED ACTION: Would appreciate one option without a full week off at Thanksgiving—communicate to cmte.

5. Reminder
   5.1. Academic Senate meeting on May 3, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 pm, PSY 150
   5.2. Interview with Finalist #2 (Kirsten Fleming) for AVP for Faculty Affairs
         Friday, May 4, 11:00 – 11:45 am, BH 316
   5.3. Interview with Finalist #3 (Mick Cunningham) for AVP for Faculty Affairs
         Thursday, May 10, 3:15 – 4:00 pm, BH 316

6. Special Orders
   6.1. Report: Provost Jersky
      6.1.1. Traveled to the CSU Academic Council meeting in SF and met with 23 provosts, two are becoming presidents. Discussed:
      6.1.1.1. (1) 3-3 workloads within the Collective bargaining Agreement (CBA);
      6.1.1.2. (2) Tenure density report;
      6.1.1.3. (3) graduate education;
      6.1.1.4. (4) unpleasant health and safety conditions at four CSU campuses;
      6.1.1.5. (5) a bill the State legislature (AB 2772) once, but no longer, requires ethnic studies in the HS curriculum—it now only encourages it;
      6.1.1.6. (6) We’re supposed to admit the top 1/3, yet we are admitting the top 40.8% of HS graduates among the CSUs—the Governor’s staff asks why we
are taking this extra bit—should pay for it ourselves then. By way of reference, the UC takes the top 1/8.

6.1.2. **CSU Humanities enrollment 2007-15.** Report through EAB of ten with largest with decline in humanities enrollments included CSULB. Data about degrees earned was based on what IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) deems “humanities.”

6.1.2.1. Humanities—a lot depends on what disciplines you put in—if Communications Studies is *not* counted as Hum; or Liberal Studies *is* counted as Hum. How can CSU support Humanities despite cycles or declines? What is happening here?

6.1.2.2. DS: Much could be said in answer to that.

6.1.3. C. Miller ASCSU chair stated that their report on shared governance is close to completion. The connection between humanities and GE is under debate at ASCSU—They have referenced Columbia University’s core curriculum. EK: This report is related to EO 1100. It is dealing with the importance of Humanities and GE. It will be a joint statement of CSU and ASCSU.

6.1.4. **We do *not* have a “severe” budget crisis!** Legislature might still put forward proper funding =$170MM to break even. No change in the May revise. Check back in June or later. Now past the philosophical debate to actual sausage-making. There’s great support in the Legislature for both University systems.

6.1.5. Question: AC: Would you talk about changing science admissions requirements? BJ: What if went from 40.8% to something higher in admissions? None seemed serious about that. AC: change science requirements to match UCs. BJ: Four years HS math and three years science was discussed.

7. **New Business**

7.1. **Partnership between CSULB and UCI to Establish Inclusive Excellence Teaching Lectureships:** UCI Vice Provost for Academic Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Doug Haynes—TIME CERTAIN 2:30 pm. Here to share a proposal. Potential partnership around UCI Chancellor’s [=president] postdoc program—support for postdocs right out of graduate school for a year. Connect with your advanced research program and would give them professional exposure. Would prepare them for a Higher Education career. We got 850 applications for 22 funded positions last year. CSU could have a lecture series that would feature postdocs and allow them professional exposure/networking and they could also participate in teaching workshops. Could bring ten to CSULB to participate in a seminar series and interact with Calstate Long Beach faculty members. **Promote contact twixt the two campuses and create a career pipeline.** Pilot here and learn from it and then grow it to other CSU campuses. BJ: likes idea as beginning of a relationship between the two campuses. There are already joint programs in SD and SF. This could show off CSULB as a desirable place for high performing faculty members. They have created a high performing hiring machine at UCI.

7.1.1. Comment: RyF: Four criminology professors are UCI alums. There is already a connection. Doug Haynes [DH]: UCI criminology has its own postdoc program
which allows the diversifying of a pool of potential people entering academic teaching careers.

7.1.2. Q: JP: thought about co-teaching with a great-teacher here? University-level student teaching. DH: A fellow might come to campus and participate in a teaching practicum—or talk about their research in a lecture series. They could participate in practicum under the supervision of a faculty member, but also teach subject matter. They need something beyond TA-ships. They could get more experience here.

