

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018  
2:00 – 4:00 pm  
Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

N. Schürer, J. Pandya, D. Stewart, A. Colburn, R. Fischer, E. Guzik, K. Janousek, E. Klink, J. Doering, S. Olson, D. Domingo-Forasté, B. Jersky, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey  
Absent: S. Apel, C. Bowles, R. Frear, J. Moran, J. Nino, P. Soni  
Guests: Sharlene Sayegh, Mark Wiley

1. Called to Order
2. Approved Agenda
3. Approved Minutes: Meeting of February 27, 2018 with sp. Correction of Lauren to Loren
4. Announcements and Information
  - 4.1. Still short one tenured faculty member for FCPD search cmte. Chair will reach out one more time. Aiming for this Thurs. to send nominees to Nominating cmte.
5. Reminder
  - 5.1. Academic Senate meeting on March 15, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 pm, PSY 150
  - 5.2. 2018 Legacy Lecture and Academic Senate Reception on March 8, 2018, 2:00 pm, Anatol Center
6. Special Orders
  - 6.1. Report: Provost Jersky:
    - 6.1.1. Take homework from *Six Cultures*, answer the questions, and then grade it!
    - 6.1.2. **IP policy on hold—the why of it:** CFA/CSU negotiating team set days at end of April 2018 to discuss IP policy, but this is separate from CBA discussions. It's a conferral. CO requests that while this is under negotiation that the campuses should not change or implement a new IP policy. The established law is something that employees inherit on employment—based on *Roberts v. Sears Roebuck* [DDF: but Sears lost their case in 1978] case where the employee invented the retractable wrench. Unless otherwise negotiated, everything belongs to the employer. IP Policy is not really a “condition of work” but is an additional matter that can be negotiated. CO is meeting and conferring, not disposing by fiat. The discussion is underway with the union, so we can contribute information but not make a policy.
      - 6.1.2.1. Q: some challenges made to this. One question was, recently, who owns online classes. We understood that the campus, within the law, could make a

policy. BJ: Each campus could negotiate with the statewide CFA who'd present the sample policy to CSU negotiators. AC described the policy we negotiated in the Senate. NS: That policy was never signed by the president. If we start now in April, it will be 2-3 years before there is a policy. It will be a separate MOU (not in the contract, but published at the end of it). DDF: What we have is so inadequate. AC: we worked very hard on it. COE people have complained about current policy (which is very unclear). If new MOU will be done soon, can wait. But still will have to flesh out the details of a policy as with prior MOUs. BJ: Not a bad idea to have a campus implementation when we get the MOU.

6.1.2.2. Q: If CFA says our policy is OK, then could the president sign it? BJ: But this is the wrong way around. The President proposes and disposes. KJ: CFA does not write policy unless it is in the CBA. But we're getting a ruling from the CO. DS: CO has put the kibosh on it.

6.1.3. *Chronicle of Higher Education* article referenced by Provost: "The ten trends." Check it out.

6.1.4. A second budget presentation given this morning at president's cabinet meeting.

## 7. New Business

7.1. **Discussion of WASC process:** Sharlene Sayegh, CSULB-WASC Liaison—**TIME CERTAIN 2:30 pm.** PowerPoint presentation. Reaffirmation of Accreditation 2020. WASC [Western Association of Schools and Colleges] now written as **WSCUC, Western Association Senior College and University Commission.**

7.1.1. Last report took five years with two campus visits. Have plenty of copies if you want one!

7.1.2. **New process.** 2013 change in Reaffirmation of Accreditation process. Have link to the accreditation handbook on website. We will produce a 50-70 page report instead of a large spiral bound notebook as in the past. It will all be online. WSCUC set up lines of inquiry to ready campus for a three day visit. BUT, now will have a more streamlined version call the "**Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation**" by their invitation. Instead of nine major components to our study, we have three. No offsite review now. Report will be due spring/summer 2020 and they will visit in fall 2020. See link to compliance worksheets. Need to look at four standards for review and all the criteria under each. Because we had a 10 year approval las time, they are just checking to see if we slacked off. See handout of proposed themes from last meeting.

7.1.3. **Caveats.** However, they have not yet operationalized their thematic pathways. It will be unveiled in April so there are more adjustments ahead. They'll do a workshop for us in early May on changes. We are the guinea pigs for this new process. Sayegh will be posting info about the WSCUC process online as it becomes available.

7.1.4. This is **not a marketing process** for the University; **but self-reflection.** For instance, they have **asked us how we define "student success."** We have a starting

place with the HVDI survey done by the research task force. But we do need to define it.

7.1.4.1. Q: **What is the purpose of accreditation?** BJ: Not just compliance with the law or a way to get student aid funds. It is for institutional reflection from micro- to the macro-level. We reflect as a community of the whole and receive outside, objective expert advice.

7.1.4.2. Q: **If I am a student or faculty member** who feels overworked, **what am I getting?** This is tough to explain to faculty. SS: I have an ideological difference with the former Liaison Officer about accreditation. Before, it was “Been there; done that. See you in ten years”; but now we should understand that the relationship with WSCUC never ends. Thus it’s about the ways we self-analyze. Also it helps us to **engage with the educational climate of the U.S. and higher education.** BJ: we will produce a report in two years [not five] and efficiently. WSCUC has recognized our “A”-level performance. We will be able to lead in the CSU as the flagship.

7.1.4.3. Q: **What do students get?** BJ: A recognized degree. We become distinctive within the CSU system—so a certain panache will be associated with our accredited degrees.

7.2. Position description for **Director of Faculty Center for Professional Development** (or whatever it’s going to be called): Mark Wiley, AVP for Faculty Affairs—**TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm.**

7.2.1. The ad hoc cmte. that worked on reimagining the FCPD helped to revise this position description. We will advertise an internal search. BJ: the FCPD will be more visible, and more extensive in its work. It will cover all aspects of a faculty member’s life, i.e. at all stages or levels of development. Q: The current person handles problem teachers, SPOTs? What difference in the future? A: The job will be broader. They’ll do more than new faculty orientation. MW: To some degree what the director does will depend on the strengths and skills of the person we get. BJ: Worth remembering that the strategic plan will direct their work.

7.2.2. **Staffing faculty development.** The position will be 1.0. Note also that fulltime staff has not been replaced. There is an assistant director, Sherry Span, who is 0.4. Each college gets 0.2 reassigned time to do faculty development. DS: Will need to repopulate the FCPD Advisory Board.

7.2.3. **Location.** We’ll have a new location—somewhere in the AS building perhaps. A place where faculty could socialize.

7.2.4. **Comments on position description.** Wiley will try to coordinate the preamble bullet points with the bullet points on p. 2.

7.2.5. **ACTION:** “Advertise the position based on this position description with some minor amendments Wiley will do” Agreed by unanimous consent.

7.3. Academic Senate agenda for March 15, 2018—**ACTION:** Will cancel this meeting! What about FCPD search cmte. nominations? **ACTION PROPOSED:** Do a Qualtrics vote when needed.

8. Old Business

8.1. **Chair's Memo on use of EO 1100 in GEGC—MOTION** AC/DS: "Send this out, with amendments to the highlighted section, to the GEGC, GEAR cmte., and Deans."  
Passed by unanimous consent.

9. Adjourned at 3:57 pm.