

Academic Senate
September 12, 2017

Present: Alvim, Ashmun, Bernard, Bettencourt, Carroll, Chvasta, Crayton, Davies, C. Davis, DeCure, Demers, Dorsey, Drake, Erickson, Espinoza, Foreman, Frost, Gerson, Gibson, Greer, Hall, Hudspeth, Jaycox, McNally, Mokhtari, Morgan, Nagel, Petratos, Petrosky, Randol, Renning, Saraille, Stephenson, Strahm, Strangfeld, Thompson, Weikart, Wellman, Williams, and Zong.

Excused: Advanced Studies, Bice, Drake, Petratos, Garcia, Geer, Filling and Webster.

Proxies: Catherine Hannula for Maryann Hight.

Guests: Jim Tuedio, Jake Myers, Rosalee Rush, Gitanjali Kaul, Darrell Haydon, Ron Rodriguez, President Junn, Helene Caudill, Rosalee Rush, Martha Cuan, Betsy Eudey, Amanda Theis, Julie Johnson, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Oddmund Myhre, Dave Evans, Jovonte Willis, Stuart Wooley and Lauren Byerly.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

Second Reading Item: 14/AS/17/SEC Resolution for the Reinstatement of a Graduate Dean, Passed.

Discussion Item: Revisions to EO 1100 on CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
September 26, 2017
2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118

Minutes submitted by:
Gerard Wellman, Clerk

1. Call to order

2:02pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved with slight revision due to a typo.

**3. Approval of Agenda Approval of Academic Senate Minutes August 29, 2017
(distributed electronically)**

Approved.

4. Introductions

Jim Tuedio, Jake Myers, Rosalee Rush, Gitanjali Kaul, Darrell Haydon, Ron Rodriguez, President Junn, Helene Caudill, Rosalee Rush, Martha Cuan, Betsy Eudey, Amanda Theis, Julie Johnson, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Oddmund Myhre, Dave Evans, Jovonte Willis, Stuart Wooley and Lauren Byerly.

5. Announcements

Speaker Davis announced that Isabel's birthday is today! Applause.

Strahm – The Guiding Principles of CFA's Anti-Racism and Social Justice Transformation were distributed. Also, the community north of campus has been stickered by the alt-right. An inter-racial couple complained on social media about these stickers and then received them on their personal property. Tonight a group is going to City Hall at 6 to ask the Council to keep a better eye out for these types of stickers on public property. The City of Turlock has not put out a resolution against hate, and we will request that they do so.

Gerson – The Art Exhibit by Martin Azevedo entitled "Behold the Man" – artist talk on Oct 5 at 6:30 pm in FDC. A Call was sent out for the Teaching Mini-Grants, due on Sept. 27th. The

Pedagogy book club is reading “Art of Changing the Brain” and their first discussion will be on Sept. 28th from 12-1 pm. You can pick up copy from Dakota, the new student assistant.

Susan Stephenson - The first exhibit at the university art gallery is ongoing, the reception is this Thursday at 5pm so please join us.

Provost Greer – The University Strategic Planning Council is releasing the strategic plan through shared governance. We will be having an open forum on Monday at 10:30am in the Snider Music Recital Hall which will be live streamed.

Espinoza – Stanislaus State is creating a diversity center in order to serve and support our students. As we work to design this center, we are partnering with the President’s Commission on Diversity and Inclusion and Associated Students, Incorporated to understand the history and complexity of our campus as well as key stakeholders to assess the varied needs of our students. We are providing three open forums on campus to solicit feedback and input from students, faculty, and staff. These forums will be held:

- **Tuesday, 9/12 @ 11am in South Dining**
- **Wednesday, 9/13 @ 1pm in the Event Center**
- **Thursday, 9/14 @ 5pm in South Dining**

This is a prime opportunity to help shape and develop a center that addresses the needs of our students. We hope you will come and provide your insights. The open forums will ask for input on the following prompts.

- **Purpose of the diversity center**
- **Design, layout, and function of the space**
- **Resources, services, and activities needed**
- **Staffing structure needed to support students**

6. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, other)

FAC – Foreman noted that they met last week and discussed security cameras on campus. There were concerns brought forward so FAC sent out a Qualtrics survey last spring and saw that the concerns are addressed in the policy. Foreman has met with administration and the University Police Dept. and now is finalizing a FAQ document that addresses those concerns.

