I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Nine Senators were present.

Ex Officio:
  Present: Rodan, Curry, Van Selst
  Frazier, Mathur, Parent
  Absent: None

CHHS Representatives:
  Present: Grosvenor, Sen, Chin, Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett
  Absent: None

COB Representatives:
  Present: He, Khavul
  Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:
  Present: Marachi

ENGR Representatives:
  Present: Sullivan-Green, Kumar, Okamoto
  Absent: Ramasubramanian

H&A Representatives:
  Present: Khan, McKee, Kitajima, Coelho, Riley
  Absent: None

SCI Representatives:
  Present: White, Muller, French, Cargill
  Absent: None

SOS Representatives:
  Present: Peter, Wilson, Jackson, Hart, Lombardi
  Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes—The Senate minutes of October 7 and October 28, 2019 were approved as written (47-0-2).

III. Communications and Questions –
  A. From the Chair of the Senate –
  Chair Mathur announced that the Chancellor had extended the deadline for providing information for President Papazian’s 3rd year review until March 22, 2020, and faculty should have received an email regarding this extension.

  AS 3397-19A, a resolution passed by the ASCSU, tasked campus senates to provide feedback regarding a CSU-wide ethnic studies requirement. Subsequently, our senate passed SM-F19-2 that asked the Executive Committee to submit a report on an Ethnic Studies graduation requirement to the ASCSU by November 1, 2019. Our committee submitted the report. The ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee met and will develop a
recommended implementation of an ethnic studies system requirement. Once it is finalized and cleaned up Chair Mathur or one of the CSU Statewide Senators will distribute to the Senate.

There is a lot of opportunity to provide input for the search for our new Chancellor. Senator Curry sent a message to the Senate as did Chair Mathur. Checkout the Chancellor’s recruitment website.

The President and the Senior AVP of University Personnel sent out a campus message today about Staff Awards. Please consider nominating a valued staff member by December 13, 2019.

The President’s Office has also sent out an email inviting Senators to the senate holiday party on December 12, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. at her house.

The President had a scheduling conflict today and could not attend today’s meeting.

Chair Mathur noted that AS 1758 from the C&R Committee is being withdrawn from today’s meeting.

B. From the President of the University – Not present

IV. Executive Committee Report:
A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:
   Executive Committee Minutes of October 14, 2019-
   Senator Khan asked about page 4 where it indicates PS is working on a lecturer policy, and asked if Chair Peter could elaborate?
   Senator Peter explained this is the lecturer policy that PS has been working on since 2010. The Senate discussed aspects of it last year. The Provost met with PS to give his feedback on it. Some of the changes have to do with changes from the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

   Executive Committee Minutes of October 21, 2019- No questions

B. Consent Calendar:
   There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of November 18, 2019 as amended by Senator Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business:

VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):
A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
   Senator Sullivan-Green presented AS 1752, Policy Recommendation, University Governance Awards for Students; Student Service (First Reading)
Senator McKee made a motion to suspend the rules and make this a final reading. The motion passed with 3 Nays and 1 Abstention. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to line 33 to read, “shall be granted the award if they attend at least 80% of the meetings, and have a recommendation from the committee chair.” The Shifflett amendment passed. **AS 1752 passed as amended unanimously.**

### B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented **AS 1756, Amendment B to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards (First Reading).**

**Questions:**

Q: Thank you for this edit. Would you consider asking the committee to put in the “4.0” on line 57 after “effective teaching”?  
A: The survey instrument might change and we don’t want to have to change the policy each time the survey instrument changes. The phrase “in survey components” is there to emphasize what is true, but many people don’t realize that we are supposed to evaluate all components of the survey and not just the final question. We were struggling with a way to say you need to look at the sum total of the survey results both qualitative and quantitative. However, we will keep talking about it.

Senator Peter presented **AS 1755, Policy Recommendation, Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs (First Reading).**

**Questions:**

Q: What happens if there is disagreement over what change should be made?  
A: PS will make the recommendation to the Provost and President and they can sort it out.

