**Minutes of the Academic Senate**

Del Norte 1500

Tuesday, September 10, 2024

2:30-4:30pm  
This meeting offers a virtual option through Zoom:

<https://csuci.zoom.us/j/86923923435>

**Present:** Cameron Harris, Colleen Delaney, Marianne McGrath, Amy Denton, Gareth Harris, Cindy Sherman, Maria Ballesteros Sola, Nancy Deans, Annie White, Jared Barton, Taryn Hakala, Sean Anderson, Antonio Jiménez, Tom Clobes, Jim Meriwether, Cindy Wyels, Aaron McColpin, Heather Castillo, Chris Scholl, Kimmy Kee-Rose, Weldon Smith, Jose Luis Callazo, Janet Pinkley, Manuel Correia, Chuck Weis, Alison Perchuk, Lydia Dixon, Matt Campbell, Peter Krause, Nancy Chen, Jose Alamillo, Tiina Itkonen, Ron Berkowsky, Georgina Guzman, Monica Pereia, Mari Estrada, Billy Munroe, Tabitha Swan Wood, Susan Lefevre, Andrew Fox, Rebecca Slocum, Cynthia County, Sean Kramer, Jeanette Edwards, Christina Smith, Andrea Grove, Jennie Luna, Greg Wood, Kaia Tollefson for Rich Yao

1. Opening the Meeting and Approval of the Agenda
   1. Called to order at 2:46, after determining quorum.
   2. Motion: No additions. Approved by unanimous consent
2. Approval of the Minutes from May 14, 2024
   1. Motion: Greg Wood
   2. Second: Monica Perreira
   3. Vote: Approved by unanimous consent.
3. Report from the Chair
4. New Business
   1. Bylaws Revision for NTTF Council (see attached)
      1. Discussion
         1. Perchuk – process clarification: This is not a first reading. Senate exec has the role for voting for Bylaws changes to be put to the faculty to accept or reject. The role of Senate is to inform the faculty about their role in accepting or rejecting the changes put forward by Senate executive committee.
         2. Perchuk – content clarification: a clean by-laws change to make the NTTF council a functional body. We are aware that there are many other by-laws changes that are necessary, and AEBC will revisit those needed changes later in the year.
         3. Swan-Wood – Thanks to AEBC for support in putting the needed by-laws changes into effect. We are following a process already established for standing committees. Though the council is not technically a standing committee in that it has outward-facing aspects.
         4. Dean – no comments to add
         5. Chair clarified that if questions arise upon reading, they can be forwarded to AEBC email.
         6. Question (Clobes) – just a single line change?
            1. Perchuk – a number of small changes throughout, all of which are captured via Track Changes.
   2. Senate Resolution to Remove Exhibit 1 (see attached)
      1. Discussion
         1. Chair – Short resolution allows the disentanglement of two documents
         2. Lina, representing APPC: Part of Senate Policy SB202 which has an attached Exhibit 1.
            1. There are items in Exhibit 1 which are not correct.

Identifies which entities need to be involved for which curriculum processes.

There are items that can occur in parallel, speeding up the timeline.

There has been resistance to following timelines out of step with Exhibit 1, on the mistaken understanding that Exhibit 1 is policy.

However, actual policy states that it is APPC’s role to determine timelines.

* + - * 1. Question: No change in policy? Just a removal of exhibit?

Yes.

* + - * 1. Question: What’s the relationship with the second document? It appears to place restrictions on the Senate, the tail wagging the dog.

If someone has a concern with that document, because for example it inappropriately constrains Senate, what is their means of redress?

The document is *not* a policy. It is merely to show the working of the APPC. (Request to ensure that this document *not* being policy is reflected on the record.)

* + - * 1. Question (Annie): If this is a Senate Resolution, does it constitute policy requiring a vote?

Wood: There was discussion in Senate that a resolution on removing the exhibit might carry the existing force, because exec was concerned about opening up the remainder of the policy for changes.

Annie wishes to ensure that we don’t end up in a situation again where action is not taken for a year.

Discussion clarifies this was intended as a first reading item, to be voted on (as a resolution) at the next meeting.

Question: why wait for two weeks if this is a simple fix for an item with urgency?

