

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, April 8, 2026

CLA Building, 98, P2-8

Zoom Link: <https://cpp.zoom.us/j/89530215914>

Zoom ID: 895 3021 5914

Passcode: executive

Attendees: Greg Barding, David Edens, Ghada Gad, Peter Hanink, Rita Kumar, Kelly Min, Dennis Quinn, Julie Shen, Nicholas Von Glahn, Faye Wachs, and Gerd Welke.

Proxy: Kelly Min for Aaron Cayer

Guests: Mohammad Husain, Desireé Reneé Martinez, Jeff Roy, and Mario Guerrero

1) Minutes

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes from March 25, 2026

There was no discussion.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Senator Kumar seconded.

There were two (2) abstentions. The motion passed.

M/s/p to approve the Executive Committee Meeting Agenda for March 25, 2026.

2) Chair's Report

Update on Ombuds Office Discussions

Chair Hanink reported on a meeting held earlier in the day with Vice Chair Barding, the President, and the Provost regarding the Ombuds Office. Chair Hanink noted that discussions are ongoing; however, the key takeaway is that the CSU system will not support the creation or reinstatement of an official ombuds position.

The President and Provost cited CSU's interpretation of Title V as a distinguishing factor between CSU and UC systems and as the basis for their position. Chair Hanink and Vice Chair Barding plan to further review this interpretation. Currently, CSU leadership appears firm in its stance against supporting an ombuds.

While the term “ombuds” itself appears to be a significant obstacle, the President and Provost expressed openness to exploring the creation of an alternative entity or structure that could serve a similar function under a different designation.

#### Resolution on Reinstatement of the Ombuds

Chair Hanink informed the Executive Committee that Senator Guerrero submitted a draft resolution calling for the reinstatement of the ombuds and requested that it be considered for inclusion on next week’s meeting agenda. The resolution was distributed via email shortly before the meeting.

Under New Business, the Executive Committee will review the resolution and vote on whether to place it on the agenda for the following week’s meeting. Chair Hanink noted his understanding that even if the resolution were to pass, it is unlikely to result in immediate action, given CSU leadership’s current position.

Additional context was provided: Senator Guerrero initially submitted the resolution while discussions with the administration were still unfolding. After Chair Hanink followed up with Senator Guerrero to explain the outcome of recent meetings with the President and Provost, Senator Guerrero reiterated his request for the resolution to be formally presented, prompting its distribution to the committee.

#### Questions and Discussion

Senator Dennis Quinn asked about the status of Mark Patterson, the former Ombuds Office director, and staff, specifically whether they were terminated or reassigned. Chair Hanink stated he did not have that information but offered to follow up.

Senator Faye Wachs noted that the statewide Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) has previously passed a resolution in support of having ombuds offices on all CSU campuses. She confirmed that this resolution predates her tenure but reflects a broader, systemwide faculty sentiment in favor of ombuds services.

Chair Hanink thanked Senator Wachs for this information and noted that the issue would be discussed further when the resolution appears on the agenda.

#### 3) Vice Chair’s Report

There was no Vice Chair’s report.

#### 4) Reports

**Presented by Dr. Jeffrey Roy, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee**

AA-005-256 Correction to Cross-Listing Policy 1122

## Summary of Discussion

- Senator Nicholas Von Glahn stated he was not prepared to give a final opinion due to illness but emphasized:
  - Senate policy must not violate the CBA.
  - Guidance from administration (e.g., Chancellor's office) should not be the sole authority if faculty interests may differ.
  - If language is clearly in violation of the CBA, it should not proceed.
  - If ambiguous, further clarification should be sought from CFA or statewide arbitration precedent before final determination.
- **Clarification of Feedback:**
  - Senator Jeffrey Roy explained that most committee feedback supported retaining the phrase “collaborate on content” and related footnotes.
  - Opposition or concern came primarily from administrative perspectives raised in Academic Affairs (Dr. Massa), reflecting Dr. Koos's recommendation for removal to align with perceived standard practice.
- **Nature of the Issue:**
  - Chair Hanink clarified that:
    - The *primary CBA concern* originally involved staffing, not content collaboration.
    - “Collaborate on content” is interpreted as a process obligation (communication/consultation), not a mandate on outcomes or agreement.
  - Senator Jeffrey Roy noted that the CBA language specifies consultation by a dean with a department chair (singular), which prompted referral and reconsideration of policy phrasing.
- **Interpretation of “Collaborate on Content”:**
  - Discussion centered on whether the phrase:
    - Implies ongoing chair involvement in course content after an ECO is approved, or
    - Apply only to initial actions such as cross-listing or proposing new courses.
  - Senator Gerd Welke suggested collaboration makes sense during the creation of new courses/ECOs, but not for established courses.
  - Chair Hanink noted that other policy sections (e.g., unilateral removal of cross-listing) suggest collaboration is limited to an initial phase and does not create ongoing obligations.
- **Procedural Considerations:**
  - Senator Dennis Quinn advised against pulling the item after first reading, noting:
    - Senate votes should proceed.
    - Administration retains the option to respond, reject, or request reconsideration.
  - Chair Hanink emphasized respecting committee process and that the matter is procedurally ready for Senate consideration.