Senator Peter presented **AS 1753, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding S73-19, Faculty Personnel Records (Final Reading).** Senator French presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to line 15 to change “S73-12” to “S73-19”. **The Senate voted and AS 1753 passed unanimously.**

Senator Peter presented **AS 1754, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding F85-8, Performance Evaluation Procedures and Criteria for Employees in Unit 4 – Academic Support (Final Reading).** The Senate vote and AS 1754 passed unanimously.
C. **Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**
Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1735, Amendment A to University Policy F15-13, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge and Responsibilities (Final Reading).*
Senator White presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to line 48 to include representatives from, “the Curriculum and Research Committee,” before “Program Planning Committee.” Senator White presented an amendment to line 46 to replace “five” with “seven” before “years.” The amendment was seconded. Senator Frazier presented an amendment to the White Amendment to change it to read “at the latest every seven” before “years.” The Senate voted and the Frazier amendment to the White Amendment failed. The Senate voted and the White amendment passed with 1 Abstention. Senator Jackson presented a motion to postpone this resolution until February 2020 or later. The motion was seconded. Senator Shifflett called the question. The Senate voted on the Shifflett motion and the motion failed. Debate resumed. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to line 275 after “for a recommendation,” to add “to reject the proposal” and strike “not to approve.” Senator Chin presented an amendment to line 269 to change, “No vote to recommend rejection of a proposal shall…” to read, “No vote to recommend rejection, including a 50/50 split vote of a proposal ...”. Senator Chin withdrew her amendment. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to line 269 to change, “No vote to recommend rejection shall be forwarded until departmental representatives have been...”. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to the Shifflett amendment to change it to read, “No committee recommendation for rejection shall be forwarded until departmental representatives have been...”. The Van Selst amendment was seconded. The Van Selst amendment passed. The Senate voted and the Van Selst/Shifflett amendment failed (17-20-12). Senator Peter presented an amendment to delete, “as needed” on line 278. The Peter amendment passed with 3 Nays. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to line 46 to read, “…at least every seven years in concert with GEAC’s program planning process.” The Shifflett amendment was friendly to the body. **The Senate voted and AS 1735 passed as amended with 5 Nays and 2 Abstentions.**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1750, Amendment to Senate Constitution regarding Administrative Representatives (Final Reading).*
Senator Shifflett presented a friendly amendment to line 12 to strike, “a staff member.” Senator Marachi presented a friendly amendment to change, “Senior Director, Faculty Affairs” to “Senior Director of Faculty Affairs.” Senator Van Selst made an amendment that was friendly to the body to change “adding” to “specifying” on line 11. Note: Vote needs a majority of total membership of Senate. (38-0-0).

D. **University Library Board (ULB):** No report.

E. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**
Senator White presented *AS 1757, Amendment A to University Policy F18-5,*
University Grading System (Final Reading).

Senator Del Casino presented an amendment to line 17 to add a new sentence, “A graduate student may petition for a maximum above 40% to the College of Graduate Studies. The petition must be approved by their Department Chair.” Senator Chin presented an amendment to the Del Casino Amendment to change “Department Chair” to “Department Chair and/or Department Graduate Coordinator.” The Chin amendment was friendly to the body. The Del Casino/Chin amendment was without objection and friendly to the body. The Senate voted and AS 1757 was approved unanimously.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Report from the General Education Special Committee by Chair Mathur, Past Chair Frazier, Senator White, and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Thalia Anagnos.

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m.

There is always something going on with GE. There are about ten different things going on at the ASCSU regarding GE at any one time. This is only one of them. There was a taskforce for two years at the CSU Statewide level. The taskforce report was finalized in February and released to the 23 campuses. The GE Taskforce report included five basic proposed changes. One recommendation was to reduce the total number of GE semester units from 48 to 42, another recommendation was to eliminate GE Area E, and some other suggestions. In March 2019 our campus, unlike many of the other campuses that responded almost immediately in opposition to the GE Taskforce Report, took a measured approach and formed a special committee to survey the campus and give broad response to the CSU GE report. Chair Mathur was appointed Chair of that special committee. The committee met every week for two months in Spring 2019 to develop and send out a survey to faculty and students and collect data.

The GE Special Committee surveyed faculty and students, conducted focus groups, and also held a large town hall meeting. Faculty were asked different questions regarding statements made in the report and one was whether they felt GE was stagnant (as stated in the report), and about 88% of faculty felt that GE was stagnant, lacked coherence, and did GE keep students from graduating on time, as well as needed reform on campus.

Faculty noted that the proposed framework would narrow the breadth and diversity of the GE curriculum and felt that students needed broader training and not reductions in GE. GE also teaches particular skills. Faculty felt although the pathways might be attractive, this could be a barrier to graduation because students might feel like they were fixed to a particular pathway. GE takes many forms and faculty felt that the changes would decrease our graduation rates. Faculty also felt that the proposed recommendations would be a tremendous increase in faculty workload, and that lecturers could be lost if categories of GE were eliminated or reduced.