FBAC – Weikart noted that they will meet tomorrow for the first time and will be talking about the strategic plan and CA Promise.

GC – Dorsey noted that they will meet on Thursday and will be discussing coauthorship of culminating assignments.

ASCSU – Strahm noted that they will be meeting next week.

UEPC – Thompson stated that the UEPC met on Sept. 7th and heard an update on the first use of the revised time modules from Lisa Bernardo and Noah Dunavan. There were still many unplaced sections of courses. The overlap of offerings at 3:30-4:45, 4:30-7:10, 6:00-8:40, and 7:20-10:00 p.m. remains problematic. Discussion will continue at the next meeting. Approved the process for certification and recertification of GE courses. The other element to review is table for alignment of GE areas with goals and outcomes developed by the GEAC. Reviewed the AS discussion of California Promise and agreed that the committee needs to take no further action but will receive regular updates on the program. Discussed an approval process for Structured Exploratory Emphases (SEEs) and will review minor modifications to the process that was recommended by the Faculty Learning Community (FLC). Discussed EO1110, Assessment of Academic Preparation and Placement in First-Year General Education

Written Communication and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses, with chairs and faculty from mathematics and English concerning course modifications in mathematics and the timeline for approval, the ability to offer sufficient baccalaureate-level courses in summer, and just what might be the system-wide standard promised in the EO. Discussion will continue at the next meeting on 9/21. Subcommittees -- Assessment of Student Learning, General Education, Technology and Learning, and University Writing -- have all begun work.

7. Second Reading Item

a. 14/AS/17/GC Resolution for the Reinstitution of a Graduate Dean

Dorsey said that the GC made two minor changes in the first and second resolve clauses – changed Graduate Council to read Academic Senate in both statements.

Speaker Davis – let's open this to debate.

Carroll – Passing this resolution will give the president additional support to make this position happen. I think this would be a strong benefit to the campus.

Eudey – I support this strongly. Last year we placed having a dean as a strategic priority item. This is a great thing for graduate programs, their students, and their faculty.

Speaker Davis – move to vote. Result of the vote count: 35 Yes, 1 No and 1 Abstention. Resolution Passed.

8. Discussion item

a. Revisions to EO 1100 on CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

Speaker Davis – Davis – The new EO that was sent to us on 8/23/17, EO 1100 that relates to GE Breadth requirements. This has been discussed in SEC and it was decided to move this to Senate to record questions, concerns, or excitement about changing GE requirements to go into effect next fall. Curriculum committee deadlines are in October.

Strahm – I have many problems with this, beginning with a lack of honest consultation on this policy process. On the FAQ document, what is noted on pg. 3, item #10 concerns me in terms of what my understanding of GE means.

10. Is “double counting” of GE courses required?

Yes, campuses may no longer prohibit the double counting of GE requirements and other

requirements. Major required courses that are approved for GE credit and courses and campus-wide required courses that are approved for GE credit shall also fulfill (double count for) the GE requirement.

The point of GE is to expose students to things that are different from what they've been exposed to before, or to their interests, to get them introduced to new ways of thinking and problem-solving. That is what makes our degree a liberal arts degree. I am concerned that in #10 what they're doing is allowing students to effectively use a major course to fulfill a GE requirement, and right now we do not allow that. We want our students to encounter new ideas and new ways of understanding the world. This is chipping away at GE.

Erin Hall – Kinesiology is concerned about the deletion of E2. We serve 1500 students a year. The Kinesiology chairs in the CSU are meeting to discuss this issue. We've been partnering to have new students take these courses to help cope with stress and improve health outcomes. We're doing our students a disservice if we don't require students to have an activity course.

Thompson – We really need information from across the CSU to know how other campuses are responding and how disciplines. campuses and provosts are responding. My question is when Kinesiology looked at this, do you mean that you read this to say that E2 is going away?

Hall – yes, I read it that it would be going away.

Speaker Davis – Attachment A has the chart and at the bottom it lists the total units as 3 units, which means E2 would be gone.

Carroll – I'd like to second Strahm's comment about the lack of consultation, and I urge Statewide to speak out against this. For our departments, these new requirements will severely impact enrollments and GE. With that many fewer students taking the courses, this could have a deleterious impact on departments.

