



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: ACADEMIC SENATORS
FROM: Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary
SUBJ: **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**
DATE: Thursday October 20, 2022, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/81231074627?pwd=ZWFzZVpKVENOY2pEb0drdC8vaE43dz09>
Meeting ID: 812 3107 4627 Passcode: 761594

PRESENT: Adamian, Alvarez, Bailey, Boyd, Burns, Burk, Cline, Coons, Draper (Ferrari), Ford, Gibson, Gray, Kaiser (Hidalgo), Kralj (Walter), Larson, Leon, Magnus, McBride-Praetorius, Medic, Moss, Miller (Lee), Musvosvi, Newell, O’Conner, Paiva (Chair), Peterson, Sherman, N., Sistrunk, Smith, Son, Trailer, Traver, Yeager-Struthers, and Zeichick.

ABSENT: Brundage, Boura, Hutchinson, Larson, Sendze, Sherman, A., and Wagner.

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 2:34 pm. Time certain meeting will end at 3:30 pm after which Standing Committees will convene their meetings.

1. Approve Agenda
Agenda approved.
2. Proposed Academic Senate [survey response](#) to ASCSU regarding Cal-GETC Common GE Pathway – Senate Action
Chair Paiva introduced item 2:
 - a. Campus was asked from the Statewide Academic Senate (ASCSU) to provide a feedback and survey response (attached above).
 - b. Formed Ad Hoc Committee to work on the response to the proposed Cal GETC common GE pathway and provide recommendation to the survey response.
 - c. Chair Paiva was part of the Ad Hoc Committee as a facilitator, and as a non-voting member.
 - d. The AB 928 legislation and the decision being made currently throughout all three systems (CCC, UC, and CSU) affects transfer students only.

Senator Smith reported Senate’s Ad Hoc Committee work:

- a. Four meetings: September 29, October 3, October 13, and October 18.
- b. Serving members: Logan Smith, Melody Jaeger Struthers, Marian Walter, Dennis O’Connor, Nicholas Burk, Holly Kralj, Matthew Miller, Jeff Trailer, Corey Sparks, Betsy Boyd and Rick Ford.
- c. Ad Hoc Committee discussed and deliberated the three possible options, consulted with a Curriculum Advisory Board (CAB), which met on October 17.
- d. CAB’s discussion led to the outcome of the voting option B the alternative to the proposed Cal GETC transfer pathway. After deliberation on October 18, the Senate Ad Hoc Committee voted

to recommend that the Academic Senate respond with option B to the ASCSU request for response to the Cal GETC proposal.

The Academic Senate will discuss and decide to endorse or not the Cal GETC 31 option B proposed by the CAB and recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee. Majority vote will decide.

If not endorsed, Academic Senate will take the second vote to either support Cal GETC option or no consensus option.

Discussion details available via transcript [link](#).

Summary of motions and decisions made by the Academic Senate:

- a. Proposed amendment to the membership to add “served as non-voting members”, and Senator Boyd’s formal name . Second. “Members of the committee included: Logan Smith, Melody Yeager-Struthers, Miriam Walter, Dennis O’Connor, Nicholas Burk, Holly Kralj, Matthew Teague Miller, Jeff Trailer, and Corey Sparks. Elizabeth “Betsy” Boyd and Rick Ford served as non-voting members.
 - i. Rationale: to clarify statewide senators were part of the Ad Hoc Committee as non-voting members who provided information and context to how the work would be used.
 - ii. Amendment to the amendment: to clarify that Chair Paiva was also a non-voting member. Second. Approved.
 - iii. No opposition, amendment approved.
- b. Opposition to support to the option B shared by the Ad Hoc Committee member. Rationale process was rushed.
- c. Question: Is it acceptable to the CAB that campus will not include additional units from 31 to 34. Answer: CAB Chair personally would accept adding 3 extra units, CAB would be asked to discuss this further prior to making a final decision.
- d. Question: Was there any consideration by either CAB or the Ad Hoc Committee regarding the logistics of making an overlay throughout the community college system? How to address fears that this represents too much workload compared to the current Cal GETC proposal? Answer: No explicit consideration, no time to explore implications.

Timeline:

September 22: Chico State received 1st official notification to provide feedback to the ASCSU.

September 22: Ad Hoc Committee formed.

September 26: CAB received notice of the above subcommittee formation and request. CAB had informal AB 928 discussion.

September 29 & October 3: Ad Hoc Committee meetings and discussions.

October 6: Academic Senate met and requested CAB Chair to be involved with the subcommittee work.

Following week CAB had discussion on AB 928, ICAS process and future implications of ICAS decision.

October 13: CAB Chair attended subcommittee meeting.

October 17: CAB meeting and further discussion. CAB used a rank choice vote method to choose option B in the response survey.

October 18: CAB Chair attended subcommittee meeting.

