

## Senate Executive Committee Meeting (2/21/2023)

Attendees: Sarah Senk (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Ariel Setniker, Frank Yip, Christine Isakson, Victoria Haller, and Provost Lori Schroeder.

Absent: Elizabeth McNie and Wil Tsai have conflicting meetings.

### Minutes Review and Approval

- The draft minutes from our Valentine's Day meeting are not yet prepared for approval. Fairbanks recommended approving them along with this meeting's minutes at our meeting next week.

### CommUnity Day Preparations

- Senk shared the schedule as it stands. Some discussion followed.
- The schedule is still (slightly) in flux, but essentially final. We need help distributing it to all campus. It will go out to all faculty later this afternoon. It should follow to all campus shortly thereafter.
- Kudos were given to Senk for leading the charge on this reimagined Community Day.
- A request was made for bios of the panelists coming for Community Day. Senk said these exist and will be distributed.
- Details of who was sending what to whom and when were sorted out. Crushed it.

### The GVAR Conundrum

- Majors cannot add units. We can't do the exam anymore. It needs to be a course – how do we adjust to accommodate this requirement?
- Isakson noted her concern about rolling the writing into a major course. In her view, this would dilute that course's purpose. Students would benefit from taking a dedicated course.
- The question has been posed – “Why can't Area C courses be adapted to be GVAR?” Answer: because that isn't the aim of those courses. It would completely change the course content and instruction. What follows that response has been – “Ok, then we'll do it in major.”
- Colin Dewey responded (in part): “To turn responsibility for this process over to faculty in-major (your “In Major WI” option below) with no knowledge or experience in how to teach or support developmental writing invites either a massive decline in the number of those who “pass” GVAR certification, or a massive increase in the numbers who ‘are passed’ who should not be.”
- Senk noted that in a CSU-wide GE Chairs meeting, some CSUs are in discussions about alignment with ‘non-native’ GE requirements and potential revisions to EO 1100. There seems to be much confusion about whether we could expect changes to EO 1100. Isakson pushed back on this, noting that this seems to be an outgrowth of previous miscommunications on whether native GE requirements would be required to change in response to the AB 928. All CSU campuses will continue to offer their own GE pathway for 4-year students. AB928 does not ask CSUs to align their pathways with the new Cal-GETC pathway, nor are there plans in the works to do so in the future.

