

<p><b>Academic Senate</b> <b>April 17, 2018</b></p> <p><b>Present:</b> Alvim, Ashmun, Bernard, Bettencourt, Carroll, Chvasta, Crayton, C. Davis, Davies, DeCure, Demers, Dorsey, Drake, Edwards, Erickson, Espinoza, Filling, Foreman, Hight, Hudspeth, Johannsdottir, Nagel, McNally, Mokhtari, Mayer, Morgan, Petratos, Petrosky, Renning, Rossi, Sarraille, Scales, Strahm, Strangfeld, Thompson, , Weikart, Wellman, Williams, and Zong.</p> <p><b>Excused:</b> Jason Geer, Mallori Gibson, Montero-Hernandez, Katie Jaycox, Blake Randol, and Karen Webster.</p> <p><b>Proxies:</b> Robin Ringstad for John Garcia.</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Erin Littlepage, Amanda Theis, Shawna Young, Clint Strobe, Ron Rodriguez, Lisa Bernardo, Gabriela Nunez, Jake Myers, Helene Caudill, Betsy Eudey, Oddmund Myhre, Dave Evans, Jovonte Willis, Jim Tuedio, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Matt Collins, Xamuel Banales, Stuart Wooley, Nina Palomino, Bao Lo</p>	<p><b>Second Reading Items:</b> 10/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan, Passed. 11/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan, Passed. 12/AS/18/SEC Affirmation of Free Speech Rights at CSU – Stanislaus (Sense of the Senate), Passed.</p> <p><b>First Reading Items:</b> 13/AS/18/FAC Range Elevation Policy 14/AS/18/UEPC/GE General Education (GE) Breadth Requirements</p> <p><b>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</b> <b>May 8, 2018</b> <b>2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118</b></p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Gerard Wellman, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. **Call to order**  
2:03pm
2. **Approval of Agenda**  
Approved
3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 27, 2018** (distributed electronically)  
Approved
4. **Introductions**  
Erin Littlepage, Amanda Theis, Shawna Young, Clint Strobe, Ron Rodriguez, Lisa Bernardo, Gabriela Nunez, Jake Myers, Helene Caudill, Betsy Eudey, Oddmund Myhre, Dave Evans, Jovonte Willis, Jim Tuedio, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Matt Collins, Xamuel Banales, Stuart Wooley, Nina Palomino, Bao Lo
5. **Announcements**  
Wellman – On May 11<sup>th</sup> in this room, from 11am – 2:30pm, will be the High Impact Practices Summit. Dr. George Kuh is an Indiana-based scholar that researches topics related to institutional improvement, college student engagement, assessment strategies and campus culture and will be giving the keynote address followed by a presentation from the HIPs Faculty Learning Circle participants. We will have a flyer to share with you before the end of meeting.

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

FAC – We'll be meeting next week and discussing issues related to today's agenda. We'll be taking up the issue of department chair evaluations. The policy on chair duties hasn't been updated since 1986.

FBAC – We'll be meeting tomorrow and discussing proposals for budget priorities from Cabinet. There'll be an open forum in MSR 130 on Friday, 9-11, to discuss the budget priorities.

GC – Meeting this Thursday and discussing time module policy and second dual degree policies. There will be a review of counseling APR and also be discussing graduate program delivery and growth and reviewing progress on the graduate education action plan.

Statewide – They had their interim meetings last Friday. Of note, they reviewed draft statement on shared governance that's a joint product of ASCSU and CSU. It's intended to come to the plenary in May. SWAS is busy with the same things we are on this campus.

UEPC – UEPC met on 4/12/18 and with some sadness agreed to discontinuation of the French program without further review. The program has been in suspension for several years and the college dean and the Provost have recommended discontinuance with further review waived, and the policy allows foregoing further review if extensive review preceded program suspension. In the committee's judgment the waiver is warranted. The committee discussed changes to the general education program and made revisions to the resolution 14/AS/18/UEPC/GE, now a first-reading item on today's agenda. The committee discussed a workgroup for the design of S104 as a technology-enhanced, active learning (TEAL) classroom and agreed to composition suggested by the provost with the caveat that future design of rooms should be considered with broader involvement of faculty across disciplines at the outset of the process.

