**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**MINUTES**

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Academic Senate Conference Room (AS-125)

In attendance:

* Jordan Doering, Joe Nino, Praveen Soni, Elizabeth Guzik, Eileen Klink, Sharon Olson, Doug Domingo-Foraste, Alan Colburn, Charity Bowles, Rob Frear, Brian Jersky, David Stewart, Jessica Pandya, Ryan Fischer, Jody Cormack
* Guests: Aimee Arreygue, Misty Jaffe, Brian Livingston

1. Call to Order

* 2:03pm

1. Approval of Agenda

* J. Pandya moved to add point 8.3 to the agenda – Voting Rights Clarification
  + Addition to agenda was accepted

1. Approval of minutes: Meeting of October 17, 2017

* Minutes with additions recommended by D. Domingo-Foraste have been approved (see Senate website for those minutes)

1. Announcements and Information

* J. Cormack mentioned that Donna Green (Enrollment Services) announced CSULB is making the filing of course incompletes an online process starting the end of Fall 2017
  + The online portal for filing incompletes should be available to faculty in December 2017
  + Questions were raised about:
    - whether or not the online approach may violate any university level policies;
    - if there might be issues regarding the validity of online signature certifications; and
    - if the requirement of having students electronically sign the form (which is a change from the current approach) would cause any issues.
  + It was suggested that the policy informational roll out take place with the help of Faculty Councils across campus and the Chair’s Council.
  + The question was raised regarding whether or not we should have Donna Green visit with the Senate Executive Committee to discuss the implementation of this new policy.
* The question was raised regarding when the new Attendance Policy (Policy Statement 17-17) will go into effect. The policy was approved by the Academic Senate on 9/21/17 and signed into effect by President Conoley on 10/16/2017. The policy will go into effect immediately.
* ASI representatives mentioned we need faculty representation on three boards (board of control, social justice and equity committee, and board of elections) in the absence of Academic Senate Chair Norbert Schurer.

1. Reminder
   1. Academic Senate Retreat on October 26, 2017, 2:00 – 4:00pm

* Final plans for the retreat were discussed. At the time of the meeting, there were 139 RSVPs and all table planning, catering, and preparation details were finalized.

1. Special Orders
   1. Report: Provost Jersky

* Provost Jersky recently returned from vacation.
* He inquired whether or not the Senate Executive Committee had received the “Time, Place, and Manner policy.”
  + Charity Bowles informed the committee that the policy was on its way. The policy is currently getting a final read through.
  + Provost Jersky encouraged the policy to be sent to the Senate Executive Committee so that we can be informed and ahead of the discussion regarding issues raised in the policy.
  + Provost Jersky informed the committee that Allyson Joy (Emergency Preparedness Assistant) did a table top activity/simulation (up to 20 people) to walk through the appropriate time and/or place for people to visit campus and make comments. The question was raised whether or not the Senate Executive Committee should go through this type of activity. Also, should student groups, staff council, or other faculty groups go through this?
  + Interim Academic Senate Chair J. Pandya will explore possible dates for the Exec or Senate to conduct the activity.
* Provost Jersky reported that President Conoley is very interested in working with faculty to see if there is any interest in utilizing the Japanese Garden as a research / teaching environment.
* Provost Jersky inquired about whether or not there was interest in holding a campus wide Student Convocation. The general response was “yes.”
* Provost Jersky discussed the interest in providing educational opportunities for formerly incarcerated individuals at CSULB. For example, individuals who are working on online Associate Degrees while incarcerated could finish their undergraduate degrees here at CSULB upon release. This would assist individuals with felony convictions to gain access to courses here on campus at CSULB.
* Finally Provost Jersky asked the committee to consider discussing suggestions to change commencement ceremonies from the current location to the athletics/track field. A few of the reasons to consider this change included the possibility of holding larger ceremonies and alleviating some ADA issues.

1. New Business
   1. Aimee Arreygue (Ed.D., Associate Professor, Educational Partnerships) visited to discuss the needs for a Dual Enrollment Task Force.