- e. Amendment to the rationale of the proposed document, to rewrite the sentence to be: “The extra three units freed by the reconfiguration of Area A1 could be used to address the elimination of 3 units from Area E, Lifelong Learning, or the three units from area C, Arts and Humanities.” Second.

- i. Rationale: Three units cut from area E. Current proposal is collapsing area C1 and C2.
- ii. Community colleges have wide diversity of courses. Need to understand these are transfer students, not “our” students. Question to ask is: are transfer students in need of lifelong learning or arts and humanities courses keeping in mind these are transfer students and not Chico State juniors?
- iii. Concerns shared this was a rushed process.
- iv. Vote in subcommittee was focused on support to content experts on this topic.
- v. Statewide Senators informed Senate they will vote abstain as they will represent the will of the body.
- vi. Senate voted: 28 yes, four no, and four abstentions. Motion passes.
- vii. Clarified that abstain votes are not part of the count.
- f. Comment shared this is a hard decision, directly impacting the strategic goals of the university around diversity, equity, and inclusion. More discussion should have been allowed.
- g. Clarified that spring process and discussion was different than the one done now.
- h. Emphasized conversation should be about transfer student that are coming from CC, and not Chico State campus students as they will still take existing Chico State courses. Transfer students will take less units. Focus is on what kind of flexibility we are willing to provide them.
- i. Motion made to remove next sentence “the proposal makes no suggestion as to how to use these three units”, after previous amendment was approved. Second.
 - i. Rationale: opposite from what was approved.
 - ii. Senate voted: 29 yes, zero no, two abstentions. Motion passes.
- j. Senator moved to add 20 minutes to this item. Second. Two thirds vote needed. Senate voted: 27 yes, one no. Motion approved.
- k. Commented by Ad Hoc Committee member that they opposed Cal GETC 31 option B.
- l. Opposition shared. Ask for either postponement of vote or revisit at later time to allow more time to discuss impact on the community. Butte College will have a significant impact on their student body.
- m. Comment shared that the very students that this process is intended to serve will create larger equity gaps in the future. Short deadlines are strategic and causing creation of illogical, rushed decisions. Opposition to options A and B shared.
- n. Rhetoric itself prepare students for a wealth of careers like business, public relations, advertising, human resources, government education. The data proves that the equity gap and impact on transfer students would be expansive.
- o. Question: rationale did not mention student success. Is there available evidence that the overlay of the oral communications competencies across the other courses will be equal or better in terms of student success? Were disciplinary experts consulted and if yes, what were recommendations? Answer: in the last CAB meeting, DFW rates and equity gap data information were available.
- p. Senator moved to call a question. Second.
 - i. Rationale: at this point there were enough discussion and Senate can move to respond to the survey.
 - ii. Senate voted: 32 yes, zero no, two abstentions. Senate will call the vote.
- q. Senate will vote on the proposal to endorse the CAB Cal GETC31 GE transfer pathway, option B.
 - i. Question: asked for clarification on what will happen in the case of yes versus no, after Senate votes. Answer: Currently Senate will vote on option B. If yes, Senate will endorse option B, and this will be shared with ASCSU. If not endorsed by Senate, next vote will

be to endorse wither option A or C. Majority vote will determine endorsement to one of three survey response options.

- ii. Senate voted: 14 yes, 16 no, four abstentions. Senate voted not to approve option B.
- r. Moved to extend meeting until 4:05 pm. Second. No objection, approved.
- s. Senate will vote on next option.
- t. Question: what does vote yes for option A mean? Answer: approval and endorsement of the ICAS GE transfer pathway, removal of one course or three units from area C. Additionally, this would remove area E from CSU GE Breadth, and would add one unit to area B as a lab unit.
- u. Motion made to endorse option C. Second.
 - i. Rationale: conversation showed no clear support for options provided. Close vote shows this body can't come to consensus.
 - ii. Point of order. Call for a vote asked Senate to finish the vote. Therefore, no other motion can be made.
 - iii. Clarified this was a sequential vote.
- v. Question: area E in parentheses in pattern 8 is added as an upper division graduation requirement. Is this an assumption due to being in parentheses? Answer: that is correct.
- w. Senate voted on option A (yes vote) or option C (no vote): eight yes, 23 no, two abstentions. Chico State endorsed option C no consensus vote. The follow-up is providing a resolution by the Ad Hoc Committee that can provide more clarity.
- x. Timeline:
 - i. the General Education Advisory Committee which is the Chancellor's Office committee on General Education co-chaired by the ASCSU begins the deliberations on November 1.
 - ii. The Standing Committees of the ASCSU meet on November 2.
 - iii. Plenary meetings are on November 3 and 4.
 - iv. Plenary meetings depend on the standing committees. Suggested to have a response by Friday or Monday at 9 am (October 31).
- y. Next Senate meeting will be on October 27 where this will be discussed as an action item.

3. Adjourn at 4:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

For a direct link to all agenda items in Box, click [here](#).