Petrosky – Article 3, #15, p. 4, "can't deny a GE online course" – do we anticipate the campuses might move courses online and hire exclusively adjunct faculty?

Article 3. Premises of CSU General Education Breadth

15. Can a CSU campus refuse to accept a GE course from another CSU (or from a CCC or other regionally accredited institution) if the course was taught online?

No, course modality is not to be considered when evaluating courses for transfer. GE requirements may be satisfied through courses taught in face-to-face, hybrid, or completely online modalities. Pursuant to California Education Code Section 66763, a course provided entirely online shall be accepted for credit at the student's home campus on the same basis as it would be for a student matriculated at the host campus.

Weikart – Section D is where the units were cut, the social sciences were cut. We're going to have to consolidate that somehow, especially in D2, and if we collapse those together, you'll

have a lot of courses that will be cut or have smaller enrollments. That's where the 3 units get dropped, from 51 to 48 units.

Bettencourt – Underscores Hall's comments about helping students. Our students receive help with health needs and getting students involved in these activity courses helps them in many aspects.

Eudey – I am concerned with the changes to areas D and E. Also, we can keep our area G, but only if all courses count in other sections. We have 20 stand-alone courses that would need to be revised. I'm very concerned about UD GE courses that will result in an extreme reduction in GE courses at the lower division levels. I know that CFA has made a statement against this, and I'm wondering if this is really going to happen, the catalog deadline is February. We have some mismatch in policy and we'll have to align some discrepancies with this EO. We have students taking 4 unit English classes which will have to go down to 3 units. We have a lot of changes we'd have to make to campus policy, and then changes to courses before February. Moving that quickly means we won't move smartly. We need to ask for a delay to do this deliberatively and consultatively, and we need to ask the CO to delay implementation for one year. Implementing this for fall will be disastrous.

Speaker Davis – Other campus senate chairs had discussions about the timeline and how this came on suddenly. Other campuses are in the state of how are we expected to do this, and wrapping their heads around this. Other CSUs are in this same boat. Statewide has asked for specifics to craft a statewide resolution.

Carroll – I strongly second Eudey. FAQ #2, p. 1, they don't say "no."

2. Can we delay implementation until fall 2019 to give us more time for the curricular changes we need to carry out?

It would be difficult to justify delaying the benefits afforded by these policy changes, which increase opportunities for student success and facilitate efficient degree completion. Student-supportive policy changes include:

- Intermediate Algebra is no longer required as the uniform prerequisite for all courses in CSU General Education Breadth Area B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning.
- Approved GE Area B4 courses may now include non-algebra intensive courses such as statistics pathways, statistics for majors, computer science and personal finance, for example.
- Major courses and campus-wide required courses that are approved for GE credit shall also fulfill (double count for) the GE requirement.
- To facilitate efficient degree completion systemwide, 48 semester units¹ is set as both the minimum and maximum for total GE units. Stand-alone one-unit GE laboratory courses may increase the maximum to 49 units. (See question #17);

- To ensure efficient completion of lower-division certification and transfer from CCC campuses, coupled with efficient degree completion at the CSU, this policy clarifies that the nine units of upper-division GE courses are taught only in Areas B, C and D.

Strahm – I think we can also just say no. We refuse to do this. We took 8 long years to get in compliance with CO requirement on GE Goals. We could do the same thing with this

Davies – What happened to F?

Speaker Davis – F is not listed as separate. They refer to it through 3 UD units that come from B, C, D. They're identified differently than how we identify them.

Strangfeld – What is the justification for this, and if it's tied to efficiency, is that code for getting people through their degrees. At what point do we say you don't need 120 units anymore? If we're lowering the number of GE units, and a push to lower the units for majors, so then students have electives, which students often don't realize they have electives, that then it becomes the next phase of this, that students shouldn't have to take electives and be done sooner. At what point do we change the number of total units? This erodes what a BA degree is, and I can't see the justification for this.

Thompson – I want to clarify when you're talking about double counting UD GE, this means you're taking it in your major. This could make significant changes. At first it seemed like there was no room to move around, but there are ambiguities that we need to track down and exploit to preserve what we value. We put together programs to serve students, and it's fair to say let's find every ambiguity to preserve what we value. If we take the English classes down to 3 units, we need to recognize why those classes were moved to 4 units to begin with. The classes all had legitimate reasons that we added for the university to help students with information literacy and FYE.