CFA – no announcements

Carroll – question for FAC – was the discussion of chair duties prompted by the fact that it's been a few decades since the policy was written, or was there a particular matter? Foreman – it was a particular matter in a particular college. We surveyed colleges on how department chairs are evaluated. We're producing a memo on the policy and want to say that the policy needs to be revised.

## **7. Information Items**

### **a. Campus Safety by Chief of Police, Clint Strode**

Strode – Thanks for having me. I'm here at the request of the president to let you know about a program we're beginning. One of the things as an officer is to protect life. That's our number one goal. Recently a lot of the media focus has been on use of force and people we encounter with mental illness. Law enforcement's response to mental health crises is an issue we've been

considering. This began as a conversation on this campus where we had students attacked by another student. We had proactive and heroic students who took action and held the person down until law enforcement arrived. Our first priority was providing care to the injured as well as the person responsible. Afterward there was a conversation with the president and she asked “How could this have gone differently if the students hadn’t done what they did? What if law enforcement was the first to arrive at the scene?” It may not have gone as well as it did. We spent a lot of time thinking about what we can do when there are crises where the person can get help and treatment and continue their education and graduate and be successful. Law enforcement is looking at ways to use less-lethal force. We are moving forward with the purchase of less-lethal launchers. I want you to focus on their purpose, which is saving lives. They are items that are being deployed to be that gap where we don’t have to use lethal force. They launch a piece of plastic with a foam sponge on the top. You can check it out. The foam projectile is launched from these devices. It goes 350/ft./second. It feels like being hit by a 90 mph fastball. It will hurt. It will be painful. It will leave a bruise. But it will probably not be fatal. And it can prevent the necessity of additional force. These are projectiles launched from a rifled barrel.

You might’ve heard of a bean bag. They are launched from a 12-gauge shotgun and they tend to not be very accurate from distances. They can do more damage and penetrate further into the body than they should. They have a lot of surface area. The pad prevents it from causing permanent damage. These are accurate and effective 5-70 feet and others can be effective even further out. The issue in the dormitory was an example of when these would be useful. One of the reasons I’m speaking is because if you see them, we want you to know what they are and what they’re for. About a year ago, there was a student at Georgia Tech killed by officers. They were in crisis and a member of the LGBTQ community. We want to be in a position where we can interact in a way that’s safe for officers and allow us to provide care after the fact.

Sarraille – Have the rounds ever tumbled?

Strode – They’re centrifugally stabilized, so they haven’t been known to tumble.

Morgan – I’m a little unnerved by saying things “probably” won’t kill someone. But what’s being done to help you all help someone in crisis. Shooting someone doesn’t sound like a way to help them. I’m also unnerved by your example of someone from the LGBTQ community. Please make sure that you’re providing training to help members of LBTGQ communities.

Strode – We’ve independently sent our officers, not required by the state, to trainings of that kind. In the local area we have training dealing with people in crisis. When they’re in crisis it doesn’t matter why they’re in crisis. It could be dependence on substance. That example was where a device like this could’ve saved someone’s life. We train our officers on deescalating situations where people are in crisis. At Georgia Tech they did not have access to less lethal devices. They didn’t even have access to Tasers. We had an incident on campus in the last

several months. The person was in crisis and suicidal. They were using a knife to cut their arm. The officer used a Taser, and it failed. Tasers have two probes that come out and come further apart, the further from the device. They have a range of 20 feet. If you've ever been within 20 feet of someone with a knife and trying to do harm, that's close. This is a tool for situations where something is needed between a knife and a gun. We're not worried about the type of crisis; we're focused on bringing the crisis under control.

DeCure – I was in the theater building today where we had the shooter simulation. It unnerved a lot of my students. My question is the protocol. If we will have this as a tool, where in the de-escalation protocol does it fall? Is it immediate? Is there dialogue?

Strode – We'll always try dialogue first. Our officers will not be carrying these on their bodies. Walking through campus, officers won't have these. They're large. If they're dispatched to a circumstance, they may take it out of the car and use it. If there's an active shooter, our goal will always be to stop the loss of life immediately. The training to respond to active shooters has changed and we go in immediately and engage the subject to end the loss of life. That will not include this. If there are shots, we are not going to utilize a less-lethal device that may or may not work. We'll use this device when we have the opportunity to potentially stop someone from hurting themselves. There are circumstances where this won't be used. Frequently we only have one officer on duty. When you only have one officer on duty, it's difficult to deploy something requiring two hands.

