

## **ACADEMIC SENATE**

### **Minutes**

#### **MEETING #3**

Thursday, October 4, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 pm  
Towner Auditorium (PSY 150)

1. CALL TO ORDER – called to order at 2:05 pm.
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA-approved by unanimous consent
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
  - 3.1 Academic Senate meeting of September 20, 2018
  - 3.2 Academic Senate meeting of September 4, 2018 – approved
4. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS
  - 4.1 Executive Committee: Announcements - Invitations going out for the Academic Senate Retreat. After Doodle poll, AS meeting is still on for November 1<sup>st</sup>.
  - 4.2 Nominating Committee- GEGC Jennifer Asenas, approved, IEC, Ehsan Barjastah, Yan Li, both COE, approved
5. CONSENT CALENDAR
  - 5.1 Rescission of Academic Senate PS 78-06 (PS-1063-18/EC)—SECOND READING-officially rescinded by AS without objection
6. SPECIAL ORDERS
  - 6.1 Report from CSULB President Jane Conoley: TIME CERTAIN 2:15 pm- Brian Jersky to speak in her absence. WASC visiting, VP Lori Williams, she states we have been selected to go through an experimental WASC review. We can skip the pre-set themes and present our 3 themes, can focus on them. CSULB held in high esteem by collegiate community. GE important in our history and future. Mary Ann Takemoto currently taking the role of VP Carmen Taylor on administrative leave.
  - 6.2 Report from CFA President Doug Domingo-Forasté- reported on upcoming election and Measure WW (working women) human rights issue rather than labor issue DDF states. Woman workers in the hotel industry housekeeping work in unfair circumstances and Measure WW will help them avoid excessive workload and forced overtime.
  - 6.3 Introduction of USAID Diplomat in Residence Alfred Nakatsuma: TIME CERTAIN 2:30 pm- He is here to serve students, he is from Federal government in DC, helps people understand what taxpayer dollars are doing overseas. USAID helps foreign countries develop education, infrastructure. Can instruct students in getting jobs, internships, fellowships. He is available to speak to classes, advise students, mentoring. [anakatsuma@usaid.gov](mailto:anakatsuma@usaid.gov)

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 7.1 Proposed revision of Policy on Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity PS 11-08 (PS-1058-18/FPPC/EC)—SECOND READING
- 7.2 Proposed revision of Policy on Avoidance of Conflict of Interest PS 99-15 and Policy on Nepotism PS 05-10 (PS-968-17/FPPC)—SECOND READING

8. NEW BUSINESS

- 8.1 Proposed Dissolution of Educator Preparation Committee (PS-1061-18/EC)—FIRST READING: TIME CERTAIN 2:40 pm- motion, seconded, no discussion.
- 8.2 Proposed Dissolution of University Library Committee (PS-1062-18/EC)—FIRST READING: TIME CERTAIN 2:50 pm- Library Dean will report bi-yearly as opposed to this committee meeting. Motion, seconded, no discussion.
- 8.3 Open discussion on draft of Policy on General Education and Campus-Specific Graduation Requirements (GEGR policy) (PS-1060-18/EC): TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm- motion to start early, seconded, objection, withdrawn motion.
- Grace Reynolds-Fisher (CHHS) reported on recommendations of new *ad hoc* committee (NAHC) with one representative from each academic college. Committee members: GRF (CHHS), James Ary (COE), Lori Brown (CBA), Teresa Chen (CED), Colleen Dunagan (COTA), Norbert Schürer (CLA), Katya Slowinska (CNSM), Jody Cormack (resource and recorder). NAHC first discussed Section 3.3.2 and recommended striking lines 468-470. NAHC also discussed Category B upper-division GE courses and Section 4.0, campus-specific graduation requirements. Committee voted to recommend deleting all these. Rationale included that EO 1100 no longer allows for Category F GE courses that meet current requirements; therefore, majors with high unit loads because of professional accreditation are highly constrained. NAHC recommended moving authority for GE approval authority to the college level due to expertise in these areas. Challenges from GEGC members or College Curriculum Committees would mean that GEGC would make a final determination. Concentrations were approved but had implementation issues with this area.
  - Open discussion began: section 4.0 questioned. EO mandates the name of upper-division GE courses, the word “capstone” was suggested to be removed and called upper division B, C, etc.
    - Alfred Nakatsuma spoke in support of GE
    - Grace Reynolds-Fisher explained the work of the new *ad hoc* committee and how they came to their conclusions and recommendations and that many hours went into their deliberations and decisions.
    - Ali Igmen- asked to define the word “movement” in section 4.0 with regards to category F courses. ‘Movement’ means that courses currently certified for Category F can apply for certification in a different GE area.