Senator Quinn motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Vice Chair Barding seconded.

There was one (1) abstention. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AA-005-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026, as a follow up to the second reading.

AA-007-256 University Curriculum Guide-Senate Approval

There was no discussion.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Quinn seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AA-007-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

**Presented by Dr. Mohammad Husain, Chair of the Academic Programs Committee**

AP-018-245 MS in Materials Engineering – Support Mode Change (Self-Support to State-Support)

There was no discussion.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Quinn seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-018-245 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

AP-008-256 B.S. in Kinesiology - New Exercise Science Option

There was no discussion.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Shen seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-008-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

AP-009-256 M.S. in Agriculture, Animal, Food, and Plant Sciences - Program Name, CSU Degree Code, and CIP Code Changes

There was no discussion.

Senator Edens motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Vice Chair Barding seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-009-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

**Chair Hanink suggested consolidating the AP discontinuation reports for today's meeting discussion. Senator Husain and the Executive Committee agreed to consolidating the AP discontinuation reports for discussion.**

AP-013-256 Footwear Design and Merchandising Minor - Discontinuation

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Gad seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-013-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

AP-018-256 New Computational Linguistics Minor (Jointly proposed by EML and CS)

There was no discussion.

Senator Shen motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Vice Chair Barding seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-018-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

AP-021-256 M.S. in Agriculture - Plant Science Option Discontinuation

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda.  
Senator Edens seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-021-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

AP-022-256 M.S. in Agriculture – Agriculture Science Option Discontinuation

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda.  
Senator Edens seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-022-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

AP-023-256 M.S. in Agriculture - Animal Science Option Discontinuation

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda.  
Senator Edens seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-023-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

AP-024-256 New Minor in Artificial Intelligence

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda.  
Senator Quinn seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-024-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

AP-026-256 New Self-Support Counterpart of the Master of Science in Computer  
Science

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Quinn seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send AP-026-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

### **Presented by Dr. Mario Guerrero, Chair of the General Education Committee**

GE-034-256 Satisfaction of the GE Area 1B (Critical Thinking) Requirement by Completion of the FYE Engineering Course EGR 1000/1000:L

#### Background and Context

Senator Guerrero explained that, under recent Chancellor's Office directives, any proposed substitution for a General Education (GE) area must be satisfied through a single course, rather than across multiple courses as had been allowed previously. In response, the College of Engineering proposes using an existing first year experience course to also fulfill GE Area 1B: Critical Thinking requirements.

#### Review Process and Consultation

Engineering submitted a comprehensive referral package, including:

- Documentation related to the Educational Course Outline (ECO),
- A detailed explanation of the proposed substitution,
- A syllabus and supporting instructional materials,
- An alignment matrix mapping course components to Area 1B criteria,
- Sample lecture and laboratory assignments, and
- Frequently Asked Questions.

The GE Committee consulted with the English and Philosophy departments, both of which currently offer GE Area 1B courses. These consultations generated extensive and substantive feedback, all of which was included in the report to the Executive Committee (EC). Representatives from both departments also serve as members of the GE Committee.

#### Committee Deliberations and Votes

The GE Committee held extensive discussion focusing on whether critical thinking, as defined by GE Area 1B, functioned as an organizing principle of the course.

Two votes were conducted:

1. Recommendation to Approve the Substitution as Proposed
  - Vote result: 6 in favor, 5 opposed, 1 abstention
  - Outcome: The committee voted to recommend approval of the course in its current form as a GE Area 1B substitution.
2. Recommendation for Course Revision
  - Based on discussion and in anticipation of a possible failure of the first motion, the committee also voted on whether to recommend revisions to the course.
  - Vote result: 10 members in favor
  - Outcome: Strong support for recommending that Engineering revise the course to strengthen its alignment with critical thinking requirements.

