



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 21, 2019**

**ASD 19-14**

*Approved 4-11-19*

**11:30 AM - 12:50 PM**

**PLN-130**

Present: Badal, Basil, Brown, Brunelle, Brusckhe, Casem, Ceisel, Childers, David, Fidalgo, Fitch, Garcia, Gradilla, Heiner, Hesgard, Holland, Jarvis, Kanel, Matz, McLain, Mead, Meyer, P. Oliver, Patton, Perez, Powers, Preston, Shahi, Stambough, Stohs, Thomas, Tiwari, Torres, Virjee, Wagner, Walk, Walker, Wood

Absent: Buck, Chandler, Dabirian, R. Oliver, Peissig, Rodriguez, Shoar, Teckchandani, Valdez, Walicki

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

A moment of silence was observed.

### **In Memoriam**

- Allen M. Zeltzer, Professor Emeritus of Theatre [died 2-10-19, age 100]

## **II. URGENT BUSINESS**

- (Casem) I would like to convey the concern that was expressed by many of my colleagues about the change in the schedule around the President's Day Holiday. So many of our faculty, staff, and students have children whose school schedule did not align, and I think this also influences our spring break timing. If we can be a little more sensitive to those parents throughout our institution it would be much appreciated.

(Meyer) Not only faculty and staff, but also students are highly impacted by changing the holiday. Short term daycare costs a fortune for our students, and we should make sure there was sufficient lead time when we did that. I think the notice we got on that change was pretty short, and I am one of those weird ones that has a three hour lab on Friday that got cancelled.

- (Jarvis) Two items related to the Chair's report which is the ASCSU GE Task Force Report. I wonder if Senate Exec would like to work on a resolution from the body that would have the weight of the entire university expressing our thoughts, namely you guys just changed GE on us, let's have this be more bottom up approach than EO 1100 was and have time for feedback.

The second and related item is wondering if all of these things change in the air from Golden Shores and possible change in the air with us having a GE Town Hall in the spring, if that calls for a GE Moratorium on new courses next year. Next year the GE Committee will likely have enough to do with recertification with the delay we had from EO 1100 we still have a bit of a back log I would think. People proposing new courses to go into GE categories that won't possibly exist. It seems like it might be time to get our whole GE curriculum in order. I don't know what the mechanism is for that.

- (Stohs) The Executive Committee has discussed some of those already, we haven't made much progress in terms of some of those details, and I'm not sure at the moment exactly how to proceed. This was not orchestrated, but I have actually prepared a brief report about the Task Force Report. I'm not sure if this would require a motion of if I can just respond.
  - (Walker) I was going to respond to Senator Jarvis's question about the moratorium. The last time we did it, we wrote a short resolution in the Senate.
  - (Childers) The General Education Committee has a meeting tomorrow and at that meeting on the agenda I'm sure there will be a discussion on the GE Task Force and our response to that. I think once we have completed that meeting we can communicate with Exec and put together a more coherent plan.

- (Stohs) I would like to seek the Senate's indulgence to have a brief time for discussion and a presentation about these issues that might help guide the GE Committee?
  - (Casem) The GE Task force will meet on February 27th and we will also be addressing this issue.

Chair Stohs presented a PowerPoint and discussed each slide for the following areas:

- |                                 |  |   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| ➤ Faculty and the CSU           | ➤ ASCSU Role in CSU GE -<br>EO 595     | ➤ Precedent for ASCSU Role<br>in CSU GE Program |
| ➤ ASCSU GE Task Force<br>Report | ➤ C. Nelson email to ASCSU –<br>2/8/19 | ➤ Next Steps                                    |

- (Bruschke) How is our campus going to develop curriculum when the current thing that is on the table will be substantially altered pretty soon?
- (Fitch) I'm concerned about any moratorium on new courses. The History Department spent time trying to respond to the fact that we lost our categories and have put courses in that are just now getting into the curricular process. I hope that when we say in process, we will accept things that have gone into [Curriculog] to respond to this change otherwise there is going to be a lot of tenure track faculty ending up unemployed in the History Department. History is certainly not the only department that has been affected negatively by these changes, and I think other departments have tried to respond by creating classes in new different ways which I think is going to benefit GE in the long run. So I hope that when we call for moratoriums on all new classes that there is some consideration given to the hours and hours of work that was done by people to design new courses that would seem to fit this.
- (Brunelle) Following up on what Senator Fitch said, when we talk about in process we have to keep in mind that for putting courses into GE it's a two-step process. So some of us, like me, have some courses that are not simply another course being flipped but a course that first has to go through the regular process, then has to be submitted to GE. So I think that if we put a moratorium on it, it has to be understood that if somebody has submitted a course that is a new course that is intended for GE, even if it hasn't reached the second stage yet, it still not be covered in the moratorium.
- (Walker) I do think we are rushing a bit if we enter into a GE moratorium primarily because people planning to teach courses and folks who are newly hired and developing their courses. Until we have a better idea of what is happening, I don't feel like that is a good idea. The last time we did it, it created havoc.
- (McLain) We are all having this discussion because of the demographic and economic pressure on the Cal State System. We have outgrown the Master Plan for Education and the Chancellor's office is trying to find a way to solve that. The portion of Title V authorizes the Chancellor to make GE changes is extremely vague, it is a single line of code. It's contradictory to use it in the way it has been used to implement Executive Order 595, and it's against custom. The other issue that makes me a little worried is the timing of things tends to be at the end of the semester when they are announced from the Chancellor's office when it's hard for us to respond to it.

