

**California State University, Chico**

Academic Senate  
(530) 898-6201, Zip 020  
MEMORANDUM

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

Thursday, March 7, 2019, 1:00 p.m., KNDL-207/209

*Academic Senate meetings are recorded. Traditionally the written minutes consist of a summary of topics discussed. For more detail, listen to the audio file [here](#). Time stamps for each agenda item are provided in parenthesis for convenience. CSU, Chico is committed to making its resources accessible for all audiences. If you have accessibility-related difficulties with any of these documents, please email [oats@csuchico.edu](mailto:oats@csuchico.edu).*

**PRESENT:** Adamian (Ford), Akinwande, Allen, Altfeld, Boyd (Ferrari), Connolly, Day, Ferrari, Ford, Gruber, Hart, Hostetter-Lewis (Mitchell-Brown), Kaiser, Livingston, McConkey, Mitchell-Brown, Paiva, Pittman, Shepherd, Sherman, Sistrunk, Sudick, Teague-Miller, Watkins, Wyrick (Chair)

**ABSENT:** Boura, Donze, Herman, Hidalgo, Horst, Hutchinson, Kim, Lang, Larson, Sharma, Trailer, Underwood, Zartman

Wyrick called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and observed that we had a quorum. [0:07-0:37]

**1. Approve [Agenda](#).** [0:37-1:11]

He noted that the agenda was short. He apologized for the inclusion of the [CSU Stanislaus Resolution](#) which is not the document he intended to provide.

Agenda was approved.

**2. CSU Chico's Response to the GE Task Force Report** [1:12-23:27]

- [GE Taskforce Report](#)
- [Introduction from ASCSU Chair Nelson and Co-Chair Ullman](#)
- [Memorandum from Executive Vice Chancellor, Loren Blanchard to CSU Presidents](#)
- [CSU Stanislaus Resolution](#)
- Survey Link

Wyrick opened the floor for comments and discussion about the [GE Taskforce Report](#) (attached to the agenda).

Sistrunk said he was one of the team that put together the [Resolution](#) in response to the [GE Taskforce Report](#). The people who signed the call that Senate hold a special meeting today were himself, Allen, McConkey, Livingston, and Hart because they felt that the issues the report brought up were so significant that we needed to meet especially. He thanked the senators.

Conversation ensued and varied points of view were shared:

- Extraordinary and flawed assumptions require immediate redress

- Notion that GE is somehow broken is egregious
- Implication that faculty efforts for so many years have been so inadequate that we need the extreme measures called for
- Narrowing the conversation to the terms suggested by the taskforce is not called for
- It is alarming to connect the size of our GE programs with arguments that we undermine student success
- As we discuss GE which we are constantly engaged in, we have processes and procedures in place locally and at statewide
- The taskforce operated alone and specifically rejected attempts at input
- We need to send a message that this way of starting a conversation is unacceptable in a shared governance context
- This is not really a faculty generated design
- Faculty must control the curriculum as we go forward to meet the challenges of the future
- Should a small percentage of faculty be allowed to reject a public records request in a public institution?
- GE made me see different alternatives to what I thought possible from my high school experience and must not be limited or cut down
- California has the lowest ratio of college counsellors to students in the country (how will they hear about possibilities without GE?)
- We just spent two years doing significant curricular design
- This new report seems to have gone through little to no consultation that in part undermines what we were just told to do with EO 1100 and 1110
- We are under strict mandates from GI 2025 –when is all this interference going to stop considering that we are a teaching system and most of us teach a 4-4 load? Where is the time to address all these mandates.
- Many of our sister campuses are taking the opportunity to provide consultation about this report including Fresno, East Bay, Stanislaus, Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Bakersfield, San Francisco, San Diego, San Marcos and San Jose
- This taskforce met for nearly two years behind closed doors breaking open meeting laws
- They are recommending policies without any data to support their effectiveness and their rationale
- The taskforce did not conduct consultation during these two years especially with the faculty and disciplines that had relevant information for their deliberations
- Open letters were sent to the taskforce and these were not acknowledged or allowed
- The process that created the report was corrupted and undermines our faculty processes
- This feedback is timely and important because the ASCSU plenary is next week and the statewide senators can take this
- The Chair of the ASCSU outlined how the Taskforce was formed and who was on it (the vast majority were faculty) There was a breakdown in communication because this group did not think their mandate was broad consultation at this time. This letter expects that there will be a series of consultations now.
- The committee suffered because EOs 1100 and 1110 came out at the same time they were deliberating –that would have caused turmoil in their process
- We should target the content more than the process (which we all recognize was flawed)
- The intent of the ASCSDU is to receive the report next week and the intent of our

resolution is to reject it

- Was the task force's charge to make system wide recommendations about GE and if so, what were the outcomes of those revisions to be? –this is unclear. What were they asked to do? –it does not seem that they did these
- If that was their assignment and this was the product we should not have to shuffle around with the impressions they came up with –this is not about the people or personalities involved –this is unacceptable work and we are not going to start from here –first we reject the thing, then we can talk

### **3. Proposed Resolution to Reject the General Education Taskforce Report (February 2019) [23:27-59:22]**

Wyrick moved discussion to the Proposed Resolution itself and explained that we are voting for it or against it. This is an Introduction item, but it could be moved to Action if people voted that way. There are only 35 minutes left today.

