

Executive Committee
Tuesday, January 28, 2025, 3:00 – 5:00 pm

Meeting Attendance

- **Executive Committee Members: 275 Sacramento Hall.** The expectation for Executive Committee Members will be to meet in-person. Participation via Zoom will be made available for those members who need accommodations.
- **Guests** will attend via Zoom.
- **Zoom:** <https://csus.zoom.us/j/86084916676>

Executive Committee Open Forum is used for items not on the agenda. It allows any campus community member to raise relevant concerns, ask questions, or present directly to the Executive Committee.

- [Faculty Senate Bylaws: Article IV. A. The Executive Committee, 3.a.3. Open Forum](#)

Agenda

Updated: 1/27/25

1. Call to Order	Gibbs
2. Roll Call	Honeychurch
3. Open Forum	Executive Committee
4. Approval of the Agenda	Gibbs
5. Approval of the Minutes ▪ EX 24/25-105 December 3	Gibbs
6. From the Chair	Gibbs
7. From the Provost	Nevarez
8. EX 24/25-115 : Policy on Reorganization or Moving of Academic Units and Programs	Terry
9. Program Proposals <u>New Programs</u> EX 24/25-106 Minor in Sustainability <u>Amended Programs</u> EX 24/25-107 BA in Liberal Studies EX 24/25-108 BS in Public Health (Occupational Safety and Health) EX 24/25-111 Minor in Asian Studies <u>Discontinued Programs</u> EX 24/25-109 MA in Education (Behavioral Sciences Gender Equity Studies) EX 24/25-110 MA in Education (Language and Literacy) EX 24/25-116 BA in Asian Studies (Chinese Studies) <i>This proposal was held until the Minor in Chinese Studies returns to the Executive Committee for review. See next page for Minor in Chinese Studies.</i>	Gibbs

Program proposals rolled back to Curriculum Subcommittee

Amended Program

EX 24/25-12 Master of Social Work

- Throughout, the editorial change of swapping “Division” for “School” has been made. However, there are a few instances that were missed: Bottom of page 15 and middle of 16.
- Requirements repeat in the proposal. Is this just a glitch?
- For the culminating experience, do students either take SWRK 500 or (both 501 and 502)? It isn’t clear from the proposal.
- There is no unit total for the culminating experience. Since SWRK 500 is listed in the catalog as 2-4 units and 501 and 502 are both listed as 2 units each, it seems the unit total would be 2-4 units. This would make the unit total for the degree 58-60 instead of just 60.

EX 24/25-13 BA in Social Work

- BIO 7 is intended for Liberal Studies majors who want to become elementary school teachers. It does not focus specifically on human biology, but rather covers the biology curriculum needed to teach the Next Generation Science Standards in biology. BIO 20 is specifically tailored to have a human focus. Currently, the Biological Sciences Department has difficulty accommodating the enrollment demands of BIO 7 for Liberal Studies. If another population of students started taking BIO 7, it would likely edge out many Liberal Studies students who require BIO 7 for their degree.
- Consultation with Liberal Studies and Biological Science re: Bio 7.

New Program

EX 24/25-117 Minor in Chinese Studies

- The proposal will be rolled back to the Curriculum Subcommittee to address: 1) no consultation with Art is reflected on the proposal and 2) why the Art classes are no longer reflected in the proposal.

EX 24/25-14 MS in Environmental Studies

- Order of electives is not alphabetical or numerical.
- ENVS 295 (2-6 units), ENVS 296 (1-3 units), and ENVS 299 (1-3 units) are all variable units but this isn’t reflected in the unit total for the Electives heading.
- Why must a student select “3-6” courses from the ENVS Electives list? Couldn’t it just specify a minimum number of courses or a minimum number of units that need to be taken from the list?
- The Electives heading has a superscript “1”, the footnote for which states that a minimum of 20 units of ENVS courses must be taken, but there only 15 units of electives required. If this footnote is supposed to be communicating that 20 units from the entire degree needs to be from ENVS courses, that should be clear. If students need to take a minimum of 9

units of 200-level ENVS elective courses, this footnote is not needed since students will have 21 units of ENVS courses with the elective and required courses.

- The Electives heading has a superscript “2”, the footnote for which states that a minimum of 18 units of regularly scheduled 200-level courses in the major subject area must be taken, but there only 15 units of electives required. If this footnote is supposed to be communicating that 18 units from the entire degree needs to be from 200-level ENVS courses, that should be clear. If students need to take a minimum of 9 units of 200-level ENVS elective courses, this footnote is not needed since students will have 18 units of 200-level ENVS courses with the elective and required courses. Also, what are ‘*regularly scheduled* 200-level courses in the major subject area’? Is this the same as simply saying “200-level ENVS courses”?
- I don’t understand what the first two sentences of footnote #3 are trying to convey.
- Footnote #4 states that if only ENVS 500A is taken as a culminating experience, another 3 units of elective “should” be taken. If this is supposed to be mandatory, “should” needs to be changed to “must”.
- If the “Culminating Experience” heading lists 3-6 units, then the “Electives” heading should list 15-18 units since taking fewer than 6 culminating experience units requires students to take an additional 3 units of electives. Would it be possible (and potentially cleaner) to simply have ENVS 500B placed in the electives list with a note that it can only be taken if the thesis or project is judged, due to its design or complexity, by the faculty advisor as requiring a larger workload?
- Students select one of three courses listed under the “Policy” heading. After a student completes one, could they take another one and count it as an elective?
- In this proposal's PLOs, the Graduate Learning Goals (GLG) that these PLOs align to are listed parenthetically by their numbers. However, these GLGs, and in particular their numbers, will likely be changing if/when the new ILO-PLO policy is passed. In this case, including the numbers will likely be misleading and create problems later. Suggestion: Delete the parenthetical remarks in the PLOs.

Adjourn