The GE Task Force was a closed meeting. Under the Bagley-Keene Act, all California meeting should be open unless they are disciplinary. It was the opinion of the Chancellor's office that the GE Task Force meeting was a closed meeting, I was not allowed in and that concerns me.

- (Stambough) With all the interest in this, I hope there is a lot of attendance at the upcoming Town Hall/Retreat on March 22<sup>nd</sup>. That is going to be the beginning of this. We are working trying to get our response as quickly as possible, as deliberative as possible, and as inclusive as possible. So I hope people will show up there and that will not be the end of it for our campus. The conversations will continue on, the deliberation, planning, and everything else.
- (Jarvis) If we can come up with a positive vision of what we think GE should be, we can actually help steer what comes down. With the Academic Senate Retreats we all know who is generally going to be there and looking around the room, it's us, the same players. I would like to encourage all of us to go back to our departments, for the students to go back to ASI, for the staff to talk to fellow staff, all of us to engage our constituents in this discussion. We can't have a discussion of all 40,000, it's just too much, but we can do our jobs as representatives by bringing those ideas to the table.
  - (Stohs) What you are suggesting is that faculty need to work together. And partly what I am trying to encourage all the Senates across the system to do is to have faculty work together across the

system. If we can agree upon a new GE going forward, whatever that may be, if the faculty of the whole system are fully behind that then to some degree, whatever the Chancellor's office or Board of Trustee thinks is the correct way, they will have a big issue to take into mind. If the faculty are fully behind the GE Program that looks solid, I think it would be very difficult to make dramatic changes to that. As we go forward, I think working together is very important.

- (Casem) Speaking on behalf of the GE Task Force, we have some ideas of how to be more discursive in working with the faculty. When I say Town Hall I'm thinking smaller than a retreat that is something we will be discussing at our next meeting. I have some ideas of how we can effectively talk to everyone, including students; we would like to include ASI.

Our Task Force responded to both of the preliminary reports that came from the ASCSU GE Task Force, we never heard anything back. In your capacity as Senator, I'd encourage you to ask for a more obvious discussion, even a thank you for your feedback would have been nice because we were very thoughtful in our responses.

- (Childers) As you know we just went through a significant change in the GE program on this campus and what the campus really needs now is stability, a stable foundation on which to build. There are tremendous efforts going on in a number of departments across campus to adapt to this newly created system, which includes creation of new courses, getting those courses into GE, and modifying existing courses. Those efforts at this time I believe should continue because we need to adapt to where we are now and not over react to something that may be coming down the pike in a year or two. Keep in mind that in all of these discussions that there is a tremendous amount of work going on right now in many departments across this campus and introducing this new uncertainty really does threaten to upend a lot of work that has been done and is currently being done.
- (Heiner) I think these changes have harmed shared governance. I think they ultimately are not in alignment with the best interest of our students or with the Liberal Arts tradition that I think is very important. A slow and global discussion to ensure some stability and deliberation along the academic values is very important. In terms of that instability, this has an effect on hiring too. My department is hiring right now and the job description for that hire given the instability in the GE curriculum makes it difficult to plan, even in terms of replacement and growth of faculty because we are hiring teachers to teach in that curriculum. So the long term effects has repercussions in a period of instability I think are significant and at the end of the day really harm students.

I know this is not the time to talk about the contents of that report, but I do think it is significant that at least the majority of that committee was composed of faculty. Whereas the Executive Order all 23 campus senates firmly were opposed at least to the process and in most cases to the content of that Executive Order.

Question to the Chair: Do you get a sense from the Academic Senate Chairs Committee what other campuses are currently doing to get out ahead? How are they responding proactively and trying to intervene in the GE?