**b. FAC Memo Re: Participation of Contingent Faculty in the Affairs of Academic Departments**

Foreman – This is a follow-up to a previous memo that indicated that even though we have changed the voting rights within the Constitution of the General Faculty, it does not affect departments. This memo is the result of that work. The CBA defines a department to include all teaching members of its faculty. There are two items in the CBA that specifically say that all members are to participate in recommending for the selection of the department chair. The same is true for hiring committees, including committees of probationary faculty. All the members of the department have to be involved in the selection process of the faculty. Those are the things that are required by the CBA.

We'd also like to make a strong recommendation to include contingent faculty in department meetings and all areas of decision-making that affect work. We don't think that's it's our place to tell departments what to do, but we advise and urge departments to include contingent faculty in all their affairs. The English Department has many contingent faculty and they made a choice to include them on a pro-rata basis to have all faculty participate in these decisions.

Carroll – My department chair and I have had discussion about this. We’re confused about one or two things. When our departments make a recommendation for chair, we vote, and we vote on the recommendation. It’s not clear whether participation and input means to “vote.”

Foreman – There’s no policy on how departments make a recommendation for the department chair. It doesn’t have to be a vote. It could be a poll. If you have a vote, it should include contingent faculty.

Strangfeld – In my department, one thing that came up is that all department faculty include all teaching faculty. In gender studies, there’s lots of faculty that have cross listed courses. They’re in another department with a cross listed course in gender studies. Are they part of our department if they have a cross listed course? We decided no. The way this is written is vague. All teaching members of the faculty isn’t clear in this case.

Foreman – I’m not certain how to answer you. My response is whether they have an appointment in your department. If they do, they’re part of your faculty.

Eudey – This same issue came up in CAHSS in terms of college voting, and that’s not addressed in this memo. The Chairs decided we’d follow the same voting practices as the Academic Senate. That might be an additional memo.

Foreman – One of the things we want to clarify is that each department and each college has the ability to make their own determinations and clarify them through bylaws or a constitution. I’m not sure the contract speaks to the issue you just raised. I wouldn’t be comfortable making a statement about that. We can’t compel that level of voting.

Petrosky – This response seems to be written from the perspective that one department equals one discipline. That doesn’t reflect my department very well. How I read this would compel me to have faculty from different disciplines voting in hiring decisions.

Foreman – The contract has no specifics to this. It speaks only to academic departments.

Strahm – If you are putting together a committee to hire tenure-line faculty, am I reading correctly that all faculty regardless of their status have a say in that?

Foreman – That’s what the CBA suggests.

Strahm – How does that make sense if you have some faculty who teach a class, limited interaction, or are tangentially attached to the department, yet they’re going to have ultimate decision-making over tenure-track hires?

Davis – They have a say, but it doesn't mean their say is equal.

Strahm – They do participate in selecting the committee to do the hiring?

Davis – Yes, they would. You can't cut them out of the process.

Strahm – Even for non-TT folks?

Davis – They should be given a chance to have a say.

Carroll – The CBA requires voting when voting occurs. Does that mean one person, one vote?

Davis – Not necessarily.

Carroll – So Departments can qualify as they see appropriate?

Davis – Yes.

Petrosky – If I wanted to minimize the impact of non-discipline faculty in a disciplinary hiring vote, I could give them 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a vote?

Davis – I don't know, but you can write bylaws that say that.

## **8. Second Reading Items**

### **a. 10/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan**

Dorsey – This is an updated plan. We hope it improves on the 2009 plan. The principle difference is that there is, added to the old one, an institutional layer of graduate education assessment. The faculty FLCs and the Faculty Fellow for Assessment will be charged with making observations based on the programs' APRs and make recommendations. For example, should a number of programs find that students need help with academic writing, as a result of meetings with the provost, deans, and others, they could fund an intervention and improve student learning.

McNally – In our department discussions, what happens if there is no college faculty assessment learning community? There could be a workload or bottleneck issue if it's left to the dean.