Conversation waxed eloquent again:

- The resolution addresses both sides of criticism of the report –one side takes issue with the process, the other with theoretical issues raised within the report itself
- The prohibition against double-counting is counter-productive –this also directly contradicts EO 1100 which encourages this
- The charge of the taskforce was to identify best practices and it did not itself use these
- Our resolution borrowed insights from other campuses and especially Dominguez Hills who are also questioning the process –we should take the opportunity to say what We want in shared governance –the process is the problem
- The resolution talks about the substance of the taskforce recommendations and our rationale has many ideas, for example, the violation of the Department of Education's Title V of the Education Code requiring 6 units of American Institutions courses, but this is really a different topic
- It is not true that students are confused by double-counting courses
- Double-counting allows students to double major which can add distinction to an ordinary major so that the student can think intersectionally which also looks good to employers
- 21 of the 23 CSU campus Liberal Studies Program directors have put forward a rejection of the goal of eliminating double-counting which would put us in conflict with the education code. This resolution will be sent to the ASCSU to be read on the senate floor.
- There is no data offered that supports the assertions of the taskforce report
- The assertion that nothing has changed in several decades is clearly untrue
- The purpose of college is to expose students to a broader world to develop a person's skillset –this is how people can change direction midway tough their college careers and still be successful
- The claims that GE is outdated have no evidence
- The report claims that faculty are creating equity gaps with GE
- The report has ulterior motives to create cheaper, faster, leaner education
- The letter sets up a process in which the ASCSU determines whether to accept the report and then it will be sent for review and assessment –we seem to be mixing the steps

- The resolution should reject the report. If we send a resolution that treats its content we are acceding to the process. If we accept the resolution we are somehow acceding to the process by which it was formed which we do not.
- This is a Statewide Senate Taskforce that appears to have followed the appointments bylaws in appointing a committee recommended by an senate resolution –why is there a presumption that there is some corruption here and a severe disruption of shared governance
- The norm is that a taskforce empowered by the senate would make ongoing reports and they normally take in information from outside and from other campuses and the fact that they denied participation seems to show their purpose got twisted
- The Quantitative Reasoning Taskforce Report was authorized through a similar process, the quality of that report, the data presented, and the nationwide consultation is night and day in contrast to this GE report. This is not a professional scholarly faculty presentation.
- Queries about progress along the way from this taskforce about this report have been stonewalled even in our local efforts
- It was asked why the second whereas clause is worded the way it is. The explanation was that this is a quote from the description on our GE website.
- A potential amendment was offered to this clause: “Beside the skills and competencies offered by majors ~~required to make a living~~, General Education at Chico State is designed....” This amendment was passed so that it could be applied at Action.
- The underlying assumption of the report is that there is something broken with GE, but there is no evidence offered that this is true. Before we start looking for a solution, show me that there is a problem
- A suggestion to move forward at Chico was that the taskforce report be rejected, and then we proceed with our discussions about improving our GE program that we have been evaluating for six years and are about to take up in our Senate. If we want to have a system-wide reform it should be articulated differently.
- Catherine Nelson’s letter (and especially the end of the fourth paragraph) seems to suggest that the Chancellor might be contemplating some general EOs about GE or that the legislature might –is there a way we can tell?
- Did the Chancellor’s Office request this taskforce be formed? Paula Selvester noted that before EOs 1100 and 1110 were issued, it was obvious that the Chancellor’s Office wanted to impact GE, and she and others felt that faculty should launch their own efforts ahead of this and this taskforce seems to be a partial result.
- If this report is discussed, more information about the impacts on the American Institutions requirements (Title V of the Education Code) may prove useful.

The taskforce recommendation cuts these in half and this will have impacts on millions of Americans damaging the public trust in the CSU and the higher education systems. These provisions go back to the World War II era when the CSUs were the state teachers’ colleges. The CSU is particularly suited for this role as the nation’s largest educational system since we are educating students from every walk of life who dream of contributing to American society in California. We cannot take away the tools to act as effective citizens as we see reports every day that Americans lack basic understanding of American government (as they can’t tell who the Vice President is). This is a problematic recommendation.

- Some senators thought whatever language would work to dismiss the report –it will “not be received”, or “it is rejected” should be applied
- We might say: “we vote not to receive the report, both for substantive reasons and for process reasons, but in the event the report is received, we still present our substantive content objections to the report.”
- The bibliography of sources utilized in the report lack in scholarly depth. In particular, the major scholars who have done substantive work on liberal general education are not cited, nor any of their sources. The works used are mass marketed writers. The research has not been done in a whole-hearted way.

The motion to reject the General Education Taskforce Report was passed as an Introduction Item

Sistrunk moved that the rules be suspended and the item be considered as an Action item Motion passed.

Kaiser suggested that if this resolution is accepted at the ASCSU that our statewide senators strongly recommend that more research be conducted to find data and promote very wide consultation about the values of general education.

Action Item passed unanimously.

#### **4. Announcements.** [59:22-1:00:7]

Kaiser wanted to thank the senators who did all this work to bring a resolution forward in such a short period of time.

Ford was also grateful for this conversation which he thought would be continued. He wanted to thank Altfeld for sending extensive comments via email as well.

#### **5. Other.** [1:00:9]

None

#### **6. Adjourn.**

Meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary