

2018/2019 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
December 10, 2018

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

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,  
Lee, J., Rodan

**CHHS Representatives:**

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

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Day, Ficke, Wong(Lau)  
Absent: Faas, Papazian

**COB Representatives:**

Present: He, Bullen, Khavul  
Absent: None

**Deans / AVPs:**

Present: Olin, Ehrman, Elliott  
Absent: Stacks

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Marachi, Mathur  
Absent: None

**Students:**

Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gallo,  
Kethepalli, Pang, Rodriguez  
Absent: Gill

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Ramasubramanian, Sullivan-Green  
Absent: Kumar

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Khan, Riley, Ormsbee, McKee  
Absent: Mok

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Cargill, French, Kim, White  
Absent: None

**Honorary Representative:**

Present: Lessow-Hurley

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Hart, Trulio  
Absent: None

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Matoush, Trousdale,  
Hurtado, Higgins  
Absent: Monday

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–** The Senate minutes of November 5, 2018 were approved as amended.

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate –**

Chair Frazier reminded Senators that the Senate Holiday Reception at the President's House is December 11, 2018.

The Provost search is ongoing. Last Friday the last candidate was on campus. Please review the videos of the forums and submit feedback by this coming Wednesday.

A new position for a Vice President of Research and Innovation has been created and we are in the process of putting together a search committee to begin in the new calendar year.

The Faculty Trustee for the CSU Board of Trustees is our own Dr. Romey Sabalius. Dr. Sabalius' term is up and he has submitted his paperwork to be considered for the position for another two years. The next step is to make the announcement in the Senate and then wait two weeks before forwarding to the ASCSU. Consider this that announcement.

**B. From the President of the University** – The President was not present.

**IV. Executive Committee Report:**

**A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:**

**Executive Committee Minutes of October 29, 2018** – No Questions.

**Executive Committee Minutes of November 26, 2018** – No Questions.

**B. Consent Calendar:**

The consent calendar of December 10, 2018 was approved as amended to correct “Connel” to “Connell.”

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

Chair Frazier presented *AS 1724, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Honoring and Thanking Senator Peter Buzanski for his Long Service to the Senate and the University (Again) and Wishing Him All the Best in his Retirement from the Senate (Final Reading)*. The Senate gave Senator Buzanski a standing ovation. The Senate voted and AS 1724 was approved unanimously.

**V. Unfinished Business:** None

**VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**

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

**B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

Senator White presented *AS 1718, Policy Recommendation, Modification to General Education Area D (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: Senator Peter requested that a full page of questions be attached to the minutes to be answered offline by Senator White (see attached questions). Would the committee consider adding a whereas that this was done under protest? Perhaps, the committee would consider also adding a reference to HEERA and the appropriate role of faculty to determine the most appropriate curriculum?

A: The committee will definitely consider that.

Q: American Institutions is not part of GE. If my reading is correct, it makes D2 and D3 overlay and require American Institutions. I would suggest to the committee that this is inappropriate.

A: The committee will take that under advisement.

Q: Would the committee consider if this is a risk worth taking? Rejecting this policy change may result in the Chancellor's Office going back to the strict interpretation of no subcategories in area D.

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Is the committee aware that this move by the Chancellor's Office is a continuation of the sweeping grab of control of curriculum across the CSU about which we have a document called the *Tenets of Shared Governance* that mentions established best practices and a recognition that consultation must allow both parties time to consider and debate both sides and that this is a violation of the Tenets of Shared Governance? Did the faculty in the departments give feedback about where the courses in those areas should go?

A: Yes, several of the chairs consulted with BOGS and AVP Anagnos received most of the feedback. It also went out over the Senate listserv. AVP Anagnos noted that a proposal was sent to all the chairs, but maybe Senator Lee was missed. It was also sent to all parties that had classes that would be affected. BOGS spoke with all the chairs as well. There was no dissent. All chairs felt the changes were acceptable. The committee will consider your first question.

Q: To what extent, if this proposal passes, will the D area changes be considered in the context of the whole package? I would ask that the committee consider the need for us to chart our own course. We don't need to stand down because of the Chancellor's Office.

A: We did put a sunset clause in this. We will consider this.

Q: There are few departments left in area D3. Can the remaining departments handle the capacity?

