



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES NOVEMBER 1, 2018

ASD 18-145

Approved 1-24-19

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-130

Present: Basil, Borjas, Brown, Brunelle, Brusckke, Casem, Ceisel, Chandler, Childers, Dabirian, David, Fidalgo, Fitch, Garcia, Heiner, Holland, Kanel, Knutson Miller, Matz, McLain, Mead, Meyer, Patton, Peissig, Perez, Powers, Preston, Rodriguez, Shahi, Shoar, Stambough, Stohs, Thomas, Tiwari, Torres, Valdez, Virjee, Wagner, Walk, Walker, Wood

Absent: Badal, Buck, Gradilla, Jarvis, Oliver, Tsang, Walicki

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Stohs called meeting to order at 11:30 am.

A moment of silence was observed.

In Memoriam

- Charlene Riggins, Lecturer in African American Studies and History [died 10-28-18]

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- M/S/P (Stambough/Brunelle) Motion for the Academic Senate to adopt a Resolution in Support of Action to Address Impacts of the Changes to GE Area C3. In particular, the Resolution asked for the GE Committee to consider the creation of a Global Studies overlay in the Spring.
 - (Stambough) recognized the amount of work that the GE Committee, the GE Task Force, and the campus community has invested in keeping the GE program strong in spite of EO 1100. He argued for keeping curricular issues at the center of our discussions. Resolution was adopted.
 - (Brunelle) reminded the body that History 110A [World Civilization to the 16th Century] would be orphaned once the body voted to eliminate the C3 category it was in. Another issue here is once you take History 110A and 110B as being done and take them out of the curriculum and make them electives, we have through our strategic plan, our mission and goals, our identity of this university is global citizenship, global studies, a globally diverse campus, as the way the GE program is being designed now to align with the Executive Order, students could go through their entire education here without taking anything that specifically addresses a global theme. I think we have a need for an overlay here or a need to consider an overlay or we are not living up to what we say we want.

Q: (Casem) Given everything that went on last year, we shut down the approval of new courses understandably. If this resolution results in a refocusing of your efforts, do you have any sense of how many courses that are already in the pipeline might be impacted because that has a broader impact across the campus as well?

A: (Bowers) No, we don't know how many new GE courses proposals will come in, in the spring, but we have had no difficulty in handling the normal load of classes. And at this moment there is no anticipation that we will be inundated.

- (Childers) The GE committee had to make lots of changes very rapidly in the last year only to find out that we were still not in compliance. We should take some time to reflect on what has been lost and gained with the changes made. We need to do it carefully, deliberately, and looking at solutions to reinserting the CSUF stamp on our GE program. There are many ways we can do this. There are advantages and disadvantages to each of the possible solutions. We need to analyze all solutions before we focus on a specific solution.

Q: (Patton) I have a little concern because I just counted and Anthropology has 20 courses in Z now and about half of those are in E and we haven't dealt with what is going to happen to those. We have a number of courses that might be considered global. But depending on how this is shifted, are we going to orphan more courses? What's going to happen to my 20 courses? I would like some time to think about the implications, I want to make sure I know enough information and can speak in the interest of my program.

A: (Walker) The way the resolution is crafted it says consideration of, as opposed to a predetermined outcome. That allows the GE Committee, the body, the faculty, and everyone to have time to think about this as the GE Committee considers it. I would imagine, given we had an entire retreat just to rearrange the letters and numbers associated with GE, that there would be much more campus-wide consultation and discussion.

- (Childers) I would like to defer to the chair of the GE Committee.
- (Bowser) There are over 70 courses, over 20 departments, and 3 colleges represented in Overlay Z and Area D likely has more than that. So this isn't a simple question and the tradition of the GE Committee in so far as I know it, has not been to unilaterally reposition courses within GE. It has been to work with the faculty, work with the departments/colleges, and to solicit proposals from the effected Academic Unit. So to restructure Overlay Z, we are talking about well over 100 courses and proposals.
- (Wood) This is a big task and GE has the issue of another overlay on its agenda for the year. This isn't a new issue in terms of what the committee is thinking.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| ➤ | Academic Senate Special Election to fill vacancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSUF Academic Senate - MCBE Constituency | eVoting will take place: M, November 5 th , 7:00 AM thru R, November 8 th , 4:00 PM |
| ➤ | Open Forum for Presidential Search | November 9, 2018, 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm Meng Concert Hall |
| ➤ | CSU IP Resident Director 2020-2021 | Application Deadline December 1, 2018 website: CSU IP Faculty Resources |
| ➤ | International Faculty Partnership Seminar | Tentative dates: June 16-22, 2019 website: CSU IP Faculty Resources |

