

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING Minutes

Tuesday, September 17, 2019
2:00 – 4:00 pm
Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

J. Pandya, N. Hultgren, M. Aliasgari, N. Meyer-Adams, C. Cummings, P. Hung, ~~D. Stewart~~, N. Schürer, ~~K. Janousek~~, E. Klink, ~~P. Soni~~, J. Phillips, D. Hamm, K. Bonetati, J. Hamilton, ~~S. Apel~~, ~~B. Jersky~~, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey

1. Call to Order 2:04 pm
2. Approval of Agenda-MSA
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of September 1, 2019 - MSA
4. Announcements and Information- need a member for Campus Physical Plan committee- Nancy MA volunteered. Question do solicited letters for review committees become “open”, in the past letters were included in the final report in the appendix. Questionnaire can be anonymous so letters do not have to be anonymous. NS feels that letters are helpful to the committee for evaluation. CC feels letters should remain open to person being evaluated. Provost review committee needs a lecturer faculty representative. NH at ATI meeting, Larissa Hamada stated that any corrections/ideas to her memo be sent to her. WASC steering committee needs a student representative per JC. MNA announcement, CHHS is going to online SPOT evals for the pilot program... 3 weeks before end of semester, so SPOT will go to students on Nov. 13th. NMA states that no one from CHHS knew this beforehand. Students will get a reminder every 7 days if not filled out, faculty will receive also.
5. Reminder
 - 5.1. Academic Senate meeting September 26, 2019- JZP went over AS Agenda for 9-26-19. New business perhaps to be moved to next meeting, NS, JC agree. Service learning policy to be discussed first. No new business decided on. NS states that Robert’s Rules states that someone can “call the question” and would have to pass with a 2/3 vote. This can happen at any point in discussion. Must be motioned and seconded. KB asks if “call to question” happens after amendments, do the amendments stand, yes. JC believes that core values of the University should be part of GR. MA asks what GR would be if voted down, answer no GR requirements for CSULB. NH feels like CEPC created a feasible policy and cannot understand the motivation for not approving policy. PFH says the complexity of policy is an issue, as well as assessment problems. JP says advisors expressed concern over GR.

6. Special Orders

6.1. Report: Provost Jersky – not present, no report.

7. New Business

7.1. GE SLOs, Tiffini Travis, TIME CERTAIN 2:30 pm –TT reports on Learning outcomes next steps for GEGC. Handout provided with her suggestions. Document based on EO 1100 and other CSU's. JC suggests having example documents included with handout. Document has been presented to GEGC and feedback has been solicited. Oct. 4th date for comments suggested. JZP asks if Area E needs an addition of Lower division learning outcomes. TT asks if upper division learning outcomes can be more standard other than QR area. DH asks if A1-Oral Comm. Can be amended "or" to "and" to include hearing impaired students. JC suggests asking Comm. Department for guidance. NH asks if outsourcing the areas out to those specific faculty that deal with these areas. NS suggests get rid of "leap" (essential skills that everyone should have in college is LEAP) in document. NS asks if word "silo" should be replaced with *disciplinary expertise*. EC understanding is that a course will have to address all of the learning outcomes for the area. JC says a worksheet will be created to assist outcomes. TT asks if. NH asks about C upper div. (CUD) and do other areas also have to be interdisciplinary. CUD, DUD and BUD. NH will send TT language suggestions for document. JC asks if GEGC will be considering other learning outcomes while this is under review. TT, yes. Checklist for GE courses currently in place, will be redesigned for each area to have own checklist. Outcomes must be at least 1/3 of course for GE asks MA.

7.2. Neil Schnoor, Chief of Staff, Office of the President, TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm- N. Schnoor presented his job duties. He is currently learning CSU acronyms which are very substantial. NS asks what he has heard about the Academic Senate. Former COS Mark Wiley told N. Schnoor about the unique qualities of CSULB, in which our AS has a senate with all constituencies represented; staff, faculty, students and administrators. His job duties include doing what Jane Conoley asks him for assistance with. N. Schnoor reports that he does not speak publicly against the President and her vision, this extends to his office staff. He states he has an ethical obligation to let the President know if he feels something if "off the mark". NS asks about the Intellectual Property policy passed by the AS. The CO then stated that they were working on an IA policy. NS asks why JC has not signed our policy on this subject. Presidential interpretation of the IA policy, is that something that you would offer input on. The executive team is Provost, Vice presidents Apel, Cesca, Min Yao, Takemoto, Fee, and Steve Raskowicz, counsel. He states that the Executive team is consulted weekly on many topics. JC suggests that he may need to consult with EC/AS on many topics; policies, compliance, governance. May be helpful if he attends AS, where all campus constituencies are present and President Conoley answered all questions fielded. Compliance is important for N. Schnoor going forward. Title IX is an example.

Why would someone email the COS? He states that some use him as the “bad guy” to present bad news. He can take care of certain items more quickly than the President perhaps. He is a “conduit” rather than a gatekeeper. DH asks that the COS present the Intellectual policy to JC.

- 7.3. Thesis Policy (95-07) – JC asks if the last paragraph which involves thesis review, thesis/project, separate out theses and projects. Need a depository for “projects”. Would like to edit 2 words in policy. Line 159, remove word “project” in three places. NH suggests interpretive memo. PFH asks if edits are only line 159 and below. NS suggests this should be a consent calendar item.
 - 7.4. Timely Graduation for Undergraduate Students (10-06)
 - 7.5. Academic integrity and plagiarism-(08-02) JC states that Bengt Allen put forth an amendment for this. Will revisit next week at EC.
8. Old Business
- 8.1. Senate Retreat Planning- handout presented to EC with preliminary ideas for Retreat topic theme. JC suggests how core values can be infused to all parts of the University. PFH suggests learning reversal, students teach, instructors learn. NH suggest compassion and the precarious nature of many students. CC states the 3 C’s is the most timely and inclusive. MA states that CCC goes the best with Beach 2030 values. EK states student ready university-no barriers is a good choice. She suggests having students at each table sharing their “barriers”. NS states CCC is the most timely and build on last year’s theme.
 - 8.2. Beach 2030—next steps
9. Adjournment- 4 pm