



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 29, 2020**

*Approved 10-20-20*

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

**ZOOM Meeting**

---

Present: Dabirian, Gradilla, Kanel, Matz, Stambough, Stohs, Walker, Walsh, Wood

---

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Stambough called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

## **II. URGENT BUSINESS**

No urgent business.

## **III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- (Dabirian) A faculty member in the College of Education has created an inclusive pedagogy for their new faculty, and it has been very successful. I am working with that faculty member to develop an online version of the inclusive pedagogy, and that particular course will be available, incentivized for regular faculty to take it. If we can get CFA to buy into it to make it mandatory, we can do it. If not, we can incentivize it. The content of that course will bring back to the Diversity & Inclusion Committee and the Senate Executive Committee to make sure we are inclusive of what we are doing in this process. The goal is to be ready around April 2021 and perhaps be prepared for faculty to take in fall 2021. We will make the online course similar to Sexual Harassment training and available on the same platforms. We will ask departments to encourage it, and we will incentivize it and mandate it. I am working with Dean Kirtman and the faculty member. I will bring it to Exec every step of the way. We are starting early and getting the Senate committee involved early, so we a rough process to get this done for fall 2021.

Q: (Wood) Is this only for new faculty?

A: (Dabirian) No, the regular course is part of the faculty process. All new faculty are being trained as part of the pedagogy; it is not the online version. Faculty have the opportunity to take the course through FDC. To get the course to the masses, including part-time faculty, we need an online version where faculty can do it in their own time. IT is funding the faculty member to get the course done, and IT will make it an online format. The process would be through Academic Affairs; I have talked to the Provost, Kristin Stang, Dean Kirtman, and will bring it to the Diversity & Inclusion Committee to make sure the content is what we want to do.

- (Stambough) The Constitutional Jeopardy link is live. We raised a little over \$5,000 for Moot Court, Guardian Scholars, and the Veterans Resource Center.

## **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

M/S/P (Walsh/Matz) Motion to approve three sets of minutes. Minutes approved.

- 4.1 EC Minutes 9-1-20
- 4.2 EC Minutes 9-8-20
- 4.3 EC Minutes 9-22-20

## **V. CHAIR'S REPORT**

It is about the Ethnic Studies Requirement. I had a couple of really good conversations with the Provost about a number of the issues which we'll discuss during new business.

## VI. STAFF REPORT

- Just a reminder that all PowerPoint presentations have to go through the Executive Committee before going to the Senate. We had a couple of people that wanted to talk at the last Senate meeting on the Ethnic Studies Requirement, and they wanted to do PowerPoint presentations. We had to inform them that was not the process; all presentations need to be approved by the Executive Committee before going to the Senate. If anyone contacts you stating they have a PowerPoint for the Senate, please have them contact Chair Stambough so he can schedule them to come to an Executive Committee meeting to present it.
- If anyone is planning to yield the mic at a Senate meeting, the names of the persons who will be speaking need to be forwarded to Senate staff to ensure they have access to the webinar to speak.
- We will also request that Senators do not send private chat messages to Mara during the meeting on changes to the documents. Several Senators were sending their edits privately, and it became overwhelming.
  - (Dabirian) Put a footnote on the agenda with these instructions to the Senators.
- We need a faculty person from ARTS for the Faculty Personnel Committee. We need to have the person on the October 8th AS agenda for Senate approval as the Senate nominee to have the special election. Please send your suggestions in the chat, and we can begin contacting faculty, and hopefully, we can get someone willing to serve.

## VII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

7.1 ASI Board [Stambough], T, 9-22-20, 1:15 - 3:45 PM, Zoom

No written report was submitted.

7.2 Campus Facilities & Beautification Committee [Dabirian], F, 9-25-20, 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom

- The last meeting minutes were approved.
- Urgent business – Committee concerned about spring 2021 to ensure our campus students' safety and how we can open other classes if it is safe. Staircases and Elevator safety was concerned.
- Emil presented a PowerPoint on all the campus reopening.
  - He explained in detail about each slide
  - Faculty were pleased with all the safety efforts for all on-campus classes.
- Safety of the Election voting on November 3rd. <http://www.fullerton.edu/election/> - Email will follow-up
- Art creation for the campus: Using a class for artwork creation (Cross-disciplinary involvement of other colleges)
- VPSA will come next time to talk about the linkage between SA and this committee, such as the cultural center
- Discussion on Folino Drive / Nutwood intersection issue and cross-section. An email will take this to Ali and Danny.