Young – This is a new piece of infrastructure, and the college FLCs have been constituted and implemented. Across the four colleges, they're at different stages of composition. One is fully constituted, one includes a dean working in tandem with an FLC, one hasn't constituted an FLC yet, and we're working with them. The Faculty Fellow for Assessment will be working with the

FLCs to devise a report that he'll be sharing and consulting with GC on. He'll have all the college FLC observations to draw on by the summer.

Result of the Vote: 36:1:2, resolution passes.

**b. 11/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Action Plan**

Dorsey – This is something we discussed over the course of two other meetings. It's an updated plan with eight identified priorities and actions to support those priorities. One example of a change is that there is an assessment component (#6).

Strangfeld – On p. 2, I think these priorities are great, but on 4B, “increase support for teaching and research,” it would be awesome if we honestly had something robust for faculty along those lines. Our current funding systems is pretty sparse. I think it would be awesome to increase that for graduate students, but it would be great to consider faculty as part of that.

Result of the Vote: 37:0:1, resolution passes without dissent, unanimously.

**c. 12/AS/18/SEC Affirmation of Free Speech Rights at CSU – Stanislaus (Sense of the Senate Resolution)**

Davis – SEC chose not to make any changes from last time. We had one question about why the Code of Conduct is referenced in the rationale after we took it out of the resolved clause. We didn't feel that it needed to be in the resolved, but we wanted it referenced in some way, so that's why it stayed in the rationale. Everything in the resolved clause you can propose an amendment for if you wish.

Greer – I appreciate what's attempted here. I understand that it's a SOTS and won't require a presidential signature. I have concerns that I would like to note to the group, and I'm not sure how they'll be followed up on. For example, most of the things in the student Code of Conduct are conduct, not speech. On the bottom of the first page, third resolved, “urges all campus constituencies to remain alert for...” I don't know who might do it, but I'm not sure that appropriate action is well defined. That might vary by person. Maybe you want it to be open to interpretation. Davis – appropriate action by an instructor is different from that of an administrator. It was left vague on purpose. Greer – our legal counsel said that hate speech continues to be protected speech, and the difference is that fighting words have to be face-to-face and likely to create violence. Her comment is that hate speech is still protected speech. There's ambiguity here. Davis – this isn't enforceable because it isn't policy. Policy like the range elevation policy creates steps and rules we have to follow. A SOTS is simply a statement of our values. There's nothing that can be enforced, it's simply a statement of those in this room.

Espinoza – Under the rationale, the end of the paragraph where it says “the code specifies...” There is an issue of nexus and that is what governs whether we can enforce the student code of

conduct. If there's a conduct issue off campus between two students, that would be governed by the Code of Conduct. If it only involved one student, then it would not have that required nexus. It's more complicated than is suggested here.

Result of the Vote: 26:7:5, resolution passes.

Carroll – This resolution came from my department, and thanks to the Senate for passing it.

## **9. First Reading Items**

### **a. 13/AS/18/FAC Range Elevation Policy**

Foreman – moved; seconded by Morgan.

Foreman – You saw this at the last Senate meeting as an information item. There were two suggestions that we took. One is that we didn't include an opportunity to respond to the department. We added that they have 7 days to respond to the dean. The second thing that came up is that the evaluation criteria and procedures seemed vague. We wanted to preserve the idea that contingent faculty couldn't be denied on anything outside their work assignment, but that they could still brag about other things they've done. Since that was vague, we took that out. I think you'll find it is much more straightforward and doesn't mention anything outside the assigned duties.

Morgan – There has been a long-term freezing of the salaries of the lecturers, part-time and full-time, which has created an unequal relationship between workload and salary. Putting this into effect immediately shows that Stanislaus State stands by their lecturers doing a large share of the teaching here and addresses something that's been wrong over the past decade.

Carroll – One of our contingent faculty asked how this changes existing policy.

Foreman – This policy is much more explicit. This lays out the three priorities much more explicitly.

Chvasta – Department feedback was concerned about implementation and to make sure that the timeline information is provided to contingent faculty at or near the levels we see through the tenure track RPT process. For example, TT hires receive reminder emails from Faculty Affairs and regular communication from the department. The contingent faculty review cycle is in the spring but they frequently are notified late. This policy should include implementation dates.