Foreman – This also involves other efforts that the CO has asked us to make. The CO has asked us to develop a stretch program that students need, and now we're being told to go in the opposite direction.

Morgan – what are the implications for lecturers, and how many teach GE courses, and whether they have entitlements to these courses. This will have implications for employment and whether they can teach these new courses that will be developed. Regarding #2, since they don't say no, it sounds like if we decide to push back until Fall 2019, we could easily make a resolution to wait one additional academic year without pushback.

Speaker Davis – One campus has asked for an extension. We could certainly write a resolution for our own campus to say that our timelines do not allow this change to happen.

Morgan – Every answer on the FAQ has a very specific answer, except for this one. It doesn't have a specific way of doing it.

Speaker Davis – SEC or the Senate could certainly write a resolution stating our displeasure. It might have no power whatsoever.

Sarraille – I would suggest that, to follow up on Strangfeld's question, why are they doing this? I suggest that we take this to Statewide and maybe we ask that question of the higher education committee of the CA Assembly and Senate. We need to get some people on our side. Someone is manipulating this and we need allies. I strongly suggest we make overtures in that direction.

Carroll – I appreciate Mark's suggestion that we look for ambiguities and that we delay, but either of those concedes the CO's authority to unilaterally impose this. We need to challenge their authority here."

Eudey – We need a resolution to challenge that this even exists, with no consultation. They did information gathering, not consultation. We need to clarify the difference between those two things. Ann's original point about the purpose of GE doesn't allow it to be part of the major, and we should strongly resist this. I think this should not be the rule because it undermines the basis of liberal education and it undermines the standards they made us adopt. We need to push back on that component as well as the overall process in which it was done, and note that we can't do this well by Fall 2018.

Strahm – I'm leaving tomorrow morning for the plenary on Thursday with the Chancellor. If anyone would put their thoughts in an e-mail, I can read those on the floor of the Senate.

Wooley – As the interim director of GE – whatever you all decide, I'm available to help, that's what this office is for. If I can help in any way, let me know. We've had many discussions and informal meetings, and I'm here to help.

Nagel – I make a motion on the floor for the Senate to move to form an ad hoc group to write a response to the CO and to also charge that group to send it as well to Assembly and Senate Education committees. Seconded by Carroll.

Weikart – Why an ad hoc rather than UEPC or the GE Subcommittee?

Nagel – There is a lot of passion and ideas about this in the room, and GE Sub has their hands full with this.

Speaker Davis – Expediting this quickly would be a consideration too. If we created an ad hoc group to write this, I would hope this would come back as a resolution two weeks from now. It would have to be written by the next SEC meeting next Tuesday. That would be asking GE Sub and UEPC too much.

Morgan – What would the ad hoc committee take as its initial task – will it be a no thank you, or a no thank you for implementing by Fall 2018, or something else? Or is that the duty of the ad hoc committee?

Speaker Davis – That would be the duty of the ad hoc committee.

Crayton – Will exploring the rationale for these changes be part of the charge of the ad hoc committee?

Speaker Davis – This would be a question to include.

Nagel – What goes into such a resolution would be up to the ad hoc committee and then it would come to the Senate as an action item. If we have an issue with it we could amend or reject it. If GE Sub wants the task, they should have it. Can anyone speak to whether GE Sub would like to do this?

Wooley – I'm not a member of GE Sub, just an ex officio member. We are working on the GE APRs, providing documents etc. They also are looking at the EO 1100 and going through it to understand all the relevant issues, to send something to SEC eventually. We haven't acted yet on developing GE recertification, which is now the old EO and we have the GE goals which are new and just getting started. There's not a mountain of work, but that's just my perspective. It makes sense that something from them would come to SEC and into governance.

Carroll – I appreciate Wooley's openness. I believe the Speaker said there should be a resolution in two weeks. So the ad hoc committee would have one week to do its work,

Speaker Davis – My concern is that if we don't move quickly, we're already up against the deadline for curriculum changes. With the information we've gathered today, an ad hoc might be able to move quickly, especially with the minutes from this meeting. A small group would be more effective than asking SEC to do it, when our meeting agenda is full already. If we want to share our concerns with the CSU system, we have to move quickly.

Sarraille – I propose an amendment to the resolution to add that the ad hoc committee would consult with GE Sub as possible.

