



**ACADEMIC SENATE
MINUTES
OCTOBER 13, 2022**

ASD 22-102

Approved 11-3-22

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

Present: Barros, Bauer, Bonuso, Brown, Bruce, Brusckke, Casem, Castelo, Dabirian, Evanow, Fry-Petit, Galvan, Garcia, Ghosh, Graewingholt, Jarvis, Kanel, Ketchum, Kleinjans, Landeros, Lewis Chiu, Luker, Mallicoat, Meyer, Miller, Milligan, Nair, Ordonez-Jasis, Parry, Perez, Plouffe, Robinson, Salvador, Self, Shepard, Stanley, Swarat, C. Thomas, E. Thomas, Valencia, Walsh, Weismuller, Wilson, Wood, Wynants

Absent: Badal, Barber, Childers, Henning, Stambough, Virjee

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Walsh called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

No urgent business.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Ketchum) I wanted to remind everyone that SB 24, the College Student Right to Access Act will be coming into effect on January 1, 2023. This means that all our students, regardless of gender identity or their sex will have comprehensive health care now in our Student Health Center, which includes non-surgical abortion services.
- There might be things happening on campus around this that I don't see, I'm not seeing anything happening right now. I'm noticing from talking to colleagues that other campuses are making visible preparations for this, including advertising that these comprehensive health care services will be available to students. Maybe we can have someone from the Student Health Center come talk to the Senate to hear about the preparations that are being made to inform our students that they will now be able to receive this comprehensive health care.
 - (Bauer) I do know that our Student Health Center is working diligently on a comprehensive plan for this. I do not have all the details, but I do know that a lot of work is being done and has been going on for months now.
- (Kanel) Welcome to our new HHD Senator, Mikyong Kim-Goh.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 ASD 22-87 Academic Senate Minutes 9-29-22 (Draft) - *forthcoming*

V. REPORTS

1. [Chair's Report](#)
2. Provost Report - no report.
3. Statewide Report - no report.
4. [ASI Report](#)
5. [CFA Report](#)

VI. UNFINISEHD BUSINESS

6.1 A Response to ASCSU on Single G.E. Pathway (Discussion item)

(Walsh) The ASCSU has asked that every campus responds to the Intersegmental Report on GE. They gave us three options to vote on. The Executive Committee has prepared a PowerPoint that Senator Casem will go through.

The PowerPoint presentation consisted of slides covering the following:

- GE Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC)
 - Mandated by California Legislature
 - This Cal-GETC
 - A Summary of the Cal-GETC Plan
 - What Cal-GETC is not
 - Our Options
 - Executive Committee Recommends
- **M/S/P** (Shepard/Wood) Motion to recommend approval of the ICAS Cal-GETC proposal. Motion approved.

Q: (Meyer) Does this mean that the community colleges will not be allowed to have their own GE package for their AA degree programs? Right now, the community college counselors have the choice of pushing students towards the community college's own GE program, the CSU breadth, which we accept or the IGETC which we and the UC accept.

A: (Walsh) My understanding from conversations and a presentation from the Chancellor's office, is this would be the single GE pathway for transfer students from community colleges.

Q: (Perez) Choosing Option #1, can anyone from Senate Exec clarify what kind of flexibility we would have in the GE Task Force, in terms of equity, making recommendations, etc.? What are the implications for our flexibility of forming a GE Task Force and figuring out GE on our campus, relative to the other two systems, particularly Community College?

A: (Walsh) Our flexibility is going to come out of the task force 2.0 in terms of recommending several things:

- What should the CSUF GE package look like for Native students?
- Should it conform to the Community College?
- What is the upper division GE package going to look like for Cal State Fullerton? And how do we achieve some equity for student access to GE across the colleges?

Those are some big questions and it's going to be a huge task, but that's what we're outlining as something we need to deliberate as a task force and come back and have multiple conversations with the Senate

Q: (Perez) Instead of the Option #2 of recommending specific changes, but in support of a universal GE plan, what is the rationale of Exec of recommending Option #1?

A: (Walsh) The rationale was that 700 faculty across the three systems have struggled with this for two years and have come up with something that they negotiated and agreed upon. We don't think given the short period of time we were asked to come up with a recommendation, by October 24th, that we had adequate time to deliberate and counter what many people have struggled with for two years. So, we are deferring to faculty across the three systems in that recommendation.

Q: (Perez) Are there any unintended consequences of Option #1, regarding flexibility, particularly for Native students that we should be mindful of before we vote?

A: (Jarvis) I can speak to it, my field of expertise, which is reversion points. What happens if you don't do it? I look at Option #1 and I see that UC gave more than CSU did. I really don't want us to go into a situation where our acting Chancellor is negotiating in a state government that has made it quite clear that CSU is at the bottom of the higher education pecking order. UC and Community Colleges are treated with more respect than we are, and you can see it in the budgeting. I look at this as the best version of a deal between the three systems.

Q: (Stanley) I don't see it anywhere in the literature, perhaps the Statewide Senators and the Executive Committee can clarify how this is going to impact GE practices of double counting high unit major waivers or if the community colleges are not going to deal with it. Was there any verbal discussion about that at any committee level?

- **M/S/P** (Weismuller/Wynants) Motion to form a GE Task Force 2.1. Motion approved.

Suggestion:

(Wood) It would be a good to have some people on the committee who were on the prior committee for continuity and some fresh people to add some new ideas.

Question:

Q: (Ketchum) How are the folks serving on the task force committee going to be chosen?

A: (Walsh) We would typically put out a call. We would get people, including self-nominations, then the Executive Committee would try to balance the representation by colleges to make sure we have a diversity, and then we would bring it back to the Senate for a vote.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 New UPS 100.XXX - A Commitment to Community at CSUF

- (Walsh) We want to bring comments back to the Diversity and Inclusion Committee on this document. Last year they struggled with revisions to our UPS, which was called A Commitment to Civility at CSUF. We found that term to be offensive and we have asked the D&I committee to look at this document again. They drafted something which the new document titled A Commitment to Community at CSUF.

The spirit is the same and what we wanted to do is to look at this document and see if there are any comments that we should relay to the Diversity and Inclusion Committee.

Suggestions:

- (E. Thomas) Line 14: add the wording "and social classes".
- (E. Thomas) Line 38: add the wording "faculty, staff, and community".
- (Bruce) Line 25: might read better if we put one of the policies in there.
- (Ordonez-Jasis) Line 14: add the word "languages".
- (Barros) Line 15: they are alluding to UPS 100.007 that has specific language in terms of the groups that they are specifying, so maybe if at least they match that so it's a consistent use of language throughout the documents, would perhaps be the best way to go.
- (Perez) This would probably go under respect, leave the opportunity and a foundation for future work on land acknowledgement, to acknowledge that there is a native history.
- (Perez) Including something in terms of dialogue and respect, always working to seek consultation and consent in our decision making.
- (Ketchum) Can a sub committee come up with some kind of recommendation and do a best practice of how other folks, other campuses are defining hate speech, drawing that line between hate speech and freedom of speech?
- (Bruschke) In UPS 100.07, we put a sentence in there to clarify the relationship between that document and the disciplinary process. So, my recommendation to the committee would be to put a similar sentence in this new UPS revision.
- (Wood) I'm wondering if it might make sense to include something on harassment as something we don't value in the document?

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Meyer) Meeting adjourned at 12:50 PM.