Strangfeld – Will there be some sort of notification given to the faculty that they are eligible for that?

Chvasta – I believe it's current policy that they be notified by Faculty Affairs.

Davis – This policy will help with implementation.

Greer – Under Application #1, evidence of a positive evaluation. The language for student opinion surveys is different from language contained in other policies.

Davis – It's what we frequently call student evaluations, but there are people who feel that overstates what it does. They prefer "student surveys of opinions" and want to use more accurate language.

Greer – People could include other things. If people wanted to provide other letters from students, they could include that?

Foreman – What you've suggested is listed in #3. The difference is that #1 will be provided by the department, not by the candidate.

Hight – Under notification, is that a typo? Sept. 1, 2017? Foreman – it is.

Morgan – Under Application #2, is that the letter from your department, or a personal statement?

Foreman – It's written by the candidate to the committee, and they produce a letter.

Morgan – It would help if it's a letter from a candidate. Another thing needs a middle road, the removal of non-teaching related items. I understand the vaguery. I find that a lot of lecturers partake in outside-the classroom work. If there's a way to say that departments could include those in a favorable recommendation but are not required to do so.

Strahm – I hear you on that but it would make me nervous if you start putting stuff like that into the policy, because you develop an expectation and that moves up the food chain and shapes how administrators define whether you are deserving of the range elevation. You've been here, doing this, you've hit the top of your range, and now we want to reward you for your continued service, efforts, and loyalty. I don't think we should put any additions in terms of policy. If the faculty member or the department wants to include that, sure, but it shouldn't be bureaucratized.

Foreman – That's the position the committee took. We wouldn't want to find that performance was escalated. In #3 they include other documents they select. Candidates are free to talk about other activities, and departments are free to include them in the letter.

Morgan – The first sentence under evaluation criteria and procedure states "Evaluation criteria for range elevation must be based on factors specified in the employee's work assignment." My work assignment doesn't detail those things.

Davis – They can't expect it if it's not part of your work assignment.

Sarraille – I would like to underscore my experience seeing things in CFA. The issue of the criteria for range elevation is not a theoretical thing. It's real. There've been disputes and grief. It's very important to draw a very careful line around the actual criteria that must be evaluated and what are the things outside the necessary criteria.

**b. 14/AS/18/UEPC General Education Breadth Requirements**

Thompson – moved; seconded by Crayton.

Thompson – presented prepared a PowerPoint. What's presented maintains the multicultural requirement. UEPC has never discussed any notion to remove the multicultural requirement. This does not add units to student degrees. We're focusing on quality with sensitivity to effects on programs. This is in response to a mandate from headquarters. The GE Sub and UEPC have worked on this for a year, and we did not request the task and would've preferred not to take it. We've communicated regularly with AS and the campus community. We're deferring the discussion on whether the term "multicultural" is the correct term.

1. Maintains the multicultural requirement.
2. Does not add units to a student's degree program.
3. Focuses on educational quality with some sensitivity to effect on programs.

Davis – What UEPC is proposing, GE A through E, are there questions or comments?

Strangfeld – So for Area E, courses currently E1, does that mean that class will lose GE designation? No. Then what is Area E requirement? We have a class in Sociology, intergenerational experiences class that satisfies E1. It's not about physical ed. How is that class still a GE, and where is it, and how does it mix with physical education naming?

Thompson – It'll be in Area E; it'll maintain its GE certification. Students would not be required to take what was E2. But we wouldn't have a university required physical education requirement.

Davis – There needs to be a path. Students can choose a path with more units, but there needs to be a 48-unit path.

Strangfeld – So they still have to take a 1-unit PE class? Thompson - No. that's no longer a university requirement.

Morgan – Students have an option to take PE, but it's not a requisite.

Young – Removing the age exception, I don't believe that removing the age exception would increase units because of the option within E, so folks aren't required to opt to take the 1-unit course, they could take a 3-unit course within Area E. I can't think of a scenario where moving the age designation would add a unit to anyone.

Demers – On the E requirement and the 2-year format, what's the concern with increasing enrollment in PE classes? Is that addressing that?

