



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
MINUTES  
DECEMBER 13, 2018**

**ASD 18-158**

**Approved 1-24-19**

**11:30 AM - 12:50 PM**

**PLN-130**

Present: Badal, Basil, Borjas, Brown, Brunelle, Brusckhe, Buck, Casem, Ceisel, Childers, Dabirian, David, Fidalgo, Fitch, Garcia, Gradilla, Heiner, Holland, Jarvis, Kanel, Knutson Miller, Matz, McLain, Mead, Meyer, Oliver, Patton, Peissig, Perez, Powers, Preston, Rodriguez, Shahi, Shoar, Stohs, Tiwari, Torres, Tsang, Virjee, Wagner, Walicki, Walk, Walker, Wood

Absent: Chandler, Stambough, Thomas, Valdez

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Stohs called the meeting to order at 11:32 am.

## **II. URGENT BUSINESS**

- (Walker and Dean Bonney) Read a Resolution of Commendation for Lynn Sargeant Professor of History and Associate Dean College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

M/S/P (Walker/Powers) Motion to adopt the Resolution of Commendation for Lynn Sargeant Professor of History and Associate Dean College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Motion passed unanimously.

## **III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- (Brusckhe) Keep an eye out for the most recent edition of the Senate Forum, it will come out this afternoon or early next week. It will come out electronically and we are working on paper copies.
- (Dabirian) In February you will not have to change your password, the next password change will be in May.

## **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

4.1 ASD 18-145 Academic Senate Minutes 11-1-18 - *forthcoming*

4.2 ASD 18-149 Academic Senate Minutes 11-15-18 (Draft)

M/S/P (Casem/Kanel) ASD 18-149 Academic Senate Minutes 11-15-18 were passed as amended.

(Holland) Add Jade Jewett as one of the presenters for the Strategic Plan Presentation.

## **V. CONSENT CALENDAR**

M/S/P (Oliver/Brown) Motion to approve Consent Calendar. Motion passed unanimously.

### **5.1 NOMINEES TO COMMITTEES**

#### **NOMINEES TO MISCELLANEOUS COMMITTEES**

##### **OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR COMMITTEE**

**Nominees:** Melinda Blackman (SOC SCI)

**Confirmed 8/30:** Sean Hogan (HHD); Scott Annin (NSM); Carol Lundberg (EDUC); Shaun Pichler (MCBE); Lisa Draskovich-Long (ARTS); Rahul Chakraborty (COMM); Mohinder Grewal (ECS)

#### **NOMINEES TO AD HOC COMMITTEES**

##### **SOQ COMMITTEE (9 faculty)**

**Nominees:** Mira Farka (MCBE), Lidia Nuno (SOC SCI); Catherine Brennan (NSM); Patrice Waller (EDUC); Cynthia King (COMM)

**Confirmed 11/15:** Peggy Shoar (HHD); Hope Weiss (ECS); Marc Dickey (ARTS); Eliza Noh (HUM)

**GE TASK FORCE**

Nominees: Lisa Tran (SOC SCI)

Confirmed 9/27: Eliza Noh (HUM); Kevin Wortman (ECS); Teeanna Rizkallah (MCBE); Sergio Lizarraga (ARTS); Janna Kim (HHD); Merri Lynn Casem (NSM); Debra Ambrosetti (EDUC); Jeanine Congalton (COMM)

**NOMINEES TO SEARCH COMMITTEES**

**AVP OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SEARCH COMMITTEE** (3 faculty)

Nominees: John Carroll (HSS), Chuck Grieb (ARTS), and Erica Bowers (EDUC)

**VI. CHAIR'S REPORT - written report distributed 12-12-18.**

[2 page report](#)

**VII. PROVOST REPORT - written report distributed 12-11-18.**

[2 page report](#)

**VIII. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT**

(Bruschke) The Statewide Senate has not met since our last report. The one issue is Chancellor has responded to some ASCSU resolutions and the one that pertains to this campus, the statewide senate requested open searches for presidential spots when candidates visit the campus and the chancellor will not be doing that, so we will have a presidential search but it will be closed.

