**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**MINUTES**

Tuesday, January 29, 2019

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

N. Schürer, J. Pandya, J. Jarvis, C. Brazier, E. Guzik, N. Hultgren, N. Meyer-Adams, ~~K. Janousek,~~ E. Klink, P. Soni, ~~G. Jara,~~ E. Lopez, D. Domingo-Forasté, K. Bonetati, S. Olson, J. Hamilton, ~~S. Apel,~~ B. Jersky, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey

1. Call to Order – called to order at 2:04pm
2. Approval of Agenda – approved by unanimous consent
3. Approval of Minutes: Meetings of January 15, 2019 and January 22, 2019 - – approved as amended
4. Announcements and Information – NS urged EC to encourage attendance to Academic Senate lecture series March 14 and 28 featuring Benjamin Bowser and Jerry Z. Muller. CSULB will host the 2021 National Conference for Research, a prestigious event and an honor to host.
5. Reminder
   1. Academic Senate meeting Thursday, January 31, 2019, 2–4 pm, PSY 150
   2. Academic Senate meeting Thursday, February 7, 2019, 2–4 pm, PSY 150
6. Special Orders
   1. Report: Provost Jersky
      1. Student success rate statement to be announced.
      2. Confirmation of 16 new TT hires forthcoming for Fall 2019.
      3. BJ will be away on vacation and missing AS and EC meetings during that time.
      4. Ad hoc task force ran a student competition to design an alternative for the Prospector Pete statue. Winner was a mural of a hummingbird. The work of the other two finalists will also be displayed.
      5. Long Beach Promise 2.0 – Further development of the pilot program that guarantees admission to LBCC students provided they meet our major specific requirements. LBUSD will pay the application fee and LBCC will pay the first two years of fees. Letters of invitation in several languages will be sent by President Conoley to apply for and participate in the transfer program. This is a sign-in program and is cohort based. The intended result is highly prepared transfer students. NS asked about the impact this would have on our lower division enrollment, and BJ said the impact will be minimal. These students will start LBCC in Fall of 2019 and will receive a “future” CSULB ID card and have access to the CSULB library. They will choose from the 10 most popular majors – more to be added later.
7. New Business
   1. Agenda for Academic Senate meeting of February 7, 2019
      1. NS discussed the challenge of having two consecutive AS meetings. The calendar this year makes this necessary in order to have enough meetings; EC passed this last year. EC was asked to discuss the February 7 agenda before the January 31 meeting takes place, also suggesting keeping RSCA early in the meeting. Current agenda and “Special Order” reports from DDF and JC were approved by EC.
   2. Future of Advisory Council on Enrollment Management: Vice Provost for Academic Planning Dhushy Sathianathan—TIME CERTAIN 2:30 pm.
      1. NS, BJ, and Dhushy have discussed the future utility of the Advisory Council on Enrollment Management which advises the Provost and President. DS feels ACEM is not effective as we look to consider all the facets tied to enrollment, not limited to tracking numbers. How does enrollment affect the way we operate? Are student fees managing the university effectively? He recommends that enrollment management needs to be strategically run in parallel with the URC since it is tethered to resources. This issue is closely connected to advising, student life and other areas.
      2. SO and EK served on the original Advisory Council on Enrollment Management and discussed ensued that the council may have diverged from their original charge to some extent. EK reports that ACEM worked with minority populations to develop courses for ethnic groups to learn English, for one example. EC agrees that ACEM needs to be refocused according to new outcomes. DDF asks DS about composition of the committee and DS says it should be chaired by a faculty member with higher faculty participation. ACEM should report and recommendations to the AS who then reports to Provost and President. Perhaps external members, although that often hinders the speed of action. Charge needs to be re-written also says DS. JZP asks if Data Fellows can be involved in enrollment decisions. NS asks why the ACEM would report to the AS since it is not policy related. EK states that enrollment management was a consultative group, the benefit for having faculty in group was that faculty learned to work together with other disciplines. Enrollment targets are set by the CO, not the University. AS not necessary in that particular process, but to make recommendation as to how the future will be enrollment wise. Review, evaluate, set priorities should be the job of ACEM according to DS.
      3. Optimal enrollment is the goal. Are we effectively recruiting, out of state? Would the group look at distribution between colleges? Current ACEM is an information exchange only. Out of state enrollment is a strategic decision according to BJ, shared governance states that faculty should be involved in this decision. Out of state enrollment generates funding for the University, but how would that affect local students, these are strategic decisions that affect enrollment and need to be discussed. JZP suggests *Strategic Enrollment Council* and *Strategic Technology Council.* Motion on floor to make this group a “council” with assigned time. PS believes that this is premature and the charge should be revised first as well as the composition of committee. PS suggests DS revise charge and present back to EC. SO states it should be modeled like the International Education Committee. DS will draft new charge and report back. No motion made to make a council. PS suggests adding to the URC charge or reporting to the URC.
   3. Key Topics for Beach 2030 debrief – In an effort to identify goals for the next 10 years, JJ identified the following points that came up 3 times or more:

• Traditional model of how to operate a university is ineffective, needs updating.

•Lack of consultation from administration with department chairs, who are on the front lines and know the challenges better.

•Shared governance should replace top-down hierarchies.

•If serious about diversity, we need more in administration.

•Lack of transparency in shared governance. *(Read senate and various committee minutes?)*

•Larger faculty = better representation in shared governance.

•Staff is not adequately represented in shared governance. Establish a staff senate?

* + 1. NMA states the shared governance does indeed exist here but that many are simply unaware. Perhaps an information exchange is needed? Faculty and staff need to fully understand the service aspect of being a faculty member. NS asks what the “higher level” goals are. 3 related things, communication, transparency and participation. Participation is a threat to shared governance at this time according to NS. EG states that lecturer faculty need help with regards to service since that is not part of their contract. EG suggests mentorship for members to achieve institutional knowledge regarding governance. A subset of communication. Lecturers are asked to perform service without compensation, DSS states they need compensation. BJ asks why only CFA is the only union on AS. JC asks what the barriers are to attendance.
  1. Definition of student success- was disseminated to EC via email. JZP states that the definition does not represent professional advancement directly. JC states suggestions some changes in verbiage. WASC steering committee to meet this Friday and discuss possible changes.
  2. Revisiting Emeritus policy? JC being contacted on a regular basis by emeritus faculty members who want certain emeritus removed. They would like a policy that has a “morals” clause perhaps to remove members. BJ states that it is an honorary status and can perhaps be removed. BJ states that the AS should be able to take action with regards to objectionable faculty. EK suggests contacting the CO regarding policy. NH suggests reopening the “resolution” rather than the policy. NS asks if we want to reopen policy, revisit next week. NS asks if it should be sent to FPPC and wait for their response. EC will send to FPPC.

1. Old Business
   1. Discussion on awards
   2. Technological change at CSULB
2. Adjournment – adjourned at 4:00pm