- (Stohs) I wish I had an excel spreadsheet with each campus in terms of what they are planning to do, but it does range from one campus saying the senate chair would like to pass a resolution condemning the Task Force Report. But I would say off hand the majority of the campus senate chairs are saying they want to go slow and this is not time for immediate reaction. The Executive Committee of the ASCSU did meet earlier this week, but we have not heard any guidance from them.
- (Gradilla) I would not necessarily call for a moratorium on GE, but I would like to see a moratorium on or maybe a softer thing than a moratorium in holding off on having First Year Experience taking GE from departments. I would like to see more research around models or if we can get some unit sharing with First Year Experience. I am worried in terms of we are doing so many things and First Year Experience is kind of the shadow beast floating around, and I don't want it to suck up resources without us knowing what our full GE options are. So if we can have brakes on that a little bit and start thinking about it as a one unit option I think that would be preferable until we figure out the funding. Because what happens in some cases with the disappearance of those GE units from departments, especially Life Long Learning and these other areas, that could devastate certain departments. I would like to see that possibly discussed on March 22<sup>nd</sup>.
- (Kanel) Is it true the reason they are doing this is fiscal? Is that the only reason that they are changing GE is because we don't have enough money as presented? Or is there some pedagogical societal reason or are we just returning back before the dark ages? We have to look at the whole context of what we are doing unless it is just fiscal and we want to get rid of classes because we have too many people going to college.

- (Hesgard) As one of the two students on this body, who had the opportunity to attend the AAC&U Creating a General Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference last week, I had the fortunate opportunities to be privy to the conversations that not only this body is having but that are being had a national level and I would like to urge this body as we move forward and as we consider what we want GE to look like for our own campus and then the state, to really have a student focused lens, not only for what is necessary for the student development of the citizens that we would like to graduate from this institution, but what we would like to see Cal State Fullerton contribute to society as a greater whole. And it would be a disservice to say that all students are unplugged from this conversation or do not have opinions about general education simply because it seems like its hoops to jump through. I quite honestly think there are a lot of us especially towards the end of our time in this institution who have reflected back and can see exactly what our GE education has given to us and provided us in terms of opportunities and areas of growth and exploration. It is important to have that focus of how this is affecting our faculty who are working here, and how is this affecting our departments and how will it impact our campus in a greater level. I would urge this body to consider things from a student perspective as well, what is the best for our students and what do we want them to actually be able to do and learn while they are in this institution.
- (Virjee) I just want us to remember why we are talking about this issue, it's not because the Executive Orders came down, it has to do with the Statewide Academic Senate asking for a GE Task Force to look at the issue and report back to the Statewide Academic Senate. That GE Task Force was not made up of the Chancellor or the Chancellor's people, but it was made up of primarily faculty. I think the language and content of the GE Task Force Report is indicative of the issue, which is there is a lot to discuss about GE more generally and a lot of coalescing to come around of who we want to be and what we want to do with respect to GE. But this is where we are at our best, this is where Cal State Fullerton in particular is at its best. There are going to be a lot of opportunities for input, I know that the Statewide Academic Senate is not going to move ahead without getting input from the faculty senates from the Academic Senates at each of the campuses. That would be folly and I don't think they would do that and I think our own representatives on the Statewide Senate wouldn't let that happen. The Statewide Academic Senate is going to be asking us what we want and who we want to be with respect to GE and asking us to reflect on the GE Task Force recommendations. With that in mind, not just to say we don't like it, but to constructively say what we want and who we want to be. I also know, and I strongly believe this whether or not you do or not, that once the recommendation comes from the Statewide Academic Senate for change to General Education, before the Chancellor's office makes changes they are going to seek input from us because they are not going to make the same mistake again that they made with respect to the Executive Orders. They don't want to and we will not let them make that mistake again. So there is going to be opportunity for input not only with respect to the current GE Task Force's report, but whatever iteration that is that will eventually get presented to the Chancellor's office and as they begin to weed through that and try to decide what they are going to do with respect to GE. It is absolutely true this is all going to take time and we are going to have time for that input. Does that mean that we should sit back and relax because we got time, hell no. It means that we should as a group begin the discussion of what we believe as an institution GE should be at Cal State Fullerton that is going to be tailored towards students success first and foremost, and that is going to be indicative of who we are and who we want our graduates to be. We need to begin that process so I'm really glad that we are going to begin talking about that at the March retreat. I guarantee you that conversation will not be the end of it, it can't be the end of it because we will not coalesce at that one meeting and we have much more discussion to be had and we need to continue to keep at that. Merri Lynn and her group are going to be working on that and we have to work on it as an institution. It has to be the Senate's voice, faculty's voice, and student's voices across this campus that comes into that input so that when we give our input to the Statewide Academic Senate and/or to the Chancellor, we can say this is what we as a community believe and want for our campus. So we need to be able to galvanize around that as soon as possible. It may morph, but at least if we start talking about that and gather around a set of principles and ideas about what we believe GE could be, we could then together present that. I guarantee you that as long as I am sitting in this seat that's what I will do to advocate for shared governance for that purpose. It has to be something that unites us as opposed to divide us or it won't work.