**IX. ASI REPORT - written report distributed 12-11-18.**

[1 page report](#)

**X. CFA REPORT - written report distributed 12-13-18.**

[1 page report](#)

**XI. NEW BUSINESS****11.1 ASD 18-150 GE New Course Proposals - Fall 2018**

1. CNSM 101 Think Like Einstein Documents
2. GEC Approved Minutes - 11/9/18

- M/S/P (Childers/Wood) Motion to approve ASD 18-150 GE New Course Proposals - Fall 2018

(Childers) CNSM 101 meets the preponderance of learning goals, meets the GE Writing component, the syllabus conforms to the learning objectives. All courses were reviewed very thoroughly because of challenges, CNSM 101 received particular scrutiny. There are sound reasons for the course. Studies have shown that gains in critical thinking skills were higher in subject-oriented critical thinking classes deploying three strategies than in general critical thinking courses. CNSM course employs all three suggested best practice strategies for teaching critical thinking. All courses in category use philosophy texts. It has been charged that NSM course would savage philosophy. Data from statistics shows that science students only constitute 10%, so the impact will be minor. Also, we have decided to put critical thinking in an applied perspective.

(Wood) I have spent a great many hours thinking about this class very carefully. I started out being very opposed to the CNSM course. My two concerns were about the writing assignments and communication of complex reasoning. But, I feel these concerns have been addressed. They have developed better writing assignments that address complex thinking. Another concern I had was about jurisdiction. The jurisdiction area is of concern, but the precedent has already been set. I also like the use of critical thinking as a paradigm for applying critical thinking.

- M/S/P (Heiner/Kanel) Motion to divide the question and separate Think Like Einstein from the rest of the courses to allow the other courses to get approved and allow discussion on CNSM 101 Think Like Einstein.
  - Brunelle/Kanel would like to make a friendly amendment to approve remaining courses (GEOG 110L, ISDS 361A, LTAM 100, HIST 386A, NURS 402, and GERO 313) first, then enter discussion on Think Like Einstein. *Considered friendly.*

Back to Main Motion

Motion passed though not unanimously

GEOG 110I, ISDS 301A, LTAM100, HIST 386A, NURS 402, AND GERO 313 approved without dissent

The Senate entered into extensive discussion/debate on CNSM 101 Think Like Einstein

(Borjas) Raised issues of students and cited some studies. Argued that students want to graduate, learn. This class is great for science students and will help students to engage with students in their major. CNSM found a gap and fulfilled the gap. If this doesn't pass, it will send a very negative message to students I would like to see this passed on behalf of the students.

(Peissig) Psychology voted unanimously to oppose this course. We do not feel it is equivalent to other classes in the category. As an advisor for Psychology I review multiple classes for students to determine equivalence, and this class is not equivalent to other courses in the category.

(Heiner) I respect my colleagues in CNSM even if we are arguing against one another. We have gotten into a crisis because of what the CO did last year—we are all kind of agreed that we should do what we can to maintain breadth as well as quality in GE. We really respect students, not just from a sense of territorialism but what we believe is the best way to support students. Recognizes Andrew Howat who spent a lot of time going over the reading assigned in the CNSM class; he looked at total pages assigned by Phil 106—Logic—and the CNSM class. For critical thinking, the Philosophy course assigns 130 pages in one whereas the CNSM course assigns only 61 pages. In the area of Logical Reasoning, the Philosophy class assigns 120 pages whereas the CNSM class assigns no pages. Other pages are assigned in the CNSM course, but the pages don't belong in a critical thinking class, they belong in a quantitative reasoning and/or first year experience classes. In our GE, we have specifically separated Critical Thinking and Quantitative Reasoning categories. First Year Experience classes belong in E, Life Long Learning. So this class attempts to do too many things. Can you do all of these things in a single class reasonably? Presents another slide that compares skills taught in each of the classes. A3, Critical Thinking, is a core competencies course. There are 67 concepts taught in the Philosophy class whereas only 27 critical thinking concepts are taught in the CNSM class and these concepts are an adjunct to freshmen experiences in the CNSM course. In looking at skills, the Philosophy class teaches and practices 21 different critical thinking skills whereas the CNSM class only teaches 12 of these. Other CSUs have included greater diversity in A3, this is true but this is not a sufficient reason to adopt it? CNSM has presented no data that shows that critical thinking skills are improved in applied critical thinking classes. But Philosophy departments have put together lots of data that show the advantages of critical thinking in Philosophy like improved LSAT and GRE scores, where students trained in the philosophic tradition score the highest. Students in Natural Sciences and Mathematics have scores that are much lower on the list. In response to question from Senator Casem, states that these figures are for students who major in these disciplines (philosophy) not for students taking particular classes. Also, it is important that we provide students with a sense of belonging in the university, but these are arguments about why this should be a freshman experience course, not a course in A3.