7.3 General Education Committee [Stambough], F, 9-25-20, 2:00 - 4:00 PM, Zoom

No written report was submitted.

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

8.1 Ethnic Studies Process

1. ASCSU Chair Note on Ethnic Studies Collaboration
2. CSUCES Letter Vice-Chancellor Blanchard and Chair Collins
3. CSUN Ethnic Studies Resolution
4. Working Draft Proposal for University Graduation Requirement Committee for Ethnic Studies Requirement
  - (Stambough) Part of the problem is we have effectively two different laws that are in place at the same time. We have the Administrative Law, which is the Board of Trustees' changes to Title IV that was passed a week before they passed AB1460. Then we have AB 1460, which overrides any part of the Administrative Law's action or the Board of Trustees that it comes into conflict with.

One of the problems we are facing is that it's a bizarre combination of two different laws designed to do similar things but intended to conflict with each other at the same time. The Board of Trustees' changes were intended to stop AB 1460; AB 1460 was designed in part to override some of the stuff the Chancellor's office was doing. There is enough overlap into a similar goal that now we are stuck with trying to figure out how to do all this administratively.

The timeline is the timeline from the law, and without going through a messy process of trying to change that, the timeline is this has to be into the catalog in time for our graduates in 2024-2025. We have to have all this done by December for the catalog year to get it into the catalog by January.

Other parts of it, this has to be a 3-unit class and required of our graduates. The law is silent on whether it could or is not allowed to be a GE requirement. The Board of Trustees ruling on that is it has to be within GE because of AB 1440.

We are stuck with a tight timeline, a law that combines the bill and the Board of Trustees ruling. We need to have it done by December to create the Area F to take the three units out of Area D to figure out what we want to do with that and figure out what our process will be like on our campus. Some thought that we don't have a lot of say over the campus process the way things are written.

- (Stohs) The law requires consultation between the ASCSU and the Ethnic Studies Council; it did not include individual campuses. The way the Chancellor's Office Ethnic Studies Executive Order came down, it said what had to be done but did not provide a lot of guidance for individual campuses. Whatever flexibility we have is there, but it is not that much.

There is an ongoing debate between the ASCSU, the Ethnic Studies Council, the Chancellor's office, and the Board of Trustees, but in many ways, that will not affect us. Unless the Chancellor's office and the Board of Trustees change, we are stuck with what we already have. I think we just go forward with what we already know from the Chancellor's office right now and try to make it best for our campus.

- (Stambough) What decisions do we need to make? Where do we have flexibility? Some of the stuff I read mentions the campuses are not included in the discussions of the Student Learning Outcomes, which I feel is wrong because it says core competencies. We need to build the process for how things get certified in the category.

Q: (Walker) If we are supposed to follow the Chancellor's office's guidance on things in which the law is silent, does that mean we get bound by the Executive Order on GE Course Approval?

A: (Stambough) Yes

Q: (Kanel) Do we not already have a class covering critical race theory, anti-racism, privilege, oppression, all the stuff we went over last year that we feel needs to be in an Ethnic Studies class on our campus?

A: (Stambough) Yes, we have classes that will fill the category.

Q: (Kanel) Why do we have to put all these classes in Curriculog, except to say we want this to now be in Area F and apply for them to be in General Education. It's not like we have to create courses. We just have to push them through Curriculog and get them set up and on the schedule more. It doesn't seem impossible as long as Curriculog devotes and focuses on this. They can get things through really fast if it's a pressing EO issue.

A: (Stambough) Things we need to figure out are our specific Student Learning Outcomes that would add definition to the Core Competencies. Who writes them? Who decides them? What is the process for getting classes vetted into that category?

You saw the report from the Ethnic Studies Chairs; they want a process that circumvents the GE Committee. We would need to figure out what do we do off of that. The ASCSU Resolution says there should be disciplinary deference of all these courses. Building off what ASCSU did last year, it says Ethnic Studies faculty need to be explicitly involved and included in the process for determining the learning goals and for certifying classes to go into it.

Q: (Dabirian) Is it possible to create a spreadsheet with all the information in columns so we can see the things we can do based on a combination to move forward? This way, we can get the best possible solution for our campus.

