**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**MINUTES**

Tuesday, December 5, 2017

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Academic Senate Conference Room (AS-125)

IN ATTENDANCE: J. Pandya, D. Stewart, R. Fischer, E. Guzik, E. Klink, S. Olson, B. Jersky, J. Cormack, M. Stephens, C. Bowles, A. Kinsey, J. Doering

1. Call to Order

* 2:00pm

1. Approval of Agenda

* Approved with mentions of changes for 4.1 to (3:30pm) and 8.1 to (3:00pm)

1. Approval of minutes: Meeting of November 28, 2017

* Approved

1. Announcements and Information
   1. VP For DAF Senate Executive Committee Interviews

* Times and dates for interviews with the four finalists were announced.
* TIME: 3:34pm
  + The discussion began with a review of the draft questions for VP For DAF candidates
    - There was discussion about the questions, and revisions were suggested and made to make the questions compatible with a 30 minute interview and to glean the best information from candidates.

1. Reminder
   1. Academic Senate Meeting February 1, 2:00-4:00, PSY-150
2. Special Orders
   1. Report: Provost Jersky

* Provost Jersky shared his feedback from his meetings with ThoughtExchange. A summary of the details included:
  + A deal is being negotiated with them to allow two full exchanges running at a time, and 100 licenses to administrators, controllers of the exchange, etc. will be available.
* Provost Jersky recently reviewed the pool of semi-finalists for the VP for DAF position, and he hopes we will be impressed with the four finalists.
* Reviewed feedback from the meeting of Provosts that took place in San Francisco this past week:
  + A key topic was “CSU Apply.” Two separate issues were raised: 1) international enrollment numbers are down; and 2) it is important for graduate programs to be aware of CSU Apply.
* Budget Issues:
  + Provost Jersky discussed the current CSU budget and reported it does not look very good. The budget the Governor is offering will leave us with a gap of approximately $200 million, and the 4% proposed student tuition increase is designed to hypothetically reduce the gap by a large amount (REPORT ~$140 million reduction???).

1. New Business
   1. CEPC Memo: Reinterpretation of GE policy pre-requisite course language

* J. Cormack spoke to this, and a handout of a memo from J. Cormack (Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate Studies) and N. Hultgren (Chair of CEPC) to J. Pandya (Interim Academic Senate Chair) and R. Piker (Chair of GEGC) was provided to all members in attendance.
  + The goal is to increase the flow so that departments/programs have more control and are able to provide GE courses to meet their program needs.
    - In order to achieve this goal, specific language from the memo was discussed, including: “In order to double count GE units towards their degrees, Colleges are requesting that they be allowed to offer GE course that have degree specific pre-requisites that may not be concurrently GE certified. This is allowable under EO 1100 as long as there ample alternative courses offered within the Category for students from outside the degree program to take,” and “As GEGC reclassifies existing courses and certifies new ones, it should interpret this section of PS 12-00 to allow departments to provide written justification in favor of certifying GE courses with degree-specific pre-requisites in high-unit majors.”
    - Following the discussion, there was a recommendation for GEGC to provide feedback by December 12th prior to having the Senate Executive Committee draft an interpretation of the GE policy pre-requisite course language.
  1. Departmentalization update: CLA/CWLC
* J. Pandya asked the committee to review a flowchart summarizing how Academic Senate Policy *95-19: Departmentalization Procedures* should be interpreted given the current status of CWLC (Comparative World Literature and Classics Department) and RGLL (Romance, German, Russian Languages and Literatures)
  + Two major issues currently facing them include:
    - Contracts that are intractable
    - Low major counts
  + A discussion ensued regarding the best ways to interpret various sections of the policy (Section 6.3, 7.0. etc.)
  + Due to some lack of clarity in the policy, the Senate Exec committee considered the possibility of opening the policy for review in the near future.
  + At the current time, the Senate Exec committee will attempt to provide some feedback regarding how well the policy is being followed in this instance.

1. Old Business
   1. Senate retreat white papers (R. Fischer, C Bowles, J. Doering)

* 3:05pm
* The white paper shared by J. Doering was reviewed (Title: Academic Senate 2017 Retreat: *Solutions)*
  + Several of the topics included in the white paper included: Financial Challenges; Necessity of Working; Limited Study Time; ‘Who can answer my questions?’; Maintaining Mental and Physical Health; Commuting Time & Length; and Course Availability
  + The Senate Exec discussed what the next steps should be regarding the white paper and the feedback from the Academic Senate Retreat.
    - Suggestions were made item by item regarding:
      * Identify who (e.g. CEPC, Faculty, Deans, Library, 49er Shops, Strategic Planning) we should send this information to for the best possible responses.
      * Identify who is already doing (or attempting to do) the various suggestions.
      * Identify who needs to be informed about various items.

1. Adjournment

* 4:00pm