

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

Tuesday, February 27, 2018
2:00 – 4:00 pm
Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

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

1. Called to Order
2. Approved Agenda
3. Approved Minutes: Meeting of February 20, 2018
4. Announcements and Information
 - 4.1. **News on statewide implementation of EO 1100/1110:** NS Went to Council of Senate Chairs' mtg. Lauren Blanchard said they had consulted sufficiently about EO 1100/1110. 8 campuses did receive extensions. Most campuses are in the place we are, muddling through and working on "campus-specific" requirements.
 - 4.2. Waiting for CSULB survey on GE to be distributed to faculty. Chair has seen draft.
 - 4.3. **Anecdotes about the Enrollment Tech cmte.** Chair serves on this. Typically IR passes out info about FTES, etc. RF: Admissions messed up music admissions by sending out rejections before auditions took place. A famous Florida High School student ironically was rejected by CSULB. JC: There is a plan afoot to look at whether they couldn't admit more **Humanities** folks. DS: The Humanities is the one place not fully impacted where you could expand admissions. It is the "accordion file" of the University.
 - 4.4. DDF: CFA working on membership.
 - 4.5. Rec'd text messages: Fire in engineering bldg. Evacuated two buildings.
5. Reminder
 - 5.1. Academic Senate meeting on March 1, 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. --Remember this is coming up. Dave Whitney will into Marty Fiebert, the speaker. NS will be MC.
6. Special Orders
 - 6.1. Report: Provost Jersky—not present
7. New Business
 - 7.1. **Constituting WASC Steering Committee and possible subcommittees:**

- 7.1.1. Interim Vice Provost JC: For the WASC report, will do a self-assessment of what we do well and what we need to improve. Thinks the cmte. structure should be different—more worker bees. Wants to have subcmtes. that go with three themes/three strategic goals of CSULB. Maybe OK to have a cmte. of chiefs (too) as proposed.
- 7.1.2. NS: we need to have faculty and others buy-in. SO: not just doing this for WASC but for self, so need buy-in of faculty. JP: we need all those people to do student success. Can't we divide steering cmte into subcmtes. A, B, and C? PS: Could pare down steering cmte. This cmte is responsible for the entire WASC process. Could still have other subcmtes and ask Senators to participate. Final products then brought to big steering cmte. The goal is to get the queen bees and worker bees. EK: Don't have as many tenure track faculty now. Had worker bee meetings in Senate conference for a year the last time. Deans chaired certain implementation cmtes. Just looking at Intellectual achievement (“first theme”)—that's “huuuge.”
- 7.1.3. NS: Reason this **all started was to define “student success”** [see minutes of last meeting], and to do that and we needed to get WASC process going. PS: Proposal has already been submitted? JC: Yes. PS: What's due now? Final report due now (2019). Need to have an academic dean on steering cmte. NS: Can we see the Proposal and why weren't we involved from the start? ACTION REQUESTED: Exec see WASC “proposal.”
- 7.2. **Intellectual Property Policy—Escape from Limbo**—KJ: working on this for the new CBA contract. CFA Desiderata: That it be completely contained within the next CBA. Want to have something that has “meat” [or broccoli?] and can work. No reason we can't have an updated IP policy now because there won't be a new CBA until at least 2020. CSU itself is waiting for ratification of CBA contract before they start/finish the policy. AC: we spent multiple years with multiple people developing the policy. ACTION: Chair will go talk with Pres. Conoley. Someone could ask her at AS meeting too. DDF: Let's have an interim policy until 2020+. PS: CO is telling President not to sign off. They want to prevent falling dominoes. But there is also heat from below [not just from powers above].

8.0 Old Business

- 8.1 **Use of EO 1100 in GEGC**: NS has attended last 2 GEGC meetings. They have two main problems: (1) How they are to evaluate courses presented to them under old policy knowing that there will be a new policy. There are 4 interpretive memos from EC and CEPC to help them so far; (2) Neither in our policy nor EOs is there a clear distinction between upper and lower division courses. If a department is putting in their 400 level courses for GE revision, they don't have a box to tick on the GEAR form. The definitions of B-1 etc. don't seem to mesh with EO 1100. The latter only helps us a little.
- 8.1.1 JC: Remember the moratorium on new GE was to just look at B courses and the courses that need to be moved into C and D that are stranded in category F. Another problem: B-2 has the word “basic” 2-3 times. The 400 level finance course is not basic.

- 8.1.2 NS: Use definitions from the EO 1100 definitions for B, C, and D. Couldn't this fill the gap for GEGC? Another Problem: The EO has two definitions for B—B1, B2. We have multiple sub-categories under B.
- 8.1.3 **Talking points for GE:** (1) Our GE policy works just fine. The only reason we're working on this is because the CO messed us over. (2) We don't just "open a policy" to casually fix it (We are a deliberative body. Starting from scratch on the Senate floor will not save time. We consult and develop things carefully). DDF: (3) State of CA set the GE program up to focus on Liberal Arts stuff. So this is why professional courses don't fit.
- 8.1.3.1 RF: Heat from two colleges who want to move faster—COE and CHHS. JC: looked at slapping on changes to GE, but realized it wouldn't work.
- 8.1.4 (4) Rather take this as an **opportunity to make real substantive changes**. SO: Notes confusion of students from our local campus because of the multiplied upper division categories F, HD, etc. Now we have to reverse the Fs. Some have asked for courses to be certified for all three—B, C, and D [the triple play]! JD: There can be new Bs; or Fs can move into B, C, or D.
- 8.1.5 NS proposes we use the definitions of B1, B2, C, and D in EO1100 for purposes of defining B, C, and D in upper division GE courses. DS: the "crisis" is in upper division. JC: GEGC is looking for the "heart" of the course to change, not just one extra lecture or reading. JP: write a memo. **MOTION:** AC/RF: *"It is OK to use EO 1100's definitions of B1, B2, B3, B4, (Area B in article 4), C, and D for evaluating upper division GE requests."*
- 8.1.6 Discussion: One worry about Quant Analysis in B4. AC: B is about the nature of science as all three of B1, B2, and B3 develop "understanding of scientific principles." Say in the memo to direct GEGC 1. For upper division course certification in GE for B, C, and D, it's OK to use the definitions of these areas in EO 1100, 2. Be clear that the area in which the course is certified is the major focus of that class. **MOTION TABLED** by unanimous consent. ACTION REQUESTED: **Will wait for the chair to draft a memo.** Final thoughts: RF: we want to help GEGC. The more guidance we can give, the better. DS: Shouldn't do a class with all three areas BCD.

8.2 Interpretation of Policy on Requirements for Master's Degrees (AS 14-01).

- 8.2.1 Under Title V the **cumulative graduate degree program GPA must be 3.0**. NS: Is it already possible to request an exception to the policy? Given that, is there a need to open this policy? JC: suggests waiting as there might be other things in the policy to revise. If OK, can continue handling exceptions with appeals.
- 8.2.2 Note the **issue of transfer credits** in sec. 2.6. Says that 70% of coursework must be in the program admitted in. Title V says 21 units must be in residence. Problem: **We don't count CCPE units as "in residence."** Issues for next year!

9.0 Adjourned at 3:56 pm. [Ain't we got fun?]