Thompson – One reason to delay implementation is to allow for the development of the 2-unit courses. It's a question what will happen with enrollment. I've heard competing things. I've heard that there wasn't a particular concern about enrollments, that students will continue to take those courses.

Eudey – The reason for the 2019 implementation is because the Chancellor's Office allowed us for that area only to take extra time to address the change. That's why this exception is in there because it's a harder fix for compliance. If we choose to delay area E to 2019, for three catalog years in a row, we'll have different GE requirements, and this will complicate advising. During the 18/19 year, if we follow what UEPC has proposed, that'll be the one year in which students 25 and older will be mandated to have a 1-unit PE course. If they finished their lower division GE prior to coming to campus, they'll be exempt from that. So this will only apply to native freshmen or some transfers 25 and older who'll have to take that class. We need to decide whether it's important for us to hold off a year to allow more 2-unit courses to be created, or if we think we have enough diversity in Area E, we could implement it now. I see strong arguments on both directions for implementation now and for delay. It's an issue we have to figure out for sure.

Thompson – Students can apply for exemptions to university requirements for a lot of reasons, but we're removing the age-based one. Other reasons might still apply.

Chvasta – I appreciate Eudey's statement. In my department there's concern that if we're double-counting UD GE courses, we haven't been sure whether to tell students to hold off on F3 knowing they'll have to claim catalog rights on exit.

Davis – Students can claim catalog rights, but it's the entire catalog.

Drake – What happened to UDA?

Davis – There are no courses in that category. All the F2s fit in C.

Bernard – The question about KINs and enrollment, from our perspective, it's hard to predict. Based on similar things at other CSUs, there doesn't seem to be a significant impact on KINS

departments there. Also, we believe that students should be required to take a PE class. We think it would be prudent to take classes that teach them how to be healthy and physically active throughout their lifetime.

Sarraille – How will this be implemented? The multicultural requirement – Area G will be leaving the catalog. Is there anyone who worked on this who can share how the catalog language will change? When people read through the catalog, how will they be aware that some courses satisfy the multicultural requirement and some do not.

Davis - The catalog describes requirements like the WP. We have a PSCI requirement. And we'll have a multicultural requirement.

Wooley – Sarah Schrader and I have been working on the catalog a bit. We're on that task and will consult. There are a lot of places where GE is referenced, so there'll be a lot of changes, though not all are substantive.

Thompson – We discussed in Senate asking for a 2-year implementation window and we didn't get that. We could've done a lot of things in that window. The complexities of the EO and doing the consultations has consumed UEPC. It's clear this should be a 2-year implementation.

McNally – In my department regarding Resolved #2, is this referring to the major degree, or entire Bachelor's degree?

Wooley – Sarah Schrader liaises with the CO and works on the catalog and she's very careful about language. She recommended that there's no such thing as a university requirement, there are baccalaureate requirements. Using baccalaureate would cover any course you took in your college degree.

Morgan – Under Resolved #4, is there are likely outcome intended – UEPC or an ad hoc committee? If an ad hoc, how will it be formed? Is there a chance that courses currently designated as multicultural could be removed by that ad hoc?

Davis – We didn't want to give it to GE Sub because they have enough to do. We also didn't want to have to make a decision quickly. We ended with since UEPC approves course modifications for WP, UEPC could be the group temporarily to decide whether a course gets a multicultural designation. UEPC could form a sub-committee or the speaker could create an ad hoc committee. We needed 2 years to discuss this further. This resolved clause gives us extra time to figure out how we're going to do that. We don't want to make that decision in the next 2 weeks. We want to discuss and have full discussions, so this is a bit of a stand-in.

Eudey – As the incoming UEPC chair, I'm concerned about the workload if all these courses come in. It would be technically possible for every single ethnic studies, gender studies, and a majority of sociology courses to receive this designation. So we're going to have to create some kind of structure to deal with this workload. We need to have conversations about the vetting for GE multicultural versus non-GE multicultural courses? With GE you have to meet certain outcomes We need to have broad campus conversations. We can't decide on structures if we don't know what we need. We need COC's input on structure of a new committee. We will follow normal processes for creating things. We'll need volunteers to serve if we decide to go this route. We need to have another body of folks willing to be on the review committee.

