Senate Executive Committee Meeting (10/6/2022)

<u>Attendees</u>: Elizabeth McNie (Chair), Sarah Senk (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Christine Isakson, Victoria Haller (Student Rep), Frank Yip, Wil Tsai, and Provost Lori Schroeder

<u>Absent</u>: Keir Moorhead

Minutes Review and Approval
- o *Minutes from 9/29/2022 were reviewed. Tabled until language is added to AB 928 section.*
- o Haller elaborated on Cruise LOs ó she does not recall receiving a syllabus for Cruise 1.

Provost Report
- o Strategic plan for enrollment will be presented after the Art&Sci Report. It seems like a good thing to discuss in proximity to that Report.
- o There will be an hour-long presentation + an

Schools. Provost Schroeder acknowledged that there is a lot of library-specific knowledge required, though other Deans do manage staff and some facilities.

o Ugpmy qpf gtgf yjgygt c Dgcpøu uctct{ ku gswkxcngpvvq c Dktgevqt/Cjckt + cp{ qvjgt support positions that would be necessary to replace the Dean, in which case perhaps a Dean would be best.

o No conclusion on the best way forward at this time.

Report from Scheduling Consultant and Scheduling Software Resolution Discussion

o Vjgtg ycu f kuewuukqp qh yjg eqpenwukqpu qh yjg eqpuwncpvøu tgrqtv, cpf ur gekkecm{ cdqw the current scheduling software (ScheduleWhiz) and whether the consultant recommended its replacement. It seems that they did not, but made suggestions about improving efficiency of processes. Yip noted the manual entry of data back and forth between ScheduleWhiz and PeopleSoft is a real pain point. That time is important and expensive.

o Provost Schroeder noted that Natalie Herring has said on more than one occasion that we jcxg c dkvqhc Ftcpmgpuvgkpøu o qpuvgt kp terms of our software.

o More discussion of this. The general consensus is that we should look closely at the Academic Scheduling Task Forceøu tgeqo o gpfcvkqp cpf yjgvjgt vjg uqhvyctg vjg{ recommended is justifiable given the efficiency gains vs. the price.

o Vucko gpvkqpgf vjcvy gtgo kuukpi uqo g rqkekgu i qxgtpkpi CS numbering, class cancellation policy, and various items recommepfgf d{ vjg eqpuwncpvu tgrqtvcpf vjcv these are important as well. We should consider how to approach writing these policies.

AB 928: GE Committee Report and Recommendation to Senate

o Senk is tgrqtvkpi cdqwvc õxgt{ kpvgtguvkpi ö GE eqo o kvgg o ggvkpi with many guests. She took copious notes.

o ASCSU Chair Steffel stated in the meeting that AB 928 only dictates a common pathway for transfer students. It makes no direction regarding CSU GE. There was also no change to UC GE eqwtugu. Uj g uckf vjcvyjgtgøu qpn{ gkqki vq dg ukipkkecpvko rcevcv community colleges.

o The GE Committee discussed all this, and they noted that transfer students do become our students, and having them be on a separate pathway seems unsustainable.

o The GE Committee is thus still concerned about this, and that humanities should not be cut. Vjg GE Cqo o kvggøu wpcpko qus opinion is that lifelong learning should be cut along with oral communication instead.

o Post-meeting, they did manage to track down where Tsai (and many others) got the impression that the changes applied to CSU GE. There was a presentation hosted by the ASCSU in which a Cj cpegmqtøu Office representative explicitly stated this.

o Isakson looked into this and got an official take through ASCSU. In short, *the presentation was incorrect* and j cu dggp tgo qxgf htqo vjg CQøu y gdukg.

o There were a few different plausible conspiracy theories shared regarding the motivations qh vjg AB 928 cwvj qtu, vjg Cj cpegmqtøu Qhhkeg, CUWeco r wu cf o kpkurtcvkqpu, gve. Always good to see.

o Isakson said that whatever goes forward [in terms of our eco r wuøtgur qpug_we should be very clear that this change is for the transfer pathway *only*.

o Some discussion of what our response to ASCSU should look like. Isakson and Tsai clarified that we *must* take a yea or nay position when we are asked to vote on the

resolution at the ASCSU that will (or will not) give Cal-GETC ASCSU's approval. We *can* offer feedback in our campus response, but the ASCSU approval vote has only "yes" or "no" options. Isakson also noted that if the ICAS recommendation fails, then the law gives the administrators the ability to craft the transfer pathway without faculty input.

o ASCSU Chair Steffel specifically said that she recommends approving the ICAS plan to prevent the above.

o Some discussion of the path forward for our resolution in the upcoming General Senate meeting. The plan, given the ASCSU deadline for response, would be to waive the first reading.