Motion to move this immediately to a second reading item up for a vote: Sean Anderson

Second: Cindy Wyels

Attempt at unanimous consent. Perchuk objects and calls for discussion.

We do have an operational structure inside Senate that calls for first and second reading. We are representative body. Though this item may be uncontroversial, we should start off the year respecting our own nature as a representative body. Though there is urgency, Lena has indicated that there is an existing workaround.

Lina: As a point of clarification – no change to the body of the policy, whether voted upon now or in two weeks.

Point of order – do we have quorum? If not, we can’t discuss business items like this.

If Senators have not been ID’d, how counted?

By 80% of the Senators that are on record.

Meeting paused to re-verify whether quorum has been met.

Quorum appears to have been lost at some point during the meeting

Discussion of item suspended due to loss of quorum.

1. Chair reminds departments to put forward their Senator’s names, and to encourage Senators to remain through entirety of session.
2. No Returning Business
3. Informational
   1. Update on APPC (Lina, 5 minutes) and GE (Geoff/Reha, 5 minutes)
      1. Brief hold while we discussed whether informational item could be presented without quorum. Wood: Yes it can.
      2. Reha (on GE):
         1. Recategorization of GE, using new numbering system
         2. Reduction in overall number of units
         3. The task force made recommendations about our existing GE courses; these recommendations were forwarded to GE committee.
         4. Question (Wood): time frame?
            1. Aspiration is to bring it to Senate before the end of the month.
         5. Lina asked for time with all chairs to talk about the changes to GE about the changes that will affect the programs themselves.
         6. Question: All GE courses have to be overhauled?
            1. Specific recommendations made by the task force. Not all courses will have to overhauled. But courses will have to align with required changes per Title 5. And the task force made recommendations about courses that don’t even conform to the existing policies.
            2. Lina: for example, GE is 38+9. Programs cannot say in catalogue there are 72 units of GE. If students take additional units, those are counting toward the program, not toward GE.
         7. Wood: what’s the timeframe to get this cleaned up in time for the catalog, since the catalog is the constraint?
            1. Lina: Catalogue published March 15, would like this cleaned up by February.
         8. Lina: All revisions will be to existing policies to conform to title 5 changes. However, there will be one new policy responding to a requirement from WASC.
         9. Lina: With Senate leadership, discussed when to offer a forum on GE changes. It will come soon, and it is about achieving compliance.
         10. Question (Anderson): What proportion of the classes?
             1. Task force looked at every course.
             2. Wood: Can we get a sense of what proportion need an edit, even a trivial edit?
             3. Lina: It should not be me or Reha providing that information. We should let the GE committee finish their work first.
         11. Question (Annie) -where do we stand with the GE Committee?
             1. Perchuk: all vacancies are viewable on the (AEBC) website
             2. Smith: vacancies in Education, Ethnic Studies, Arts and Humanities
         12. Question (Perreira) – If there is a moratorium, how do new programs get their GEs satisfied? Also, several times we’ve heard that people need to step up. However, in at least one case, someone on a committee had not finished their term yet, but was not informed of that.
         13. ASI rep – is it correct that students are “grandfathered in” according to GE requirements at admittance?
             1. Students have catalog rights to the pattern of GE in effect when admitted. BUT, the “GE-ness” of a course is tied to when it was taken.
4. [Reports Are Linked Here for Your Reference](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DEZ5HZ-4An_xbh2eSkkb6AlpxC8Y73Fi/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=109230774333751288704&rtpof=true&sd=true)
   1. Report from President Yao
   2. Report from Provost Lavariega Monforti
   3. Report from Statewide Senators
   4. Report from CFA President
   5. Report from Staff Council
   6. Report from NTTF Council
   7. Report from ASI
   8. Reports from Senate Committees
      1. Appointments, Elections, and Bylaws (AEBC)
      2. Academic Policy and Planning (APPC)
      3. Senate Budget (SBC)
      4. Equity and Anti-Racism (CEAR)
      5. Faculty Affairs (FAC)
      6. Student Academic Policies and Procedures (SAPP)
      7. Others
5. Intent to Raise Questions (link to materials will be updated soon)
6. Adjourn
   1. Motion – Jose Luis
   2. Second – Tabitha
      1. Unanimous Consent (no objections)