ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Extra
Minutes
Tuesday, October 13, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.
Videoconference

Members: A. Hegde, M. Danforth, J. Millar, M. Martinez, M. Rees, R. Gearhart, C. Lam,
B. Street, D. Boschini, V. Harper

Visitors: A. Wrynn, L. Van Cleve

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK**
   - Assistant Vice Chancellors (AVC) A. Wrynn and L. Van Cleve – A. Hegde posed some questions. A. Wrynn started with short PowerPoint to help answer the questions and process that that lie between 1) AB 1460 the law and 2) how Ethnic Studies (ES) becomes CSU policy, 3) Why in GE, 4) Rational for Timeline, and 5) Faculty impact and involvement. The California Community College (CCC) transfer courses for CSU GE credit are centrally approved. They have a February deadline to submit their classes for approval, per A. Wrynn. Courses are reviewed based on core competencies, learning outcomes and an ES prefix. M. Martinez asked if students could satisfy ES requirement through CCC courses. Wrynn replied, “yes”. M. Danforth asked about 2.2.5 subitem D where it strikes authority for campus to make adjustments. Her concern is that some may try to eliminate upper division major course double-counting and other adjustments used at CSUB to free GE units for CSUB-specific GE areas. For example, Upper Division B is met through a STEM course for STEM majors. A. Wrynn replied that upper division campus based requirements okay as long as stay within 120 units to graduate. We have six areas with prescribed area of units. M. Danforth is concerned by taking out campus autonomy it may limit flexibility and creativity. The change to Area C took away flexibility for courses in the sub areas and is not related to the ES implementation. The proposed wording does not interplay well with the option to fold American Institutions – US History into Area C. Does US History take the proposed “student-choice” slot or the Humanities slot? Label it C-3 and call it US History? A. Wrynn will follow up on campus autonomy. Some things were shifted during the change. She doesn’t think that Computer & Electrical Engineering and Computer Science will have trouble. Be sure to include concerns and recommendations in the campus’
written response. A. Wrynn will check with D. Jackson too. M. Rees also had similar concerns about the proposed wording changes to Area C. A. Wrynn said one can suggest language. The CO will listen. If it needs to be specifically in the policy, send the language along. M. Rees asked about Area F Departments. A. Wrynn replied that the rationale shall be met only by a specific list of departments (African American, Asian American, Latina/o American or Native American Studies) in the findings and declaration and not in the education code. The ES Council said it should come from one of the four departments. The approved cross list is a compromise. If campus wants another level of approval, forming an ES Council is OK. The courses don’t have to be interdisciplinary. There are many classes that can be met from other departments – Art, Sociology, etc. M. Danforth asked if the policy will also list a more generic ES department to approve, (reference page 9). A. Wrynn replied that the updated version of demonstrates flexibility in the naming of departments. Example Ethic Studies, Native American, aka Indigenous People of the Americas, etc. A. Wrynn appreciates that this is extra work. A. Hegde thanked A. Wrynn and L. Van Cleve for being responsive. M. Martinez asked for written confirmation that CCC courses can satisfy the ES requirement. It will help our transfer students. She will revise power point before she sends to A. Hegde.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
October 6, 2020 Minutes (deferred)

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
Approved by advance agreement that the sole purpose of the meeting was to meet with the AVCs to discuss Feedback on CSU GE EO.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS** (deferred)
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart)
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam)
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
      iv. BPC (B. Street)
   b. Provost Update
   c. Searches
   d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation - PBTF
   e. Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
D. Boschini said the slide presentation from AVC A. Wrynn was helpful. Keep in mind that an overlay is off the table. Make it clear in every conversation that overlay of courses is off the table. If a new person comes into the conversation, get the points of clarity out front so the conversation doesn’t have to start all over again. If we pause to consider one more thing, we go down the rabbit hole. The horse is so far out of the barn that we can’t go back. M. Rees read the opposition from other campus. Is there a sense that we need to join? A. Hegde replied that there are four campuses with controversy. Half objected to the deadline being too soon. The other two campuses charge that there is faculty conflict with the Senate Task Force. The Senate Chairs of those campuses said that it’s the sentiment of enough faculty that they had to show that there is conflict. The law doesn’t say that it has to be lower division GE or Area F. A. Hegde doesn’t advocate for conflict. It’s the law to meet requirement of ES before graduation. Hear everyone out and do the best we can. The CSU has a deadline to submit results to legislature. D. Boschini supports J. Millar’s point about the potential of a lot of conflict and her suggestion to bring someone in to mediate the beginning of the conversation and set norms. R. Gearhart suggested to invite ASCSU Chair, R. Collins to have that role. A. Hegde replied that learning outcomes and unit implementation were separated to avoid conflict. The AVC’s presentation veered towards the technicality of the core competencies and who is ES faculty. It is a completely different conversation than the three units requirement. He didn’t see any objection to Area F coming from reducing Area D. He spoke with Psychology. There are two main programs that will be impacted. Right now, we don’t have the resources to meet all the GE. Students will take three less units in Area D. It may require some GE Modifications. GECCo’s task force and the departments can propose some modifications. A. Hegde offered to moderate so we don’t have to hire a consultant. Although he could talk to Provost to see if we can hire one. A. Hegde will also ask R. Collins if he’s willing to moderate. R. Gearhart: every week AA chairs meet. The law is still in flux. Their focus is first on unit implementation and then worry later who and what courses apply. C. Lam was involved in the design of the current semester GE and GECCo. The reason for the current structure is to prevent silos and lack of communication between areas. There is no coherence with the GE program. We need to address that part. V. Harper has a lot of faith because we have talked about EO 1100, we reduced remediation, and we went through the Quarter to Semester conversion. Faculty has more than overcome obstacles; they have optimally implemented change.
There are some related issues that can be resolved through governance. During the ES Task Force meeting, the group concluded that they will take care of unit implementation and make recommendations. V. Harper has assured faculty that he is supportive of who teaches the courses and that the teaching is reflected of the diversity. Let us check the box for unit implementation, and then we will engage in the long term and work on GECCo. M. Danforth suggested bringing a 3rd party outside of EC so there really is neutrality. Look for a volunteer to avoid any conflict-of-interest. It may be better received if there is someone outside the ASCSU and CSUB Academic Senate structure. To C. Lam’s comment to prevent silos, it was probably directed toward the interdisciplinary parts of GE, Area A and Area E. The discipline-specific areas of GE need more subject matter experts brought into the process. A. Hegde said we can get someone from outside, yet the feedback has to go through the Academic Senate anyway. Further, no one else has invested as much time in finding out about AB 1460. This process is for those of us here. There will be some debate, and we shouldn’t be afraid of that. It’s healthy. The university has faith in individuals to resolve those things. If we bring someone in, it sends the wrong message that we expect problems. We anticipated that the learning outcomes would be somewhat controversial. That’s why forming an ES Council, or a Curriculum Committee was suggested. There would be subject matter experts on board and if the Curriculum Committee says “no”, there has to be some recourse for appeal, which will come at a later date. Now, focus on unit implementation and create an Area F. He is not on the ES Task Force. Whatever comes from Task Force will go through EC. M. Martinez suggested for the members to contemplate including the ES Councils at Taft College and Bakersfield College. A. Hegde agreed the language isn’t from non-experts dictating what can or cannot be in a course. Example: Kinesiology doesn’t tell Political Science what should go in a Government class. There are other faculty with ES expertise, such as I. Cargile, who can determine whether faculty is certified or not. The presumption is that faculty chairs will choose who is qualified to teach. As ASCSU chair R. Collins said at the last CSUB ES Unit Implementation Task Force meeting, Computer Science could offer a course that has 50% coding and the other 50% meet the ES learning outcomes. There is a lot of common ground. Have faith in our colleagues. It’s for our students. R. Gearhart said there are three things he’d like the ES Unit Implementation Task Force to approve/not approve at the meeting tomorrow: 1) GEMs become the domain of the departments, 2) reduction from 6 to 3 units in Area D, and 3) Creation of Area F that houses lower division ES courses with current ES courses migrating from C to F. Who
teaches cross-listed courses or the course approval process is to-be-determined. A. Hegde encourages members to be mindful of having a discussion that moves things forward. M. Danforth will miss the ES meeting as she teaches at that time. She asked that someone reach out to Liberal Studies and Engineering Sciences about how Area D unit reduction would affect them. There is a Nursing professor on the Unit Implementation Task Force. Those majors are impacted. A. Sawyer of Liberal Studies and L. Cabrales of Engineering Sciences will be contacted. M. Danforth said we have to make sure that the programs are not caught between two state laws. Everything else is a local decision. V. Harper said that the deadline to submit feedback to the CO is November 2.

b. Provost Pandemic Research Group (deferred)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 15, 2020 (deferred)
   - Announcements
     - President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
     - University Police Update – M. Williamson (Time Certain 10:30)
   - Consent Agenda
   - Reports
   - New Business
   - Old Business
   - Open Forum and Wellness Check

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR
   ES Council helps to fill the gap where there aren’t any ES faculty on GECCo. For example, if another department wanted to start a course, the ES Council could approve for cross listing. J. Moraga and T. Salisbury would be members, as well as others who are not ES faculty, yet they have experience. R. Gearhart learned that SF State is looking at courses if 50 % includes the learning outcomes. M. Danforth said that GECCo is a relatively new structure, and previously there was more control by the discipline experts on what constitutes an Area C class, etc. For example, NSME Curriculum Committee used to have control over Area B. GECCo has proposed changes to Area B but NSME Curriculum Committee has rejected those changes. We need to return control to the subject matter experts. There are disciplines that are Area-specific. A. Hegde agrees. It’s not conducive to shared learning. We’ll get something in place to take care of the law. Then in the spring we’ll take apart the structure and rebuild.
V. Harper is in favor of building a small committee to meet deadline. We had two weeks to form a committee to provide feedback on EO 1000. The campus’ response was “Other”.