A: There are 4,200 seats in area D2 and D3. Of those, 3,300 are in American Institutions. That is about 900 seats not in AI. Less than half of these students are taking it for GE credit, most are taking it as part of their major. There are less than 500 seats moving from D2 and D3 to D1 that would be GE related.

Q: I think there is so much wrong with this policy. There is so much movement from D2 and D3 to D1 that I'm concerned departments may end up cannibalizing themselves. Can the committee consider this?

A: The committee will consider.

Q: I do not teach in the UG program, so I'm looking at this from a pedagogical place. A classes are taken before B classes, so how will this impact those classes?

A: There is no intent by the committee to split A and B classes. It would be up to the department if they wanted to keep them together or split them.

Q: On line 72, did the committee consider the three upper division units in area S? I'm concerned that there may be confusion around upper and lower division and some effort may be made to consolidate area D and Area S?

A: I will take that back to the committee to consider.

Q: I appreciate the hard work of the committee. Has the committee considered what the impact of hiring additional lecturers will be and has that discussion been held with relevant chairs in terms of their budgets?

A: The committee did not discuss, but GUP is already planning for the hiring that will be needed.

Q: Would the committee consider a different way of dividing area D up. I'm concerned the subcategories were given precedence or preference?

A: The committee will consider.

Q: My concern is the control of the curriculum and the more we see control from the Chancellor's Office, even if it is a small thing right now, it opens the door for potentially more changes, particularly in general education. Has the committee considered what the impact will be by passing this policy recommendation forward in terms of sending the wrong message to the Chancellor's Office in terms of control of the curriculum?

A: The committee will consider.

Q: Could you explain what the compromise was? I'm not sure I see that compromise. The sequences are under threat at this point.

A: The compromise was to not have the subcommittees broken down.

Q: You made a comment about this being about students being able to transfer between CSU campuses and have consistent GE. Has there been discussion in the committee, or in research, that there are not a significant number of students making this transition? They are looking at turning the curriculum upside down for a small number of students.

A: You are correct. The transition is a small number.

Q: What are the consequences if this policy is voted down in the Senate?

A: I wanted to end with a straw poll. My interpretation is that if the Senate votes this down, the Chancellor's Office will ask the administration to enforce the change. That would then bypass the Senate.

Q: Has the committee considered that we are really losing five decades of sophisticated thinking? The CSU will be making a statement that looks very bad in the eyes of the world philosophically speaking.

A: The committee will consider.

Q: Would the committee consider the benefit of U.S. institutions embedded in GE areas?

A: The committee will consider.

Q: Can the committee consider including a statement to clarify what this is about? This isn't about student learning. This is about graduation rates. We are sacrificing

the real education of our students.

A: The committee will take it under advisement.

Q: Would the committee consider rejecting the comment made earlier about having the area studies take the place of a concentration in American History and Government, because what has been demonstrated in the past several years is the ignorance of the general public of the basic fundamentals of American democracy? If democracy is lost here, we will be run by tyrants.

A: The committee will take it under advisement.

Q: In the past, I've spent eight years in a committee that revised GE. I hear tremendous sincerity about these issues and think it is important to give time to air it out. However, I have to ask if this is the issue you want to draw a line in the sand with the Chancellor's Office over? I think it needs more conversation. I want to give a strong nod to AVP Anagnos. She worked very hard and diligently on this. What I really don't want to have to do is impose curriculum changes on our faculty.

A: The committee will take it under advisement.

C: Senator Rodan complimented Provost Ficke, Senior Vice Provost Kemnitz, and AVP Anagnos for negotiating a carve out, based on San Francisco State's Area D GE program, allowing our campus to maintain its Area D sub-categories.

Senator White called for a straw poll to help determine if the Senate would support the resolution if the changes requested were brought back in a final reading. Several members commented that it would be hard to say without seeing the changes. The straw poll was not conducted.

---

Senator White presented *AS 1714, Policy Recommendation, University Grading System Policy (Final Reading)*.

Senator White presented an amendment to insert "at a minimum" on lines 82/83 after "...C-" and "...B-." **The Senate voted and the White amendment was approved.** Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to line 45 to replace "is allowed" to read, "will be used." Senator Peter called the question. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the question was called. The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment failed. Senator Rodan presented an amendment to line 55 to add, "c." Where courses are offered in multiple section in a given semester, all sections will use the same grading scheme." The Senate voted and the Rodan amendment failed. **The Senate voted and AS 1714 passed as amended.**

**C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): None**

**D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1715, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Requesting the Appointment of a Presidential Task Force to Recommend Measures to Foster a Supportive Workplace and Calling Upon our Community to Preserve Civility and Combat Bullying at San José State University (Final Reading)*.