* Dr. Arreygue informed the Senate Executive Committee of the need to create a task force to assist with working on dual enrollment at the university. She has been handling a lot of the work at the operations level and would like to include more faculty members in this work, especially with respect to developing guidelines.
* The committee inquired about the best types of faculty members to assist with this project, and Dr. Arreygue commented that she has worked with a small handful of faculty already (e.g. ethnic studies), and therefore she would like to include those faculty members as well as other faculty who may be relevant contributors.
* Further questions and comments included:
  + What role the Senate Executive Committee should play in this process. Should we review nominations? Will we need to go through FPPC or other councils/committees prior to the implementation of this task force?
  + One member of the Senate Executive Committee discussed similar types of attempts to create task forces to review and create standards for various programs and emphasized the need to clearly lay out the standards in advance to putting out the call for nominations.
  + What are the issues/problems that require a task force, and why do we need that task force? Dr. Arreygue responded that there is currently no centralized organizational structure on campus for this program. Students are currently going through CCPE and other university units, but this approach lacks consistency and clarity regarding the appropriate process.
  + Why do we need dual enrollment with all the opportunities for AP credits at local high schools? Provost Jersky and others mentioned the financial access for higher SES students and the lack of university level teaching for AP courses in order to support the relevance of the dual enrollment program.
  + Where are these courses being taught currently? Response: We have some students coming to our campus to take courses (a small number), and we have some students taking Saturday courses at local high schools being taught by CSULB faculty.
  + It was suggested that we should have more than one member from LB Unified High School District on the task force. We should consider having more than just one administrator. For example, we might want to include teachers or someone to oversee transportation, safety, and scheduling.
  + It was also suggested that we have student representatives on the task force.
  + How many dual enrollments do we currently have? Response: Approximately 400-500 students (primarily Ethnic Studies).
* A motion was made to assign the task of screening nominees for the Dual Enrollment Task Force to the Nominating Committee (along with the appropriate call for nomination language – to be created by J. Pandya and A. Arreygue), and then having the Nominating Committee send their three recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee.
  + The motion was seconded and passed with unanimous approval.

1. Old Business
   1. CLA RSCA Resolution. Simon Kim, Misty Jaffe

* Guests Misty Jaffe (CLA) & Brian Livingston (Chair’s Council) joined the meeting.
* Dr. Jaffe presented a summary of the CLA RSCA Resolution which identified potential problems with the current plan to move the RSCA deadline to November 6, 2017 and keep the Mini-Grant & Summer-Stipend deadlines early in the Spring 2018 semester.
* The Senate Executive Committee commented that they do not have the official authority to change these dates.
* A summary of the CLS RSCA Resolution provided by Dr. Jaffe included:
  + There is a policy conformity issue. University policy states the deadlines (e.g. RSCA, mini-grants) should be the same date. The current change is in violation of that policy.
  + Faculty can only apply for a single award. Therefore, faculty members are put into a difficult position when deciding the type of award to apply for (especially if they receive notice of an outside award after having applied for RSCA). The CLA resolution recommends that faculty be able to apply for more than one award so that they can better plan their research plans.
    - There was a discussion about sending the policy to FPPC to discuss the issue raised by the CLA resolution
  + Due to the issues raised above, they are requesting having all deadlines set on the same date in February 2018. If that is not possible, they would like to see deadlines occur after the date of notification of awards for major outside grants.
* Dr. Brian Livingston provided the following feedback as a representative of the Chair’s Council:
  + The impetus for the change in RSCA deadlines was intended to alleviate issues with scheduling for department chairs. With the February deadline, the schedules and room planning often need to be modified late. This results in extra work for the Department Chair, it limits the flexibility for faculty who are often encouraged to use the assigned time in Spring rather than Fall, and it requires the appointment of new instructors to teach Fall courses or cancel classes when faculty opt for Fall assigned time.
  + The Chair’s Council is largely in favor of the change.
  + Given the large number of granting agencies and multiple deadlines across disciplines, returning the RSCA deadline to February doesn’t alleviate all the possible problems pertaining to decision making for individual faculty members.
* Several questions were raised by those in attendance at the Senate Executive Committee meeting, including:
  + When must the allocated RSCA funds be used? The answer was that the funds must be used by June of the following year.
* Two motions were passed.  The first motion was passed 5 to 0 in favor of 'yea,' with one abstention.  The motion included:
  + The Senate Executive Committee will send the RSCA, Summer Stipend, Mini-Grant Policy to FPPC to recommend changes for coming years.  The issues for FPPC to focus on are: 1) Should there be a three unit maximum for awards; 2) Should applicants be able to apply for more than one type of award; and 3) Who determines the deadline dates, and how?
* The second motion passed with unanimous approval.  The motion included:
  + The Senate Executive Committee requests that our administrators merge/consolidate the two deadline dates (1. RSCA & 2. Summer Stipend/Mini-Grants) in an attempt to comply with university policy, AND that they use their best judgment (taking into account the issues raised by the discussion held during the Senate Exec meeting) when deciding the single deadline date.
  1. Conflict of Interest Policy v. CO Policy (policy tabled until 11/9 Senate meeting)
  2. Voting Rights Clarification
* The Senate Executive Committee discussed the issue of voting rights and outcomes for elections. The interpretation of the Senate Executive Committee was that “the majority of the votes cast” should serve as the guiding principle.

1. Adjournment – 4:00pm