(Bruschke) My comment is based on two issues: 1) this class isn't taught by specialists in critical thinking and 2) it is not exclusively dedicated to critical thinking. CNSM is claiming that anyone with an advanced degree in a discipline can teach critical thinking courses. This argument has not been advanced before in discussing courses in the Golden Four categories. I believe that non-specialists will not teach materials as well as specialists will. Moreover, this course is not specifically devoted to critical thinking, is restricted to freshmen like the other courses in the category and is doing a variety of other activities useful to freshmen, which are all good, but take away from the emphasis on critical thinking found in other courses in the category.

(Kanel) Thanks everyone, seems like a good course. I would like to take a course like this, but it seems to me that we granted an exception to a department a few years ago because courses like those in A3 conflicted with their high unit load and we have had a lot of exceptions made to graduate students quicker—this is done for units. These high unit loads have become an excuse for why students shouldn't have to take courses that other students take. My students don't want to take a lot of classes either because it doesn't apply to their career choice, but they still have to because I want my students have a lot of breadth. I want them to hear different world perspectives, different world views. If we are going to move in the direction of UCs where there are limited GE requirements, then we should be doing this for everyone. My students would like to take courses that are just in the humanities and social sciences. They want to feel welcome in their classes too. You create diversity and welcoming by mixing students up. Is going on scavenger hunts really about core competencies? I think we really need to think about what we are doing with GE and not just push students through to graduate without thinking about these things. Again thanks to the [GE] committee. I know committee work is not easy.

(Casem) I respect and value the views of my colleagues who oppose me. Most CNSM students take about 60% of their GE courses outside of CNSM. I constantly encourage my students to take classes outside of the CNSM. I am aware that there has been a lot of activity behind the scenes urging folks to vote against this. I am glad we are all here today and I hope everyone has had a chance to read all of the documents. I do recognize the fallacies in the arguments of the opposition. My favorite is that once you open the floodgate, you will have physicists teaching art. This won't be a slippery slope. We are specialists in the area of science. We are not philosophers or experts in human communication; we are experts in the use of critical thinking in scientific reasoning. Our students will have a different experience, but I believe my students will have good critical thinking skills and foundations coming out of the course as well as the sense of belonging that will help them in their lives and other courses. We are assessing this. Critical thinking is taught from multiple perspectives. I am committed to preserving smaller departments. Even so we should not be making curricular distinctions on the basis of how the changes affect other departments. I urge you to support this class as it represents commitment of the college to student success

(Brunelle) This class raises a lot of questions for me. I am not in critical thinking, but the class raises a lot of questions for me about where we are going with GE. I see no intrinsic reason why CNSM cannot teach critical thinking, but are we transitioning to a general education that is college based tailored to specific majors as opposed to general education? There are huge implications to this. What happens if non-declared or non-CNSM students take the class? Will they be prepared for advanced work in other majors? I know we can handle this, I am just wondering if we have thought this through. I can see History teaching a History critical thinking class. We already have a class tailored to our majors, but what should GE in the long term look like? I don't know how I will vote on this, but I do think that we need to think about what are the larger implications of where we are going here? I think it is much bigger than this course. What will happen to the departments who will be losers even with changes that are good for some students? This course shouldn't have to bear the brunt of all these larger issues.