There was also a lot of concern about the elimination of area E. Area E is the area where we address exploration and mental health issues as well as connections to the campus. Cutting this category out could have an impact on students in terms of their mental health. Many
Faculty were concerned about the reduction in American Institutions (AI) units from 6 to 3 units. They noted that this reduction is coming at a time when student engagement in our country is needed more than ever. Faculty also felt that cutting out first-year courses would be detrimental to students. Some faculty liked the reduction in units so that units in the major could be increased, and some felt we should eliminate GE altogether.

Chair Mathur and Vice Provost Anagnos went through all the responses on the student responses that were open-ended. We did not expect the positive responses we got from students. Many students felt GE was a great way to broaden their horizons, meet new people, and experience students from abroad. This was a very positive thing. Students were very supportive of double counting and it was very important to them. Many students liked the classes they got in area E. Students were concerned about getting to the 120 units in a timely manner. Students felt learning about themselves was important. Many students felt that they would not be able to get all the information they got in the AI classes if those 6-units were cut. Students also liked the Humanities and American Studies interdisciplinary option. There was not a lot of support for pathways. Many students also felt getting on a pathway would extend their time to graduation. Similar themes were noted in the student focus group. In the town hall meeting, participants were concerned about the impact of the proposed changes in relation to our graduation rates, but also noted the resiliency of our faculty in adapting to change.

The overall findings of this report include the following. First, across all the groups there was a strong feeling that the proposed recommendations would have impact on graduation rates in a negative way. Faculty and students wanted to retain area E and American Institutions. Faculty and students found GE to have alternative ways of thinking and cutting pathways would be negative. Faculty and students felt GE gave them more opportunity for diversity and inclusion.

Chair Mathur and the committee asked for endorsement of the full report so they could forward it on December 1, 2019.

Questions:
Q: Will you be reporting to other bodies on this campus like AS?
A: We aren’t required to by our SM Resolution, but we can take it to them.

Q: Are we looking for an endorsement today?
A: Yes.

Q: Can Senator Van Selst comment on the CSU Statewide GE Taskforce?
A: The GE Advisory Committee at the CSU Statewide level is not obligated to do anything with the data since it is advisory, but I’m sure we will look at this kind of information. The kind of work our report shows is exemplary.

Senator Peter presented a motion to support the report. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Peter motion was approved unanimously.**

Chair Mathur thanked the committee members.
VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:
   A. Vice President for Student Affairs: Not present.
   B. Chief Diversity Officer:
      The CDO’s Office is continuing with the Campus Climate Study. They are submitting the IRB approval for the study soon. The committee will meet at the end of the week to complete the evaluation of the survey items.

      The CDO has supported and collaborated with Undergraduate Education and the CDO had 25 faculty members attend a seminar on teaching practices. Vice Provost Anagnos did some great work looking at the Dashboard and how it can be used in a collegial way and not just for individual faculty. This is part of the CDO’s year-long work with the College of Science to improve teaching practices and innovation and develop a cohort to look at closing the achievement gap for underrepresented students. The CDO is meeting with various colleges to try and support the work they are doing in terms of closing the achievement gap.

      The CDO has been approved for a search for a new Title IX investigator to add to her team. The CDO office is close to 200 intakes already this year and that is a significant increase from last year. Last year they had about 570 for the entire academic year. The CDO does not believe there are more cases, but that students, faculty, and staff are feeling more comfortable and willing to coming forward to report incidents.

      The CDO is working with the Provost and Student Affairs looking at faculty diversity. The CDO has been working with the College of Engineering as well with their search committees.

      Question:
      Q: Since we only have one investigator, is that person in charge of all 200 cases? What type of reports are coming in in terms of faculty-student, student-student, athlete, etc.?
      A: The CDO’s Office has a Title IX Investigator and a Coordinator who both work full time on investigations. The CDO also shares some investigators with university personnel. In addition, the CDO sometimes contracts out for investigators. Lots of cases that come in are about incidents that happened a long time ago and involve survivor counseling and support. The majority of cases are student-on-student. There are some staff and faculty. There is an annual report that breaks down the cases. That report is on the CDO’s website.

   C. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): The CSU Faculty Trustee submitted his report electronically to the Academic Senate. Trustee Sabalius announced that he recently got married. The Senate congratulated him.
   D. Statewide Academic Senators: Moved to next meeting.
   E. Provost: Moved to next meeting.
F. Associated Students President: Moved to next meeting.
G. Vice President for Administration and Finance: Moved to next meeting.

X. **Adjournment:** A motion was made to extend the meeting by 10 minutes by Senator Rodan. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion failed. The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.