### **Concerns Identified**

The committee also raised several concerns:

- The course appears to function primarily as a first year experience course, rather than being centered on critical thinking as defined in GE Area 1B.
- Instruction in core critical thinking concepts—such as reasoning types, argumentation, inference, and logical fallacies—is not consistently or explicitly demonstrated.
- Compared to traditional Area 1B courses, the course devotes limited instructional time and assessment to foundational critical thinking theory.
- Critical thinking does not consistently appear to serve as the organizing principle of the course.
- Questions remain regarding instructor assignment, consistency, and training in critical thinking pedagogy.
- Although critical thinking may be reinforced elsewhere in the Engineering curriculum, committee members expressed concern that students who leave the major or the university would earn Area 1B credit based solely on this course, raising questions of standalone equivalency.

### Final Recommendation

The GE Committee advances the recommendation to approve GE-034-256 as a substitution for GE Area 1B by a vote of 6-5-1. Simultaneously, there is strong support for encouraging Engineering to revise and strengthen the course, particularly with respect to explicit instruction and assessment of critical thinking skills. Engineering has indicated openness to feedback and a willingness to pursue improvements.

### Questions and Discussion

Senator Dennis Quinn thanked Senator Guerrero for the committee report and raised concerns regarding the narrow margin of the GE Committee vote (6 in favor, 5 opposed, 1 abstention). He noted that the small margin, combined with the unresolved concerns identified in the report, could lead to significant debate on the Senate floor.

Senator Quinn specifically referenced feedback attributed to the Philosophy department, characterizing it as particularly critical of the proposal. He asked whether it might be beneficial for the GE Committee to spend additional time addressing outstanding issues to strengthen the proposal and achieve a clearer consensus before bringing the item forward to the Senate. He expressed concern that advancing the proposal with such a slim margin could result in heightened controversy during Senate deliberations.

### Response

Senator Mario Guerrero acknowledged the concerns raised and agreed that discussion on the Senate floor is likely. He stated that it is difficult to predict how senators will ultimately respond to the proposal.

Senator Guerrero explained that the College of Engineering has expressed willingness to address the committee's concerns and engage in revisions. However, he noted that the GE Committee faced timeline constraints, including adherence to the April 15 referral deadline and the need for review prior to the fall semester, potentially in alignment with Chancellor's Office expectations. He indicated that it was unclear whether sufficient time remained—either over the summer or within the Senate calendar—to allow for additional committee review, revisions, and the required Senate readings.

Senator Guerrero reiterated his expectation that the proposal will generate substantive discussion when brought before the full Senate.

### Discussion of Timeline Constraints

Senator Gerd Welke raised a question regarding the timeline for consideration of the proposal, noting that the issue had already been addressed. He summarized that the firm deadline remains mid-April, leaving insufficient time to revise the proposal and return it through committee review in time for implementation in Fall 2026.

Senator Welke observed that, given the timeline, the options appear limited: if the proposal were advanced and subsequently failed, Engineering would likely need to pursue an alternative approach for AY 2026–27, with the possibility of revisiting the matter for AY 2027–28. He acknowledged that uncertainty remains regarding the precise process and deadlines.

### Chair's Response on Senate Scheduling

Chair Hanink explained that even if the item were forwarded to the Senate, the second Senate reading would likely occur at the May 6 main Senate meeting. Chair Hanink noted that while contentious items are generally avoided at that meeting, exceptions may be necessary if timelines require action.

Chair Hanink also shared that Senator Jonathan Puthoff had raised the possibility of calling a special Senate session to allow for a second reading outside the regular meeting

schedule. This session could potentially occur on a non-Wednesday or on a Wednesday outside the established event calendar.

Senator Welke expressed support for a special session if needed.

Chair Hanink noted that Engineering faculty worked extensively over the academic break to ensure that the proposal met committee deadlines and could advance by the end of the spring quarter. While Chair Hanink did not recall the exact origin of the timeline constraint, he emphasized that a firm external deadline does exist.

Senator Welke recalled that a previous iteration of a similar proposal, approximately five years earlier, had been highly contentious. Chair Hanink agreed and added that the topic itself is likely to generate debate regardless of timing or format.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the report to send to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Quinn seconded.

