CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

AMENDED Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, February 26, 2019

Members Present: Andrew Carlos, Paul Carpenter, Karina Garbesi, Julie Glass, Edward Inch, Mark Karplus, Michael Lee, Jeff Newcomb, Ian Pollock, Stephanie Seitz, Jason Smith, Meiling Wu

Guests: Jake Hornsby, Mark Robinson, Maureen Scharberg, Angela Schneider, Mitch Watnik, Shirley Yap

Members Absent: Leroy Morishita

1) Approval of the agenda
   ● M/S: Glass/Carlos
   ● 7b strike “director”
   ● 7a - ii to b, iii to c, iv to d, b to e
   ● Motion to add 18-19 BEC 7 (handed out as hard copy) as business item 6f (Carlos/Newcomb)
      ○ Discussion about how pressing this is; is it customized for EB, or just Humboldt language (is customized)
      ○ /P 1 against, 1 abstention
   ● /P unanimous

2) Approval of 2/19/19 minutes
   ● M/S Garbesi/Smith
   ● Attach amendment line 111
   ● Add “begin the” after Excomm line 189
   ● Misspelling of Watnik line 106
   ● /P as amended unanimous

3) Reports:
   a) Report of the Chair
      ● Went to as many standing committee meetings as possible
      ○ went to FAC to help address Monday class issue
      ○ FAC chair discussion to amend bylaws to close loopholes and address eligibility issues
   b) Report of the President - no report; President is in Taipei
   c) Report of the Provost
      ● Colleges have done a good job with budgets; all coming in under budget
      ● Should be uptick in enrollment next year
      ● Would like to have conversation with COBRA to have transparent multi-year budgeting
● Should have last feedback report about pilot workload program by Friday, should have $1M allocated, goal is to provide research opportunities for probationary faculty
d) Report of the Statewide Academic Senators - no report
● Question about GE taskforce report discussions, resolution against passed at Stanislaus, Chair Lee will share information he is getting with Statewide Senators and eventually Excomm
● There will be a normal 2 reading process; will make a report at earliest at plenary in Nov.
● Discussion about whether Statewide will follow tenets document, test of whether campuses can do this together
● In the future should set aside time to discuss at Senate
● Already under discussion at GEOC
● Seems that substantive background information is missing from report
4) Appointments/Approvals:
a) Spring 2019 CEAS replacement for Talya Kemper on GEOC and CIC
  ● Linda Smetana, Educational Psych for GEOC
    ○ M/S Garbesi/Carpenter
    ○ /P 1 abstention
  ● Cathy Inouye, Kinesiology for CIC
    ○ M/S Garbesi/Carpenter
    ○ /P 1 abstention
b) Schedule for Spring 2019 Election 2 of 2: College, Lecturer, SSP, Emeriti and Staff election
  ● M/S Karplus/Smith
  ● /P unanimous
5) Information:
a) College Representative Distribution to the 2019-2020 University Tenure and Promotion Committee memo
  ● M/S Smith/Garbesi
  ● Discussion:
    ○ Clarification that intention is we accept and put as information item for Senate
    ○ Is there rule that there should be 5 members? Should be tied to actual number as opposed to percentage.
      ■ At FAC there was memo that proscribed five as membership model - is in RTP document
      ■ Not an issue of workload, but representation
      ■ Should there be membership from Library since it’s a college, would be discussion about changing constitution/bylaws and RTP document
      ■ Might be something wrong with numbers/representation given percentages
      ■ Historically membership has been based on majority gets two
    ○ Senate office will change CSI to CSCI in table
  ● /P unanimous
6) Business:
a) **18-19 FAC 8:** Proposed solution to Monday only courses in Fall 2018 having only 12 class meeting days
● M/S Garbesi/Wu