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 ASD 18-135 Academic Senate Minutes 9-27-18 (Draft)

M/S/P (Brown/Brunelle) Motion to approve ASD 18-135 Academic Senate Minutes 9-27-18. Minutes were approved unanimously.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

5.1 **NOMINEES TO COMMITTEES**

M/S/P (Matz/Brunelle) Motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Consent Calendar was approved unanimously.

NOMINEES TO STANDING COMMITTEES

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE (10 faculty)

Nominees: Aitana Guia (SOC SCI)

Confirmed 8/30: Jennifer Burnaford (NSM); Rebecca Dolhinow (HUM); Annie Petrossian (L/A/C/E); Vita Jones (EDUC); Gabriela Best (MCBE); Hyun Sook Kim (ARTS); Chelsea Reynolds (COMM); John Sanders (ECS); Kristi Kanel (HHD)

EXTENDED EDUCATION COMMITTEE (10 faculty)Nominees: Kristen Seaton (ARTS)Confirmed 8/30: Jochen Burgtorf (SOC SCI); Debra Ambrosetti (EDUC); Mori Jamshidian (NSM); Gary Geramo (HHD); Ken Guo (MCBE); Tenzin Dorjee (COMM); Hakob Avetisyan (ECS); Brady Heiner (HUM); Colleen Greene (L/A/C/E)**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE** (10 faculty)Nominees: Jason Teven (COMM)Confirmed 8/30: Brenda Bowser (SOC SCI); Michele Wood (HHD); Pratanu Ghosh (ECS); Denise Stanley (MCBE); Jie Tian (L/A/C/E); Greg Childers (NSM); Jim Taulli (ARTS); Kathryn Glasswell (EDUC); Lana Dalley (HUM)**VI. CHAIR'S REPORT - written report distributed on 10-30-18.**[2-page report](#)**VII. PROVOST REPORT - written report distributed on 10-31-18.**[2-page report](#)Additional Report:

- Congratulations to everyone involved with the Library Frankenread program this week.
- We recently received information via HRDI that Cal State Fullerton is Number 1 in the CSU in terms of faculty searches this year. Thanks to everybody involved in that work.

VIII. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT

(Bruschke) Statewide Senate meets next week and the main item of business will be the Tenants of Shared Governance.

Q: (Walker) Can you share the tenants with the Senate?

A: (Stohs) Yes, we will send it out today.

IX. ASI REPORT - written report distributed on 10-30-18.[2-page report](#)**X. CFA REPORT - written report distributed on 10-30-18.**[2-page report](#)**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

11.1 ASD 18-139 Revisions to UPS 210.070 - Evaluation of Lecturers

M/S/P (Walker/Stambough) Motion to approve ASD 18-139 Revisions to UPS 210.070 - Evaluation of Lecturer. Motion passed.

Q: (Mead) Is AACSB required to be in a university policy or that we have those standards?

A: (Walker) If a department does not have standards, this is the document they revert too. So if this is not in that document and a department in MCBE does not have standards, then they do not have to meet this standard.

Q: (Fidalgo) Is MCBE the only college that needs to meet outside standards for accreditation?

A: (Walker) No, but it depends on the college and the way it's been implemented. The way it was implemented in MCBE is they worked with the previous chair and the Faculty Affairs Committee to get this into this policy so that it was available for them to use in evaluating their lecturers.

Q: (Wood) Would it be problematic to say "all lecturer faculty are expected to meet accreditation standards as implemented by their college; narratives provided by lecturers shall include information needed to determine whether those standards are met"?

A: (Walker) On the one hand it sort of does, on the other hand it doesn't give specific accreditation standard, so if there is variation in the accreditation standards, then that would give carte blanche to someone to pick and choose.

11.2 ASD 18-143 Revisions to UPS 411.100 Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Courses

M/S/P (Mead/Fitch) Motion to approve ASD 18-143 Revisions to UPS 411.100 Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Courses. Motion passed unanimously as amended.

- M/S/P (Walker/Stambough) Motion to remove Section III and all references to pre-baccalaureate throughout the document, then renumber subsequent sections.