7.1.3. AC: Great! Two-way thing could bring people from here to UCI. DS: Is this a two-way exchange? EK: We hired a UCI graduate and we interact with English there—we look for CSU teaching experience when we hire. Having had a real teaching experience for a semester is what we’d look for. AC: We have new faculty mentors on our campus already. For some fields it’s hard to find people, e.g., Science Education. NS: Love the pipeline. Indeed our students apply to PhD programs at UCI—What about mentoring for our MAs?

7.1.4. DH: Our applicants are very diverse and committed to public education. What does it mean to be a faculty member here?

7.1.5. BJ: Excited about getting to know each other—let’s organically go forward—in research, teaching, two-way pipeline, and programs pushing our students into contact. The Chancellor’s Doctoral Incentive Program (CDIP) had 8 applicants for 2018-19. There are lots of tendrils—so connecting is nice.

7.1.6. MOTION: [Let’s go forward.] RyF/JP. [No vote of Exec though consent implicit] What’s the timeline? We may need a year’s notice. Will show profiles to deans in summer. In fall can have a meet-n-greet. Then see how they slot in. SO: Our students are sometimes intimidated about going to UC—our students get to know folks—could have UGs, MAs and postdocs presented together. BJ: PROPOSED ACTION: We are interested in exploring. Meet first in the fall.

7.2. Report from FPPC Chair. Al Colburn—TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm

7.2.1. Worked on 3.5 policies. The SPOT policy [AS 17-05] we didn’t think needed to be changed. Online SPOT should conform to this policy.

7.2.2. Changed CBA 27 in the “Policy on Reassigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students,” AS 18-02, by “two words.”

7.2.3. A new RSCA policy is coming.

7.2.4. Worked on Nepotism/Conflict of Interest policy. Probably will pass it out this Friday. We will be sending it back to the Senate. Nepotism and conflict of interest we’re treating as two beasts. This policy is also governed by many laws, e.g., the Privacy Act of 1974 [5 U.S.C. sec. 552a]. Nepotism is also covered by the CO’s office. We decided that the campus did need a policy that was clear and minimal. See 7.8 below.

7.3. Selection of faculty representatives for WASC Steering Committee—ACTION: Chose J. Pandya and D. Stewart by unanimous consent.

7.4. Selection of faculty representatives for ad hoc committee on Student Convocation—ACTION: Chose C. Miller and K.R. Kelly by unanimous consent.
7.5. **Timing of CMS/PeopleSoft system upgrade**—time given us by COs office. Grading allowed until 5/25, MYCSULB down until the system back up on 5/21. Did our campus have any input? BJ: Dates chosen without a full campus consultation. However IT sought input in summer 2016 and the decision was made by the financial management office. Someone did know the dates but didn’t update us about it. We should ask about what is scheduled 2 years hence. NS: Shouldn’t they have consulted the academic calendar. Or consulted with FACT?

7.6. **Access to student records for advisors**—initiated by S. Leigh. There were two cuts of people with access. First cut chairs could choose who to retain. In a 2nd cut they were told who they could retain. DS: We need to accommodate various models of advising using EAB.

7.7. **Constitution of Nominating Committee**—have non-Senate members? Former senate members?—deferred to next meeting.

7.8. **Possible change to FPPC meeting time**—The Council meets 1st and 3rd Fridays at 12:30. Meet non-Senate Thurs.? FPPC is smaller and consists of all tenured full professors or lecturers (see charge one AS website). People don’t attend for professional reasons. Have tenured Associate Professors on the Council? Is the reason to change time because full professors can’t come? If change the charge, must take it to AS. The Council now has 12 members; needs seven for quorum. AC: Never have 12 come. RyF: Hindered by low turnout? **ACTION:** Explore time and full change next fall. [Add to fall agenda].

7.9. **Possible Graduate Studies Appeals Committee**—no discussion

8. **Old Business**

8.1. **GE survey and forums**—no discussion

9. **Adjourned at 4:02 PM**