### III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Bruschke) The United Way and United and Homelessness group is going to have a Homelessness 101 presentation on Monday, March 18<sup>th</sup>.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

## 5.1 ASD 19-04 Academic Senate Minutes 2-7-19 (Draft)

M/S/P (Walker/Fidalgo) Motion to approve ASD 19-04 Academic Senate Minutes 2-7-19. Minutes were passed unanimously.

**V. CONSENT CALENDAR**

## 5.1 ASD 19-10 Revisions to UPS 410.115 Academic Credit Certificate Programs

M/S/P (Brown/Walker) Motion to approve Consent Calendar. Motion passed unanimously.

**VI. CHAIR'S REPORT - written report distributed 2-19-19.**

[2 page report](#)

Q: (Heiner) Can the PowerPoint you presented be distributed?

A: Yes, we will send it out.

**VII. PROVOST REPORT - written report distributed 2-20-19.**

[2 page report](#)

**VIII. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT**

- (Stohs) Was mixed in with the Chair's report and the PowerPoint presentation.
- (Bruschke) To clarify, this is not yet an action of the Statewide Senate. The Statewide Senate has not yet received the report to react to it. The only Academic Senate Statewide issue that has come up is that the Vice Chancellor forwarded the report to the Presidents with commentary before the Senate had seen the report.

**IX. ASI REPORT - written report distributed 2-20-19.**

[2 page report](#)

(Hesgard) Correction to the report, the date of the first mobile food pantry distribution will be on Tuesday, March 5<sup>th</sup> from 11:00 am - 2:00 pm.

Our Board of Directors is currently reconsidering leadership of the board positions, adding a single vice chair and taking away the vice chair title from the secretary and treasurer. So there might be another additional position for leadership within our ASI body coming this next term.

**X. CFA REPORT - written report distributed 2-19-19.**

[8 page report](#)

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

## 11.1 ASD 19-05 Revisions to UPS 290.000 - Outstanding Professor Award

M/S/P (Gradilla/Brunelle) Motion to approve ASD 19-05 Revisions to UPS 290.000 - Outstanding Professor Award. Motion approved unanimously as amended.

(Matz) Lines 10-11: revised the wording to read... "Each academic year during spring semester, the Outstanding Professor Committee shall recommend and forward their name for the award to the President...". *Considered friendly.*

(Badal) Q: As we have replaced the "his/her" to "their", are we also going to do that for the "he/she" throughout? *Considered friendly.*

(Badal) The four documents we approved at the last meeting still have the “he/she”, so they will also need to be changed.

11.2 ASD 19-06 Revisions to UPS 411.101 - Policy on Courses: Numbering, Standard Codes and Controlled Entry

M/S/P (Mead/Gradilla) Motion to approve ASD 19-06 Revisions to UPS 411.101 - Policy on Courses: Numbering, Standard Codes and Controlled Entry. Motion approved unanimously.

11.3 ASD 19-07 Revisions to UPS 210.000 - Faculty Personnel Policy and Procedures

11.4 ASD 19-08 New UPS 210.XXX - Tenure and Promotion Personnel Standards

M/S/P (Walker/Brunelle) Motion to approve both items ASD 19-07 and ASD 19-08 at the same time. Motion passed.

Senator Walker gave an overview of the changes that were made to UPS 210.000 and what was removed from UPS 210.000 to create the new UPS 210.XXX.

Q: (Jarvis) Will this cause a problem with every one of our existing departmental standards or bylaws that specifically references UPS 210.000? Will we run into any problems if we make a decision and there is a grievance and it's referencing a UPS that is incorrect? Do all 85 departments now need to go through and make a small change to their standards?

A: (Walker) The idea of the committee was this is step one before we actually do some wholesale revisions to a lot of chunks of the document, so I actually imagine that there is going to be lots of revisions for departments separate from us doing this. But because we really made no changes to the document one of the things we could ask the Senate to do would be to maintain the old document along with the new documents on the website so that if standards were approved with reference to the old document it could still be referred too. But if that section then changes as we move through this process of revising it, the revisions are going to have to happen anyway.

- (Collum) We kept UPS 210.000 for procedures because most of the standards documents reference the procedures but not the standards, which would be UPS 210.002, so I don't think there will be a lot of problems.

Q: (Fidalgo) All these possible changes in departmental standards, are they going to go to the college Faculty Personnel Committees or to the University Personnel Committee?

A: (Walker) The changes would follow the normal procedures, so they would go through the departments then the college, then FAR, and then up to the President.

- (Kanel) Since Counseling is the only place that does not have their own Departmental Personnel Standards, even the FPC if there is a disagreement at any level goes to the department standards, they do not go to UPS 210.000 unless the people don't have their own department standards. So it's really only really only for the Counseling faculty, that's the only people affected in terms of FPC.

## XII. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Fitch/Fidalgo) Meeting adjourned at 12:50 PM.