- Jody Cormack reported on campus-specific requirements and recommendations made by the committee.
- Fumio Hamano states GE seems more manageable under current system for his college.
- Nellie Wieland asked about removal of **Campus Specific Requirements**, double counting in upper division B, C, and D.
- GRF stated that high unit majors and highly constrained majors determined that **CSR** was not feasible at this time.
- JP stated that CEPC deliberated for substantial hours on the original draft policy regarding **CSR**'s.
- Upon request, Neil Hultgren reported that CEPC referred to the EO and current GE policy and spend 2 hours per meeting for an entire semester on the policy draft; they felt that the **CSR** were important parts of CSULB education. They looked for ways to integrate these into high unit majors. Racial and ethnic diversity courses reflect the “inclusive excellence” that the University stands for.
- Gary Griswold asked about writing intensive courses and how do students do the GVAR?
- Danny Paskin stated that **CSR** in the policy draft from the summer *ad hoc* committee would be overlays to the GE requirements and were not meant to add units to agrees.
- Alan Colburn stated that upper-division major-specific courses in Categories C and D seemed to be only for specific majors. New draft stated upper division B courses to be open to all majors in a certain percentage.
- Chris Brazier stated that **CSR** do not add units to any major and therefore should not be removed.
- Terry Armstrong asked about the rationale for suggestions to change the title of Section 4.3.1 for “Racial and Ethnic Diversity” to “Human Diversity.”
- GRF stated that racial diversity was too restrictive for certain majors.
- Tiffani Travis asked about revisions regarding racial diversity issue and difference in requirement.
- Genesis Jara asserted that from a student perspective courses in racial and ethnic diversity courses are essential to a CSULB education and thus spoke in favor of the **CSR**. She stated that they addressed inclusive excellence, which is one of the pillars of CSULB supports.
- Henry Yeh spoke in support of revised policy due to the 120-unit constraint.
- Praveen Shankar asked why upper-division GE requirements B and D can be covered in existing courses in high unit majors.
- Doug Domingo-Forasté asked whether the goal of University experience was intellectual achievement or graduating in four years, in the opinion of the committee.

- Flora Banuett stated that diversity is a limiting term and can refer to many qualities.
- Deborah Hamm asked about the approval of GE policy moved out of GEGC to an outside committee and why?
- Danny Paskin asked whether the idea of giving colleges the authority to certify GE courses went against the EO mandate. In his assessment, the suggestion of the NAHC goes against section 6.2.2 of EO 1100 because it takes power away from GEGC.
- Edwin Achola stated human diversity has many elements, race and ethnicity is contentious and easy to ignore, human diversity can be addressed.
- Lucy Huckaby stated nursing has high units, went to 126 units due to GE, she stated that nursing teaches human diversity, cultural, global diversity in their discipline. She feels mandated diversity courses are too limiting. She supports new draft from NAHC.
- TT stated that current nursing courses could be approved as GE courses by GEGC and could double count.
- Ryan Fisher stated that diversity is an ever-changing issue and will continue to change. He asked what students value as being important.
- NS responded that raw data from the survey (which was shared with the entire campus community) suggested that racial and ethnic diversity were among the students' highest priorities.
- Heather Barker asked about *federalization of GE* and how GE supported the University mission?
- GRF supported pulling GE back into the majors/departments rather than follow a federal mandate.
- Eileen Klink asked if exceptions in EO states that high unit majors may issue exceptions, will our campus ask for exceptions with regards to **CSR**?
- Jody Cormack said CSR to be included in the 120 units and exceptions may be made in high unit majors.
- Deborah Thien stated that students want a space to learn about diversity issues. She suggested that high unit majors needed to consider that GE is important and that their problems in counting units could be worked out.
- Elizabeth Guzik stated that you cannot teach diversity without addressing all intersections.
- Christine Jocoy stated that four-year graduation may not be realistic. Some major course could not be GE due to prerequisites for example.
- Paul Laris stated that he took GE as an undergraduate and that it was very important in his life. He stated that students who were exposed to diverse groups did better in the workplace intellectually than those not exposed to diverse groups of persons.
- Neil Hultgren said GEGC did not write the EO. He wondered whether GE in the departments was really GE.

- Pei Fang Hung asked if upper-division courses were the question, diversity is many things not just race.
- Sanjian Khang stated Federalism can mean many things, retrain faculty members are highly qualified to give out global knowledge

9. ADJOURNMENT at 4:00