Back to main motion

11.3 ASD 18-140 Revisions to UPS 411.201 - GE: Breadth Objectives and Course Development

M/S/P (Childers/Wood) Motion to approve ASD 18-140 Revisions to UPS 411.201 - GE: Breadth Objectives and Course Development. Motion passed.

- (Childers) Explained that the major change was to conform to the CO's directive by removing category C3 (Origins of World Civilizations) from the CSUF GE package. We will look at what we have lost with both the proposed change and the elimination of D2 last semester, but the purpose of the proposed revisions is to bring us into compliance with the CO's executive order.
- (Bruschke) The deeper background is that in 1985 WASC noted that we had problems with GE. We changed History 110A and 110B and by 1991, WASC singled out these courses as exemplary by providing coherence to our GE. But we are now being asked to remove these categories. So here's how that's supposed to happen. First, we are supposed to decide if there is a problem. What should these categories be? What should be in them? Then we should talk about if we shift everything around, how will this impact different departments? Who's going to be affected? Will it affect our lecturers? Will this impact faculty? Will students still learn what we want them to learn? Then we would define categories and define learning objectives for them, and then we would eliminate that category. That's what is supposed to happen. What did happen is that we didn't get to have any of this discussion. It still hasn't happened. And, as Senator Patton pointed out, just rearranging an overlay is a long drawn out process. This will take time. But what we are about to do, we have talked about ripping the rug out from under our programs, if we vote for this, we will be ripping the rug out from under the History Department. We wanted our students to learn about global history, but now the class will be in a category with many other options. History could lose as many as 600 FTES. This will be a loss. I do want to be optimistic. The campus and especially GE chair Bowser has worked to find solutions. We worked all summer and used shared governance to arrive at a solution, which was difficult to come to, but it showed shared governance worked, but then our solution was vetoed by the CO. Now we are asked to simply get rid of the category without having any of the kind of careful discussion that is needed. This is not shared governance, we are voting today because the CO issued an executive order saying we have to vote on this today. We should stop and reflect on what is happening. The Chancellor without consulting with anyone issued EO 1100. All 22 campus objected to this and indicated that it would impact programs. Nine other bodies said, don't do this, but the CO did this anyway. Even after we worked to comply with the executive order, last April the CO said that was not enough. HERA says that the CO should make decisions in the context of shared governance, but the CO has decided to determine on its own how much shared governance is necessary. They are more interested in standardizing curriculum than they are in thinking about what the impact of changes will be on well thought out curriculum. You should vote your own conscience, but I can't vote for it now.

Q. (Fidalgo) Can we do anything about this or just talk? In the past it seems like we have made decisions assuming the CO gave us no choice only to find out later that we could have done something else.

A: (Bruschke) I don't know what options we have. The Chancellor hasn't given us any. They won't give us more time. They won't discuss it with us. I don't want to vote for this because it implies we agree with it. We are being asked to do something that will harm the History Department without doing or talking about doing things that might help the History Department.

- (Brunelle) The History department is furious about this, but I want to point out two things. 1) This is not just a History problem. We (History) are simply the leading edge of the train wreck. 2) It happens to be that our (History) courses were in the categories being eliminated. These categories and their

learning goals were created through a collegial process that involved many different people and voices. It is a myth that History has tried to keep courses out of the category. These are categories with learning objectives we are eliminating, we are not eliminating History courses. And three, because of the timing, we have not been able to reposition the History class into another category. Thus, we (History) are entirely dependent on the good will of the GE committee and the campus community to reposition the class once it is eliminated from GE through the elimination of the category today. This is entirely because the CO has given us an arbitrary deadline to eliminate the category.

Q. (Kanel) Why do we even bother having a vote on these things if it is dictated to us? And this seems like a really bad time to get rid of History classes. I don't know why we bother to vote on things like this in the Senate if we aren't going to have a voice in what we are voting on. It's not a true vote if we have no way to say anything on it. It is frustrating to think that this is collegial governance. I will vote against this on principle.

- (Fitch) We speak about wanting our students becoming global citizens in all of our documents; I think it is in the new strategic plan, it appears in the University Learning Outcomes and in the GE Learning Objectives. It was never problematic in the past because most students had to take our world history classes, but now students can possibly take a class with a global focus, but there is no guarantee that they will. I think that is why the category we are voting to eliminate and the learning objectives associated with it have been important to the university. What worries me is that is very easy to simply get rid of a category, but it is a long complicated collegial process to move the course. Everyone is trying to help us, but the timeline results in orphaning the course from GE. Since this is going to happen whether I vote for it or not, I am inclined to follow Senator Kanel, especially because I don't want to vote for a position that will negatively affect our lecturers and my colleagues.
- (Brown) I am going to vote no, and I urge you to vote no.

Q: (Patton) I have a practical question I would like to address to our President, what is the alternative? It seems we were given an extension to this semester to eliminate this category, very explicitly. I know that Northridge was mentioned, but I also heard that we no longer have the same Provost at Northridge. Can you tell us what, if for some reason, this body was to vote and not do this with explicit directions from the Chancellor's office, what would happen?

A: (Virjee) I can't answer the question about what the practical effect in the end will be. What would happen is we would not be in compliance with the requirement of the Executive Order and we would not have met the requirements from the Chancellor's office that we come into compliance by the date they have given us. We will then face some significant problems with respect to throwing into question how we do registration next year, how we implement the EO going forward because we would have a set of requirements in our policies that are out of compliance with what the system requires. That will play itself out by directive, where the campus is directed to make these changes and we would have to deal with that as well, that is what is happening at Northridge.

I do have to say there has been significant time allowed for consideration of how to do this and it has been something that we haven't as vigorously debated here earlier. We are here talking about this now when the deadline is right upon us and when we could have been doing it earlier. I agree with the idea this has not been done in a way that is as collegial as it could be and that we have not engaged in the shared governance process as robustly as we could and should. This is not something that the Chancellor's office set out to do with the purpose of getting rid of our World Civilizations Requirement, they did not say let's put an Executive Order in place that gets rid of C3. This is an effect of what they have done with an overall purpose of making sure that general education requirements are more uniform across the system for all CSU's for the purpose of allowing for both uniformity and transfer among the systems as well. It is part of that attempt to move the system forward in that way. That's a policy judgement that the Chancellor's office and the Board of Trustees has made with respect to how we move forward with this. We can debate and I know we would, whether or not that is something that is within their purview about shared governance, but that is something that is playing itself out, as it should, in the System-wide Academic Senate in its interactions with the Chancellor's office on the issue.

- (McLain) The ultimate foundational problem is that the CSU has outgrown the California Master Plan for Higher Education. This is a band aid. It will come up again and next time it will be a different department. Thus it is important to set a precedent right now. This school was founded by historians, the first president, the first librarian. The deadline is very last minute, which is why we are in the predicament now. It is also true as the WASC report implied that other CSUs should be emulating CSUF in requiring history, not the other way around. It shouldn't be optional, it is necessary for a

healthy body politic. This is especially true in California with its diverse population. This history class is often the only place where they encounter the themes that make up global, diverse California. Think of the impact if all students in all the CSUs were exposed to world history. But that will not happen. We are being hit with a very blunt instrument to make up for an inadequate Master Plan and it is not just History it will affect many more departments.

- (Walker) If the university thinks this is such an important category, we can always make it a university requirement as long as it is not in GE and does not put us over 120 units.
- (Sargeant) I want to argue about the impact of not voting for this today even though I agree with much of what has been said today. If we don't vote on this today, the History Department will not be able to plan for the coming year because we will not be able to project the number of seats or classes that will be needed. History has risen to the challenge and the Dean's Office is doing what it can to facilitate the process. But we must pass this so we can move forward and get the class in C2 and once that is done, we can look at other options to reduce the negative impact on the department.
- (Casem). I support what Lynn Sargeant said. This is a time for us all to come together to support this. This is the Fullerton Way.

11.4 ASD 18-141 Revisions to UPS 411.202 - GE Program: Unit Requirements, Academic Standards, and Exceptions

M/S/P (Childers/Wood) Motion to approve ASD 18-141 Revisions to UPS 411.202 - GE Program: Unit Requirements, Academic Standards, and Exceptions

(Childers) Amendment to change wording to Line 72 to read "Students shall complete an additional three lower-division units in Introduction to the Arts (C.1), Introduction to the Humanities (C.2), or a combination thereof". *Considered friendly.*

Back to Main motion

XII. TIME APPROXIMATE

12.1 Fiscal State of the University Report - President Virjee and VP Kim

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Rodriguez) Meeting adjourned at 12:42 PM.