Thompson – UEPC can constitute its own ad hoc committees as well and that could be a subgroup of the committee or a different committee, and the speaker can constitute an ad hoc if necessary.

Lo – I appreciate we're having a larger discussion than last time. We're in agreement that this has moved faster than we'd like. We'd like to continue the conversation in the future. I agree that if we go through this list and should involve under-represented voices on this campus. If we truly centralize issues of diversity and equity, we need to ensure we do that in our curriculum. We continue the dialogue, but when it impacts students, we'd like to be part of the conversation.

Banales – I'm trying to figure out the language of this. I think that I'd like to hear a conversation of what it would look like to maintain the multicultural requirement, but also the WP requirement – one that would satisfy both, but not either/or. If it could count for a multicultural requirement, that would solve the problem of impacted majors. It needs to be centralized in a way that's part of the education we're trying to implement with the PCDI. There are lot of issues of inequity that are so clear. If we do business as usual, we'll perpetuate the balances that are there. Sac State and San Francisco State do something similar in which students opt out have to take exams. I want to have another option besides what's there. When we're thinking about students, the imbalances are there. This is central to our dynamics here. We need to have multiple conversations beyond what's here.

Carroll – In the unlikely event that EO 1100 is revoked, would this still go into effect?

Davis – Considering they added to the requirements, they're not revoking it. If it were revoked, we'd have to decide. But we can't wait and hope, we need to make a decision.

Thompson – We decided not to put in contingency language because we didn't know what it needed to be. Don't hold your powder dry until the second reading. UEPC has discussed this for a year, so if there's something else you think we need to discuss, please let us know.

DeCure – Any discussion that we have has to include the folks that do the work that we’re speaking about. EO 1100 is a mandate that comes from above, and we don’t want to perpetuate that top-down approach. I agree with Dr. Banales and Dr. Lo. I’m disturbed that the students that need to have these courses may not be the diverse and underrepresented groups. The students that need to learn how to get through society, the ones that live the privilege need to experience these courses.

Davis – The purpose of Faculty Senate is to make sure that every department has a voice. If you teach multicultural courses, please make sure your faculty looks at this.

## **10. Discussion Item**

### **a. WASC Essay Review**

Davis – We don’t have time for this full discussion, and Senate will have to provide feedback through other mechanisms rather than through a Senate discussion. We have one more Senate meeting. If you or your department has feedback, please provide it through other means.

## **11. Open Forum**

Carroll read the following email with the Senators:

Colleagues,

In light of our university having switched our retirement savings to Fidelity, I’d like to call your attention to an article in the Sunday, March 4, edition of the San Francisco Chronicle (<https://www.sfchronicle.com/business/article/You-might-be-a-gun-owner-even-if-you-don-t-12724391.php>) regarding the heavy investment in gun manufacturers by BlackRock and Vanguard, both of which are among the primary mutual fund investment choices we have from Fidelity, and the latter of which makes up the majority of those choices, making it very difficult for us to invest in ways that do not support this industry.

I’ll quickly add that I realize that we have thousands of other funds that we can invest in through Brokerage Link, but I’d suggest that researching thousands of additional funds to find ones suitable to our investment preferences is hardly compatible with our 70-hour work weeks. Our primary investment options from Fidelity (target-date funds and index & actively managed funds) do not include a single “social choice” fund or “green” fund.

I am proposing that we strongly urge the CSU administration to renegotiate with Fidelity to include among our primary investment options at least one well established and successful social equity fund and one well established and successful environmental/sustainability friendly (green) fund, many of which currently exist.

I realize that there are some among us who have strong reservations about the concepts of social justice and sustainability, as I’ve witnessed directly in governance bodies and, most recently, in

responses to the Sustainability Questionnaire, but in anticipating possible objections to my argument from those colleagues, I would point out that I am calling for a choice in investment options, not forcing anyone to invest in something against their will. Given the current make-up of our Fidelity options, I would argue instead that, for all practical purposes, we are now being forced to invest in funds whose objectives many of us do not entirely support, as in the case of gun manufacturers.

Carroll - This is a serious issue and there maybe factors that I'm not aware of. If the problem exists as my colleague noted, there should be great concern.

Davis - We can continue this discussion on Facnet.

## **12. Adjournment 4:00 pm**