**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**MINUTES**

Tuesday, October 31, 2017

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Academic Senate Conference Room (AS-125)

In attendance:

* Jordan Doering, Praveen Soni, Elizabeth Guzik, Eileen Klink, Sharon Olson, Doug Domingo-Foraste, Alan Colburn, Charity Bowles, Rob Frear, David Stewart, Jessica Pandya, Ryan Fischer, Jody Cormack, Mary Stephens, Kelly Janousek
* GUESTS: Cyrus Parker-Jeanette, Karen Kleinfelder, Tony Marsh, Chris Miles
1. Call to Order
* Convened 2:00pm
1. Approval of Agenda
* Approved
1. Approval of minutes: Meeting of October 24, 2017
* Approved with minor modifications.
1. Announcements and Information
* Tabled 7.4 (Senate retreat debrief) from current agenda. Awaiting final feedback from ThoughtExchange.
* There was a brief discussion to clarify that the recent call by President Conoley for Faculty Award nominations is limited to Full Professors.
* There was an announcement that students conducting research for a class on campus tested drinking fountains around campus and found a higher than normal level of lead in some fountains in MHB. Mary Stephens reported that those fountains will be marked and there will be attempts made to provide bottled water in that area of campus.
1. Reminder
	1. Academic Senate Meeting November 9, 2:00-4:00, PSY-150
	* Review and approval of Academic Senate Meeting agenda 11/9/17
2. Special Orders
	1. Report: Provost Jersky
* Provost Jersky was not able to attend the meeting, so there was no official report.
1. New Business
	1. Center for Contemporary Ceramics proposal
* TIME: 2:15pm
* Guests: Cyrus Parker-Jeanette, Karen Kleinfelder, Tony Marsh, Chris Miles
* Tony and Chris have had an idea about this type of Center for a while. A donor came forward and is willing to match funds up to $500,000. The proposal has been presented to the Provost, and they are now looking for the support of the Academic Senate.
	+ Dr. Miles mentioned that this proposal has been talked about for over a year and a half. They would like to have our students working alongside professional artists in a way that will provide mentoring and guidance that goes beyond the standard teacher – student classroom setting.
* Several items were raised and discussed:
	+ Other faculty members may be able to work with the Center. No assigned time is currently planned, but potential collaboration with the Center will be open to those who are willing and interested.
	+ Reporting Line: There is a responsible Dean and a Responsible Director. The spirit of the proposal is to have communication and reporting to the appropriate party as necessary.
	+ It was confirmed that the Center will be affiliated with the School of Art.
	+ The Council of Deans has approved the proposal.
	+ They do not have an advisory board yet, but the plans for one are in the proposal.
* A **MOTION** was made to approve the Center. There was unanimous approval of this motion, and the Senate Executive Committee will follow up with the necessary paperwork.

* 1. GE/EO memo, J. Pandya & J. Cormack
* Dr. Cormack discussed the memo that was shared with Senate Exec describing the three phases of implementation for EO 1100 & 1110.
* A few key points from the discussion:
	+ There are no plans to open the GE Policy for revisions/discussion until we have further clarification about timelines, requirements, necessary changes, etc.
	+ The GEGC will meet on Monday 11/6 to start discussing how upper division courses in sections E & F can be moved into B, C & D.
	+ The Chair of CEPC has put forth a draft interpreting the language of the memos.
	+ There was a discussion about the issue of possibly needing multiple levels of review for GE changes (e.g. department, college, university, GWAR, GEGC).
* A few key points pertaining to the three phases mentioned in the memo:
	+ Phase One
		- We are still waiting for an official response from the President and/or higher level university administrators/officials.
	+ Phase Two
		- How should we organize Open Forums to discuss this issue? We would like to have the Senate inform the colleges and then have college reps inform the rest of faculty.
	+ Phase Three
		- The question was raised, “Can we get the information from forums to the GEGC in a timely fashion in time for Spring 2018?”
* Throughout the discussion, some minor grammatical and stylistic changes were made to clarify the language in the J. Cormack & J. Pandya memo (“EO 1100 – Revised General Education Breadth Implementation” 10/31/17)
* A **MOTION** was made to approve the revised J. Cormack & J. Pandya memo. It passed with unanimous approval.
* There was also a discussion about the two interpretive memos that preceded the Cormack & Pandya (10/31) memo. These memos were the N. Hultgren (CEPC – 10/18 – Request for Moratorium) memo and the N. Hultgren (CEPC – 10/23 – CSULB’s General Education) memo.
	+ GEGC sent the 10/18 memo to CEPC. CEPC reportedly approved of the moratorium.
	+ Dr. Cormack and Dr. Pandya wrote the 10/31 memo in response to the 10/18 and 10/23 memos.
* A **MOTION** was made to recognize that the Senate Executive Committee received the 10/18 and 10/23 memos. It passed with unanimous approval.
* A **MOTION** was made to instruct the Interim Chair of the Academic Senate (J. Pandya) to write a brief and concise interpretation of the two memos (10/18 & 10/23) extracting the necessary information contained in the memos (particularly the four paragraphs on page two of memo 10/18) and send that out with the Cormack & Pandya (10/31) memo to the campus. The final interpretive memo will be posted alongside Senate Policy Statement 12-00 on the Academic Senate website.  The motion passed with unanimous approval.
	1. Graduate Student Success Initiative (GSSI) Thesis Manual review
* J. Cormack mentioned that Grad advisors had a breakfast and thesis issues were a primary issue of concern. GSSI formulated a subgroup to discuss and suggest modifications to thesis procedures within the 97 page thesis preparation manual.  The subcommittee will look at best practices for better procedures to expedite the process, make it more efficient, and make sure we are in alignment with our current university policies.
	1. Senate retreat debrief
* R. Fischer, J. Doering, and C. Bowles will review the data from the retreat and ThoughtExchange to see what we can do, what we already do, and where we should refer the relevant findings about the “things we want to do.”
* C. Bowles will share the findings with the Research and Evaluation Task Force (HVDI)

1. Old Business
	1. Conflict of Interest policy
* It was discussed whether we should send the policy back to FPPC and have them meet with our campus legal counsel (Steve Raskovitch) in order make sure that our policy is concordant with other CSU policies. We may also ask S. Raskovitch to meet with the Senate Executive Committee to review the policy.
1. Adjournment
* Time: 3:55pm