M. Martinez agreed with everything M. Danforth said. There is not systemic racism in the group, yet there are issues. Any perceived activism is not a good thing. Going from enthusiasm to activism is crossing the line. Ensure that we’re not crossing that line.

J. Millar is in support of an ES Council. She encouraged use of the CO’s Council of ES to walk us through the conflicts/ideas. An Asian Studies professor teaching in History may be considered a fellow to provide feedback. Assemblywoman Weber has ES background and her legislation is based on the Council of ES. It’s about people, races, and intersectionality.

9. ADJOURNMENT
A. Hegde thanked the members for attending the extra EC meeting to address the feedback on the EO GE Ethnic Studies. He adjourned the meeting at 11:45.
Agenda

• Ethnic Studies and AB 1460
  • Applicable laws: HEERA, SB 1440, AB 1460
  • How does a law become CSU policy?
  • How will this new policy impact students?
  • How have faculty been consulted about this new policy?
  • Resources

• Questions
How does a law become CSU policy?

Legislation → Education Code → Title 5 (Trustees) → CSU Policy (EO) → Campus-based Policy
Example: How does a law become CSU policy?

Legislation: AB 2382

Education Code: 66042, 66042.1 and 66042.3

Title 5: § 40515 and 40516 (Trustees)

CSU Policy (EO): 1076

Campus-based Policy: Policy Statement 11-11 (at CSULB)
Where are we with AB 1460?

Legislation:
AB 1460

Education Code:
89032

Title 5: §40405.1 (Trustees)

CSU Policy (EO): Current status
DRAFT

Campus-based Policy: Campuses are reviewing and revising policies this semester
Why in GE?

- Implications for First Time Freshmen

- Implications for Transfer
  - Ensures completion at the California Community Colleges (CCC) for Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) students.

- Ethnic Studies Task Force Report and the “Findings and Declaration” section of AB 1460 explicitly state that this new requirement is to be a General Education requirement
  - Statements by Assemblymember Weber during her legislative testimony clearly convey that this is to be a General Education requirement.
GE: Implications for First Time Freshmen

• Beginning in fall 2021, first time freshmen will be required to take this requirement as part of their degree.

• New first year students will fall under the newly revised GE program and will be required to meet the Ethnic Studies requirement as part of CSU GE Breadth
GE: Implications for Transfer

- According to AB 1460, we may not increase the units required for graduation, thus we need to find three units that all students are already required to take.
- CCC transfer students will be able to meet this requirement at their community college.
- This is particularly pertinent to Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). Existing state law prevents CSU from adding any courses to the lower-division 60 units of ADTs that the CCC offer unless it is part of CSU GE Breadth.
GE: Task Force Report & Findings and Declarations

• In the *Ethnic Studies Task Force Report*, issued in 2016, the creation of a standalone section of GE in Ethnic Studies was Recommendation 1.
  • The “Findings and Declarations” section of AB 1460 includes this recommendation.

• In her testimony before the Assembly Higher Education committee on April 23, 2019, Assemblymember Shirley Weber cited the recommendation and called for this requirement to be in General Education.

• On June 25, 2019, during the Senate Education committee, Assemblymember Weber’s opening statement makes reference to the 2014 Task Force.

“In 2016, the number one recommendation of that Task Force, was to make Ethnic Studies a general education requirement throughout the CSU system. AB 1460 codifies the number one recommendation of the CSU Task Force report.” – Asm. Shirley Weber
Why does this need to be a standalone category in GE and not an overlay?

• The topic of overlays had previously arisen with Assemblymember Weber when the CSU revised EO 1100. She has been very clear that she did not view this the Ethnic Studies requirement as an overlay. This new requirement is to be a standalone section of GE.

• Student clarity
  • Students are not always certain as to which CSU they will transfer to—consistent application of the requirement across the system promotes student success.
Why is the timeline so rapid?

• The law requires all CSU campuses to offer courses in Ethnic Studies by the fall of 2021.

• Additionally, it requires that students graduating in 2024-25 have met the Ethnic Studies requirement – these students will have catalog rights established in 2021.

• In order to meet campus curricular deadlines for the fall 2021 semester, the CSU will need to update Title 5 and the existing Executive Order policy on CSU GE Breadth this fall 2020 to provide time for the campuses to conduct curricular work through shared governance.
How have faculty been consulted about this new policy?

• The Academic Senate, CSU (ASCSU)

• The CSU Ethnic Studies Council (CSUESC)
  • The California State University shall collaborate with the California State University Council on Ethnic Studies and the Academic Senate of the California State University to develop core competencies to be achieved by students who complete an ethnic studies course pursuant to implementation of this section.

• There has been one meeting among the three groups so far—with another scheduled this week, we have approved core competencies (as of 10/13/20).
Resources

• To learn more about the process we have posted
  • The text of AB 1460
  • An FAQ document
Questions?

• Leo Van Cleve, Assistant Vice Chancellor, International, Summer Arts, and ASCSU Relations
  • lvancleve@calstate.edu

• Alison Wrynn, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs, Innovations and Faculty Development
  • awrynn@calstate.edu