Morgan – if GE sub can't comment within a week, will that delay the ad hoc committee? We can say "if possible," so the ad hoc committee can still move forward?

Speaker Davis – I don't object to that. I don't see objections.

The constitution says that the speaker can appoint ad hoc committees. Reading from constitution.

Section 5.0 The Speaker may appoint faculty ad hoc committees to consider matters not within the province of any standing committee of the General Faculty or of the Academic Senate. Ad

hoc committee reports shall be timely and shall be filed in writing with both the Speaker and the Clerk for transmission to the General Faculty or the Academic Senate for action, as appropriate to the topic. Such ad hoc committees shall have a limited life as specified at the time of their appointment.

Greer – I understand the resolution moving forward. What happens after this? What happens after the resolution? There's no conversation or discussion, or is the group waiting for a response, or is this a statement?

Speaker Davis – That's up the ad hoc committee to decide. It could be a resolution or a sense of the senate. I recommend it be a Sense of the Senate, and that it is stated with whom it is shared. As we create a sense of the senate document, that tells the CO how widespread the concern is about this issue, so this also helps other campuses know where we stand on this issue. We can't just stop, but we can express our view while we figure what this EO means.

Sarraille – It will be important to discuss this with legislators, and diplomacy is important. Good rational arguments aren't enough because this boils down to power. Diplomacy has been stated as saying “nice doggie while you're looking for a rock.” There's a time for both.

Strahm – This is what happens when important components of our civilization are handed off as spoils to the victor. This is what happens when the trustees are selected by the governor, who are cronies of the governor, not necessarily educated or well-versed in what it means to step outside their backgrounds. I will state again, that in the 1980s through the early 2000s, we had different-looking students and a lot more money. As our students have become poorer and browner, the funding for their education has been chipped away, and I want to remind people of that over and over and over.

Speaker Davis – I want us to return to the resolution on the floor, to create an ad hoc committee. I move us to vote to craft an ad hoc committee to draft a response to EO 1100 and bring it to the SEC and to the senate meeting in two weeks. Vote: 36:0:1, unanimous.

Speaker Davis – Now we need volunteers: Betsy Eudey, John Sarraille, Chris Nagel, Paul Morgan. Anyone else interested can e-mail me after Senate. I can also contact the Chair of GE Sub, Heather Deaner.

Sarraille – I point out that we need to get people on this ad hoc committee who are affected by it, so I'm agreeing to be on it, but I'm also less directly affected by it.

Thompson – I appreciate the listening posture that administrators have taken in hearing what we're saying, but I also think this could be destructive for our students, so we also need to hear good honest information from our administrators and deans. I would like to know what the leaders of the faculty across the CSU believe about this. Whenever the time is appropriate, I hope this information can be shared with us.

Morgan – The memo that was sent out doesn't specify if this was based on data about student completion rates. They say it's based on changes recommended by faculty, administrators, and students, and I'd like to see those recommendations because it would let us understand the rationale beyond what they're saying. What is the source of what they're saying? Can we get that?

Speaker Davis – Was there a written response? Do we have that response from statewide?

Strahm – I can send it if I locate it.

Eudey – The reason they sent people to campuses to learn about GE was because some people were complaining about GE keeping them from graduating. I think some of it is concerned with liberal dogma, but it's also that some trustees think this is what's keeping our students from graduating in 4 years. We need to address this in our resolution that we are implementing new advising tools and other things and it may be that with better scheduling and curriculum planning and advising that we don't need to substantively change the GE program that has been helping in other ways. We need to remind them that we are doing lots of things that are aimed at improving time to graduation, and we need to see if they're effective. Systemwide, we had very few majors that had difficulty being completed in 120 units. It's not a GE problem – it's a course frequency problem and lots of other factors that won't be fixed by changing GE.

Speaker Davis – I have sent an e-mail to Heather Deaner asking if she'd like to join the ad hoc committee. Hearing no other comments or questions, I move us to open forum.

9. Open forum

Eudey – I'd like to thank the folks that put on the forum on DACA issues and wonder if they can provide an announcement about tomorrow's event and vigil.

Strahm – There will be a DACA rally in the Quad from 12-2 put on by SQE and 6 other student groups on campus. Please come out to support them.

10. Adjournment

3:24pm