A: (Stambough) Yes, that is probably the best way to go.

(Stambough) Hard questions about things I want us to consider. If we are okay with Ethnic Studies Faculty having veto power over Area F certification when a department out of HSS decides to move into Area B, do we let NSM do the same thing? When something usually from NSM proposes to go into Critical Thinking and Communications, do we let Philosophy and Communications do the same thing? Do we have the same type of disciplinary deference for the other categories? Do we let the College of Arts and the College of Humanities part of HSS control Area C? Do we have Social Science Departments control Area D? What is the Senate floor's argument that a different process needs to be in place for Area F and not for the other areas?

- (Gradilla) If we take this traditionally conservative approach, yes, we can set up this precedence. It is uncomfortable at first, but eventually, we will find the remedy. Cross-listing with other faculty who could teach those classes is important. But what we are afraid of is how watered down it could get quickly, and it is not critical because the university is tying it to first-year experience and student success. These courses are not designed or solely taught by faculty. That's our concern because that has been leveraged to do all sorts of things when we use other initiatives to work against these types of criteria, especially if it's lower division.
- (Walker) I think there are issues broader than Ethnic Studies, but I think we need to sort the Ethnic Studies thing out, and then we can worry about some of the other problems. One of the biggest problems we have had in GE is once a course gets proposed as GE, it pretty much just sails through; nobody says no. If we want to have a vibrant, thriving GE Program, our GE maybe needs to say no. I think the question about sorting out how to approve the Ethnic Studies classes could be solved easily in a couple of ways structurally. The way the EO is written, they will have to go through the GE Committee, but that doesn't mean we as a campus can't put in an additional layer before that. Or the committee could have a subcommittee every time. We have got to do something broadly about GE after we have solved this problem. If we solve this problem in the way we have talked about, we are creating a precedent by which we can start talking about a GE Committee that gets input from subject matter experts.
- (Dabirian) I agree; using this as a model is perfect. Having the expertise and having a small subgroup look at it makes a lot of sense. Using this to create the process and the committees, we need to do the Ethnic Studies and use it as a guideline.
- (Kanel) As a university, we have already agreed that we want Ethnic Studies Faculty to be the primary gatekeepers; they have the expertise; they know what should be included in this course. If it's a lower division GE course, we don't have to worry about too many other departments. If you let other departments come into it too much, then that flavors how their department might utilize this, which detracts from the content. I think these classes will be jammed packed with history, content, culture, and theory of sociological and political theories. I don't know how you will bring in discipline-specific concepts, so I see no reason why other departments have to focus on it. It should be a straight class, which is purely about the Critical Race Theory and Ethnic Studies. If another department thinks they can teach that and the faculty who specialize in just that, then the Ethnic Studies can just look at those syllabuses and those requirements and see if they meet the basic standards. I don't see why they can't be the consulting firm with our GE Committee, and they tell the GE Committee if they approve of this.
- (Wood) I think the structural history requires that Ethnic Studies control what courses and evaluate which courses count. I love this idea of having the committee review before GE because it keeps the GE process in tack, but it adds this review layer. Our department has a class we would love to submit, but if we did and an Ethnic Studies faculty came back and said we don't think this is right, and here's why I think the Ethnic Studies Department and faculty should have that authority. This is a different topic from where our disciplines overlap, and the history is different.
- (Stambough) What I'm hearing is something that could go into the Bylaws of the GE Committee. We set up a subcommittee that would review any of the courses that would go into Area F before it goes anywhere else. The subcommittee would be Ethnic Studies Faculty.
- (Gradilla) To make it institutionalized, we could create a timeline starting with Area F, and next year we could evaluate the other areas; GE did this with recertification.

8.2 Request from Chairs

Jon Bruschke and Jade Jewett join the Executive Committee meeting, and there was a robust discussion on the letter from the chairs to the Provost and the SOQ issue.

8.3 Campus Morale

8.4 Discuss SOQ Task Force Membership and SOQ Task Force Report

<http://www.fullerton.edu/FAR/soq/SOQ%20Committee%20Report%20FINAL%205.6.2019.pdf>

Faculty Committee Assignments for Standing Committees

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

M/S/P (Dabirian/Walsh) Meeting ended at 12:55 PM.