

**Executive Committee Minutes***Tuesday, November 26, 2024, 3:00 pm**Approved: December 3, 2024***Roll Call:**

Martin Boston, Sharon Furtak, Hogan Hayes (absent), Carolyn Gibbs, Amber Gonzalez, Sheree Meyer (absent), Pat Oberle, Adam Rechs, Andrea Terry, Matthew Krauel, Raul Tadle

**Executive Session Call to Order:** 3:00 pm: Administrative positions discussion.

**Regular Meeting Call to Order:** 3:49 pm

**Open Forum:**

- **November 21 Senate Meeting – Status of approved items:** When will the following items be acted on by the President and the policy be posted in the Sacramento State Policy Library? The Senate Action Memo has been sent to the President for review and action before the winter break. The policy, once approved, will be posted in the Policy Library.
  - FS 24/25-76/EX Protecting Undocumented Individuals and Immigration and Customs Enforcement on Campus (Interim), Adoption of Policy as Permanent and Amendments
  - FS 24/25-75/EX ASCSU Resolution AS-3690-24/FA/JEDI: Fortifying and Supporting CSU Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Through Employment by Advancing their Inclusion and Equity in the CSU, Endorsement of
- **Communication Studies Master’s Program Honored:** It was shared that the Communication Studies Master’s Program was honored at the National Communication Conference as the top Master Program.
- **Dr. Rita Gallardo Good, College of Education Alumni** was named the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce 2024 Legacy Latina Estrella. The Award recognizes a professional who has “contributed to the Hispanic community and at large through extraordinary leadership and mentorship creating a legacy in the Sacramento region. Demonstrates excellence, creativity and initiative in their business or profession. Provides valuable service by contributing time and energy to improve the quality of life for others in the community.”

**Approval of the Agenda:** Approved as published.

**From the Chair:** No items.

**From the Provost:** The Latinx cluster hire update was provided.

**Draft December 5 Senate agenda:** Approved.

## Program Proposals

The following program proposals will be placed on the December 5 Senate agenda on Consent Action:

- **EX 24/25-77 BS in Substance Use & Abuse Studies**
- **EX 24/25-78 MS in Criminal Justice**
- **EX 24/25-81 BS in Hospitality and Tourism Management**
- **EX 24/25-80 Bachelor of Music (Jazz Studies):** Editorial items to be corrected before placing on the December 5 Senate agenda on Consent Action: Both MUSC 50A and MUSC 50B need the superscript 1 added to them to indicated they each need to be taken four times.
- **EX 24/25-83 BS in Recreation Management:** Editorial items to be corrected before placing on the December 5 Senate agenda on Consent Action: The superscripts and footnotes don't seem to align. There are three footnote #1, but two of them are identical. There are two different footnote #2. If superscripts refer to the footnotes directly below them, RPTA 32 and 33 both have a superscript 3, but there is no footnote 3 in the footnote section that directly precedes the them. Recommend not having multiple footnotes with the same number (e.g., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 instead of 1, 2, 1, 2, 3).

The following program proposals will be rolled back to the Curriculum Subcommittee

### **EX 24/25-85 MS Environmental Studies:** Rolled back to address:

- 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.

**EX 24/25-79      BA in Social Work** Rolled back to address:

- 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.

**EX 24/25-82      BS in Public Health (Health Promotion)**

- Given that the program is no longer impacted, the program's repeat policy seems harsh.
- Under (Credit by Examination” (page 8) it states “Refer to Credit by Examination section of the Sacramento State Catalog. However, this section of the Catalog only states “Students may challenge courses by taking examinations developed at Sacramento State. Credit shall be awarded to those who pass them successfully.” Recommend referring to the Credit for Prior Learning Policy instead.
- Page 10 state “Select one concentration from the following”, but then there is a list of courses, with the concentrations lined out. I don't understand what these courses are.
- The courses listed under the heading “Concentration in Health Promotion (24 units)” (page 10) is not 24 units. It isn't clear how this section relates to the “Required Upper Division Courses” Section.
- Since PUBH 195 is 3-4 units, the section that it is listed under needs to have a range as well (e.g., the concentration can't list just 24 units).

**EX 24/25-84      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.

**Adjourned:** 4:37 pm