**Senator Peter presented a motion that was friendly to the body to change the first sentence of the last Resolved clause to read, “Resolved: That, in the meantime, faculty, staff, and students who have suffered from bullying be advised via the San José State University website that some limited services are available. Senator Manzo presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 96 where it reads, “and/or students” to say “and students.” The Senate voted and AS 1715 was approved unanimously as amended.**

---

Senator Peter presented *AS 1716, Policy Recommendation, Amendment of S96-2, Direct Instruction Obligations (Final Reading)*.  
**The Senate voted and AS 1716 passed unanimously as written.**

**E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1721, Policy Recommendation, Amends S13-9, Merging, Dividing, Transferring and Eliminating Academic Units (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: This troubles me. We are taking the committee’s word that we are rescinding a policy that does nothing that isn’t in current policy, but sometimes there are slight differences left in the old policy. Has the committee done its due diligence in screening the old policy to ensure there aren’t differences that are missed, and could you report any differences to us?

A: I compared these two policies side-by-side and do not think we missed differences that would prevent rescinding the older policy. Even the content of S06-7 is included in the newer policy.

Q: Has the committee considered whether this is a good time to consider this when people will be amending GE?

A: Yes, it is always a good time to rescind old policies and do clean-up.

Q: It looks like to me that S13-9 is only an amendment and the bulk of the policy is in an older policy. This was before we began incorporating amendments into the original policy and amendments looked like separate policies. I think S13-9 is only a fraction of the whole policy?

A: Unless I missed something, it is all there. The content of S06-7 is in S13-9.

Q: There are subtle differences between S06-7 and S13-9?

A: S13-9 was approved with the changes and that isn’t up for discussion today. Today all we are doing is amending S13-9 to rescind S06-7.

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1719, Senate Management Resolution, Charge and Membership of Policy Committees (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: Can you tell me why the Instruction and Student Affairs membership has non-voting members?

A: If the I&SA Committee would like to make that change between now and when we bring it back as a final reading, we would be happy to do so.

Q: Is the Past Chair automatically a member of the Executive Committee?

A: Yes, the Past Chair is a member of the Executive Committee, but if there is no Past Chair that year, then a Faculty-at-Large representative is elected by the Senate and serves in place of the Past Chair on the Executive Committee.

Q: Did O&G discuss with the President's cabinet which of the President's cabinet should sit on all the different committees to be sure our committee structures accurately reflect the needs of the university?

A: Yes, in fact very early on O&G discussed the new VPRI seat, but decided to wait to see what that VP might do before proposing any changes to committees.

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1722, Senate Management Resolution, Charge and Membership of University Committees (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: On page 15, the Graduate Studies and Research Committee does more than just establish guidelines for theses. They also review them. Should the charge be changed?

A: The GS&R Committee didn't give us any changes to the charge.

Q: If we have suggested changes, who should we give them to?

A: Give to O&G and we will go to the committee to verify and get their feedback.

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1656, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of Bylaw 1.10 (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

None

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1717, Policy Recommendation, Amendment of Bylaw 15a (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

None

**VII. Special Committee Reports:**

**VIII. New Business:**

Senator Rodan presented *AS 1723, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting Adoption of the Tenets of Shared Governance by the Academic Senate of the California State University (Final Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 33 where it reads, “adoption if the Tenets by the ASCSU” to read, “adoption of the Tenets by the ASCSU.”

Senator White presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike “spent” from line 44.

*Senator Peter presented a motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed.*

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike the “Rationale” and to change line 31 where it reads, “approach shared governance,” to read, “approach to shared governance.”

Senator Buzanski called the question. The Senate voted and the question was called (16-8).

**The Senate voted and AS 1723 was approved as amended (16-12).**

**IX.**

**State of the University Announcements:**

- A. Chief Diversity Officer:** Moved to next meeting.
- B. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation):** Moved to next meeting.
- C. Statewide Academic Senators:** Moved to next meeting.
- D. Provost:** Moved to next meeting.
- E. Associated Students President:** Moved to next meeting.
- F. Vice President for Administration and Finance:** Moved to next meeting.
- G. Vice President for Student Affairs:** Moved to next meeting.

**X. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.