There was one (1) abstention. The motion passed.

M/s/p to send GE-034-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

#### Final Comments

Senator Mario Guerrero announced that the GE Committee plans to offer a workshop on new GE course proposals for the upcoming academic year. The workshop is intended to clarify expectations, outline the proposal process, and address questions that arose during the current cycle. The committee proposes holding the workshop in late April or early May, prior to the start of summer. Senator Guerrero invited interested faculty to contact him directly with questions or concerns. Chair Hanink expressed support for the initiative.

#### 5) Old Business

There was no business.

#### 6) New Business

#### **Policy 1212 Correction**

The Executive Committee was informed of the minor correction to Policy 1212 of which the page requirement was reduced from 50 to 25 pages.

#### **Tentative Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026**

There was no discussion.

Senator Quinn motioned to approve the senate meeting agenda. Senator Edens seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed.

M/s/p to approve the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for April 15, 2026.

## 7) Discussion

### **Desireé Reneé Martinez, Director Tribal Relations and NAGPRA/CalNAGPRA NAGPRA Update**

#### **Purpose of Presentation**

- Director Martinez requested guidance and advice on how to effectively implement the CSU NAGPRA Policy at the campus level while balancing legal compliance and academic pedagogy.

#### **Overview of Legal Framework**

- **NAGPRA and CalNAGPRA** are federal and state laws requiring:
  - Repatriation of Native American human remains and cultural items.
  - Tribal consultation regarding land disturbance, sacred sites, and cultural sites.
- California environmental laws reinforce protections for sites significant to California Indian tribes.

#### **Policy Background and Guiding Principles**

- Extensive consultation with California tribes informed policy development.
- Tribes emphasized preventing the creation of *new* collections that would generate future repatriation obligations.
- Key guiding principles include:
  - Respect for tribal sovereignty.
  - Ongoing consultation and relationship-building with tribes.
  - Commitment to repatriation, protection of remains and cultural items.
  - Transparency and accountability in compliance efforts.

#### **Impact on Academic Programs and Field-Based Courses**

- CSU NAGPRA Policy (effective July 1) includes requirements for:
  - Field schools and courses involving ground disturbance (e.g., digging, staking, collecting samples).
  - Tribal consultation and records searches prior to such activities.
- A recent geology course case highlighted implementation challenges:

- Ground-disturbing activities triggered additional federal tribal consultation requirements when conducted on public land (Bureau of Land Management).
  - Resulted in delays and cancellation of certain hands-on activities, though non-disturbing field work continued.
- Concern expressed about unintentionally limiting experiential learning opportunities for students.

### **Operational Challenges Identified**

- Tribal governments face high consultation volumes, causing significant delays.
- Lead time of **3–6 months or more** may be required for compliance.
- Costs (e.g., ~\$500 per records search) and staffing limitations create further strain.
- Only qualified archaeologists can access certain confidential site records, limiting scalability.
- CSU system-wide solutions are under discussion but not imminent.

### **Potential Solutions Discussed**

- Exploration of **pre-cleared field sites** (e.g., “green/red map” concept) to streamline faculty planning.
- Coordination with nearby CSU campuses to share cleared locations and best practices.
- Use of California Historical Information System (CHRIS) data, with campus-level filtering for faculty.
- Development of campus databases identifying courses with field components and associated locations.
- Outreach strategies:
  - Presentations at department chair, college, and dean meetings.
  - Use of University Chairs Committee and college senators for information dissemination.
  - Combination of targeted emails and face-to-face “roadshow” presentations to increase faculty awareness.

### **Statewide Coordination**

- Statewide Senate (via Senator Faye L. Wachs) expressed interest in:
  - Developing a resolution to seek more system-level support and resources.
  - Exploring centralized databases and shared clearances to avoid duplication of effort.
  - Advocating for increased staffing and expertise (e.g., archaeologist positions) at the Chancellor’s Office.
- Campus recognized statewide praise for being proactive in policy implementation.

### **Next Steps / Outcomes**

- Continued collaboration with Academic Affairs to identify affected courses.

- Further exploration of pre-cleared field sites with BLM and Office of Historic Preservation.
- Follow-up discussions with statewide Senate and Chancellor's Office.
- Director Martinez to return for a future full Senate forum (rescheduled due to travel).

Adjourned @ 5:07 PM