(Fitch) I am very torn on this one and am very concerned about some of these larger issues and am sorry they are getting worked through with this course. I do want to say as someone who has been the Senate Exec liaison to the GE committee that the committee has worked hard to carefully consider this course trying to weigh multiple, multiple issues on this. And there was a divided vote because the issues involved in evaluating the course are so complicated. Every single person on the committee read every single document. Unfortunately, the issues raised by this course are very complicated. I basically believe that people should be able to teach critical thinking from a variety of perspectives. My problem is that this class seems much more like a first year experience class than a critical thinking class. I would love to take a class like this as a first year experience class because it really does integrate substance into it that is important, but it still seems more like that kind of class to me. I am also glad to hear that the writing assignments have expanded some because that was a major concern I had. Still, it seems like there is a larger issue here. We used to be concerned about creating silos, but now it seems we want to turn our little grain silos into missile silos with miles and miles of concrete around them in the name of graduating students quicker.

(Brown) I will vote against this course.

(Walker) We approve courses on the basis of what are the outcomes of the category are and has the course met these outcomes. The GE committee examined the course materials in the context of the learning objectives and supported the course. We were on the losing side of an earlier decision related to category B2. At that time, someone on the floor of the Senate said we should trust the committee, which I do. Let's also look at some precedents here. ECS came to us and said they could teach critical thinking throughout their curriculum and we approved that on a majority vote. The precedent throughout the CSU is that this course lives in multiple places. But basically, the course meets the learning objectives of the category.

(Perez) I am proud to be part of an intellectual community that can take this seriously. I am torn as well. I have a larger critique of GE and where it is going and the need to protect liberal arts education from a critical pedagogy perspective. I could say many things, but what I have to add is what is the trajectory that our students have from experiencing our GE curriculum? Lots of studies show that employers pay a great deal of attention to the critical thinking skills displayed by perspective employees, who have graduated from private colleges. This perpetuates inequality. Therefore we need to pay special attention to making sure our students develop these critical thinking skills as well as the ability to display them. This leads to the question, while the course meets the learning objectives of the category, does this course do what the other courses in the category do in an equivalent way so that students can then display skills in the broader world and not just say they took a course that taught these skills so they have a positive trajectory in the market place. They need to display these skills in interaction and debate using critical thinking, not just say, "look at my transcript." The learning objectives are met, the important words are in the proposal, but I am not sure about the pedagogical content and the substantive content. I am not sure that it meets the goals of critical reflection and what some people in the literature call multimodal sensibilities, learning to think critically in terms of your position in the world, that is reflecting on who you are and your privileges and in doing that understanding other people. I don't see that level of critical thinking in the content. I don't know if this should be a consideration. It is a critique of our learning objectives for this category as well.

(Knutson Miller) I am speaking as a scholar in favor of class. It is a course that is aligned with what we want for our students and was approved by people I respect. All of the issues that have been raised are relevant, but I will vote for it, because I support students and support collegial governance, which is why we are here.

(Fidalgo) There are two issues here: 1) I believe in multidisciplinary learning and teaching, so another course in category should be good, but 2) while the course is good, it doesn't seem to meet the needs of courses in the category; it seems more like freshmen experience.

(Mead) I think there is a benefit to CNSM teaching critical thinking. I think they have a different perspective that we should encourage here. Having the mixture of different perspectives in a category makes other courses very important. This is good and should be encouraged. I also want to say that in the past few years we have had several courses that have been challenged. I have been on the losing end, but I think it is important that we embrace the broadening of interdisciplinary perspectives. Our practice has been to debate these courses after committees have made their decisions. We should vote for this class or change our practices of curriculum approval.

M/S/P (Meyer/Fidalgo) Motion to call the question.

There was a hand vote (division after the voice vote):

- Yes - 19
- No - 18

After the show of hands, Chair Stohs declared that the ayes have it. Senator Heiner subsequently requested a roll call vote, and Chair Stohs declared/ruled that the request was out of order. Chair Stohs asked the Senate whether any Senator wished to comment about the "out of order" decision.

## **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

M/S/P (Dabirian/Fidalgo) Meeting adjourned at 1:03 PM.