THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

5200 N. Barton Ave ML 34

Fresno, California 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate FAX: 278-5745

TEL: 278-2743 (AS-4)

October 26, 2020

Members excused: B. Findley

Members absent: A. Alexandrou, G. Brar, J. Crane, K. Jordan

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Holyoke at 4:04 p.m. via Zoom video conferencing.

1. Approval of the Agenda.

MSC

1. Approval of the Minutes of 10/12/20.

MSC

1. Communications and Announcements.

Ms. Zuñiga (ASI) invited all to next ASI meeting where students will voice concerns about the discontinuation of wrestling and other issues of concern to students.

Sen Tawfik informed the Senate that this Wednesday interesting research results from the Fresno State Transportation Institute concerning findings on COVID and public health will be publicly announced. (See: Fresno State News).

Informational Session: AB 1460 Ethnic Studies Requirement

Guests: Vice Chancellor Dr. Alison Wrynn and Assistant Vice Chancellor Dr. Leo Van Cleve.

Dr. Wrynn was introduce and given the floor where she shared some prepared slides. This slide set was sent to the Academic Senate Listserve after the meeting, and Dr. Van Cleve sent the following link to all via the Zoom chat.

https://www2.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/diversity/advancement-of-ethnic-studies

Chair Holyoke sought and gained approval from the Senate for guests to speak without the typical needed recognition by a senator.

Sen. DeJordy asked for clarification about when the Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) rights kick in for a student. Dr. Wrynn described that these rights are associated with the catalog rights at beginning of City College enrollment.

Ms. Zuñiga: Inquired about how to supply input, and specifically how ASI might be involved, and how the Chancellor’s Office will reach out to other campuses. Dr. Wrynn indicated that the request for feedback (that was sent out in campus wide email) is open to all, and students are welcome to submit their feedback by the Monday deadline.

Chair Holyoke inquired about the timeline for a final Executive Order on this matter. Dr. Wrynn said to expect it in late November.

Sen Ram asked why this requirement is a GE requirement instead of a campus requirement, and how ADT is involved in making the decision about where to place this new requirement. Dr. Wrynn specified that any student with ADT (60 units) must be accommodated, and that there is and no room for electives within the popular ADT in Business.

Sen Ram followed up by asking if it would be possible to grant flexibility to allow upper or lower division GE for the requirement. Dr. Wrynn emphasized that adequate lower division GE courses must be able to accommodate, but some upper division would be allowed as well.

Sen. Herrera expressed concern for the adverse impact this will have on our area D, specifically to allies of Ethnic Studies such as Women Studies and other programs that include under represented faculty. Dr. Wrynn expressed the view that the Chancellor’s Office was opposed to this legislation for very similar concerns (and others) and knew that the impact would be harsh, but mentioned that cross listing courses in WS with ES could work to mitigate some of the negative impact.

Sen. Polegato expressed concern for modern and classical courses, and that some cultures seem to be neglected in this law. Dr. Wrynn reiterated that her office opposed this law due to such narrow scope, and that the law is indeed very focused in this regard.

Sen Ram inquired about the use of double counting of GE courses. Dr. Wrynn said this may be acceptable but students must choose. Approved to two such.

Dr. Clement asked for clarification concerning cross listing, and if all FTES from the requirement must be found within Ethnic Studies programs. Dr. Wrynn said there is nothing in the law about FTES or programs, and it can be done as long as both departments are cross listed, and that we will need to leverage faculty to do so.

Dr. Forbes expressed her concern that eliminating D3 eliminates all GE social science courses, and how the Chancellor’s Office reconciles that? In addition she expressed further concern that the AA in Business is being made a priority while other programs are negatively impacted. If curriculum must change, why not change the ADT in Business to make room for 3 units? Dr. Wrynn partially addressed these concerns by indicating that there are other options each campus can explore other than elimination of D3, but that a use of overlays cannot be accommodated.

Sen Jakobs asked about potentially cross listing a specific nursing course. Dr. Wrynn offered the answer could be yes, but they would have to find a willing ES faculty to collaborate with, and the course must meet specific learning outcomes.

Due to other obligations, Dr. Wrynn and Dr. Van Cleve departed the meeting.

Sen Maldonado asked the Provost to provide needed guidance concerning cross listing as soon as possible to the faculty.

Sen Lent suggested that if FTEs are not an essential factor, perhaps granting various faculty across campus adjunct status in Ethic Studies could be part of the solution.

Sen. Vitali asked about the ES taskforce and how faculty governance is involved. Chair Holyoke gave a brief outline of the makeup and charge of the Task Force (including Dean Cummins, Chair of Senate, Chair of GE committee, Chair of UG committee, and all ES faculty), and emphasized that the Senate will most likely need to change APM 215 and make new policy to meet the requirements.

Sen Kim expressed the sentiment from Economics, in that they shared concern of loss of D3 and associated negative impact, and that this curriculum change impact is huge for Business.

Sen DeJordy asked for clarification on who has authority, and what our options really are, and if Area F is a done deal. Chair Holyoke acknowledged the sentiment, and indicated that we first need to know the parameters so we can formulate plans, and right now those parameters are unclear.

Dr. Roach shared an urgent concern about faculty workload issues, especially for those on the COSS curriculum committee, who are tasked to look at 30 proposals per week with only 5 members, all Assistant Professor level faculty. Chair Holyoke fully acknowledged her concern. Dr. Delcore also expressed that he was deeply concerned about what is happening within the COSS curriculum committee, and that current requests are unreasonable to ask of our colleagues. In addition he sees similar issues on the GE committee as well, as Dr. Wrynn mentioned adding an Area F and other changes and additions.

Dean Muscat mentioned that there needs to be Area F requirement as a mechanism such that the ES requirement can’t be waived, as per the law. Currently, *campus requirements* can be waived.

Sen Ram pointed out that the US Government course is similarly required, so there seems to be an inconsistency with how we implement bans on such waivers.

Sen Jenkins opined that with only two Area Ds staying in, and an Area F added, something must give, and our reorganization of GE seems a narrow path.

Sen Ram added that we seem to have no rules concerning the division of units towards *GE requirements* versus units for *campus requirements*.

Sen Mercado-Lopez called for an Ethic Studies campus wide forum, a move that worked well for our MI requirement, and may give faculty a chance to share models.

Dr. Macias suggested pushing back on the timeline, and although liking the proposal for a forum call, expressed concern about negative impact of the timeline and rush.

1. New Business.

Sen Botwin made a motion to place a resolution concerning the timeline of Ethic Studies requirement implementation to the agenda.

MSC

Sen DeJordy inquired if this resolution requests us or others to violate the law. Sen Schlievert indicated that the timeline is law, and requested clarification on what the resolution is asking for. Sen. Jenkins further noted that it is not clear what would happen if we violate the law, but he felt a message must be sent that the timeline in the law might be ridiculous. Sen DeWalt asked if this resolution is a principled stance, or an actual pause in work?

Sen Botwin indicated that indeed this resolution is a principled stance and *does not* call for a pause in work. Sen Ram further clarified that nothing in the resolution states we will not comply with the law. Sen Mullooly expressed his support for the resolution while Sen. Schlievert cautioned that a minority of CSU campuses have passed similar resolutions.

Sen Botwin moved to waive second reading.

MSC

Vote to affirm Resolution and send to Chancellor’s Office

MSC

----------------------------------

The Academic Senate adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be November 9, 2020.
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