● Discussion:
  ○ Second paragraph of background - misspelled Watnik
  ○ Section D, should read “so that class meets until later at night”
  ○ Paragraph below A/B on 2nd page
    ■ Departments’ should be singular possessive (department’s)
  ○ Under Recommendation: FAC recommends that: 1
    ■ Should read “restore lost contact time” rather than 1/15th
  ○ Subsections of CFR are not referenced, questioning accuracy of statements
    ■ Will ask FAC chair to amend prior to Senate meeting to include citations
      of subsections (or explain on Senate floor)
  ○ Registrar’s office guest - discussion on feasibility of some recommendations -
    some recommendations giving responsibility to registrar are not things that
    registrar can do
    ■ Registrar does not have responsibility/purview to make changes to
      schedule
    ■ Room scheduling has to be taken into account
    ■ Staff of scheduling would make changes (contact department schedulers,
      then sent to room schedulers)
    ■ Language of Recommendation 3 - delete reference to registrar and
      include contact with schedulers
  ○ Classes that fall outside of regular time modules are scheduled last
  ○ What would be implication if no policy is passed?
    ■ No makeup for lost contact time unless unofficial changes are made at
      department/faculty level
    ■ Can’t guarantee contact hours
    ■ WASC would have to check via piecemeal process
    ■ APS would have to work with each department and would be time
      consuming
  ○ Number 4 - does that refer to option D
    ■ Could be amendment proposed on Senate floor
  ○ If no policy is passed, would potentially fall to APS and/or administration to make
    decision unilaterally
  ○ Did FAC refer to previous remedy
    ■ FAC had issues with it not working well at other campuses and may have
      impacts on lecturers
  ○ Is doing anything you want a better solution than an imperfect policy solution?
  ○ Point 5 cannot be done from the registrar
    ■ It’s up to the department to communicate with students; will only happen
      after enrollment; may cause some student consternation; will be
      inconsistent and confusing
      ● Would have to be done by department scheduler
      ● Feasible to appear to student at time of enrollment
      ● Language must be changed so that does not include registrar
FAC did not understand what could/could not be done by registrar

- Bulk of scheduling will change to W/F; chairs may decide not to schedule M classes
- Should recommendation 8 be the only solution?
- Can we use this opportunity to collect data on solutions and consequences for future
- Call the question - no objections
- /P 1 abstention

b) 18-19 CIC 14 & 18-19 CAPR 9: Religious Studies Minor
- M/S: Wu/Carlos
- /P unanimous

c) 18-19 CIC 15: Approval of SOC 330 to satisfy GE Area D4
d) 18-19 CIC 16: Approval of SOC 340 to satisfy GE Area D4
e) 18-19 CIC 17: Approval of SOC 360 to satisfy GE Area D4
- Bundling c-e
- M/S: Wu/Carlos
- Substitute Motion to put all 3 on consent calendar: Karplus/Wu
  - Make sure to remind body that they have the ability to pull it if controversial
- /P unanimous (substitute motion)
f) 18-19 BEC 7
- M/S Pollock/Newcomb
- Motion to postpone to next meeting: Smith/Garbesi
  - /P unanimous

7) Discussion:
   a) Ongoing Constitution/Bylaws review
      i) Procedures to determine criteria satisfaction to serve on Senate Committees
         - Proposal to put together checklists for every position for which there is an election/appointment (could be self check, followed by check by excomm prior to election/appointment)
         - Anything to create more clarity is important
         - Should be job of senate office to check eligibility to streamline process (verification process)
         - Excomm has responsibility to determine eligibility
         - Mechanic/logistic process to capture nuances in documents
         - Loopholes regarding, for example, term limits must be clarified prior to making checklists
         - Marketing issue - don’t want to discourage anyone from participating; shouldn’t be seen as “crack down” on rules, simply clarification
         - Simplicity and clarity is paramount
      b) Standing Rules Clarification
         - No discussion
      c) Documentation re: approval of University Requirements
         - Handout from Garbesi re: process for approving GE and overlays
Do we know of examples where faculty have felt constrained? Is this hypothetical problem?

These have been developed over a long time. Do we want to consider a change regarding the “teeth”, would that be a direction to CIC to review?

Assumed to be examples, so changing wording shouldn’t be a problem

Conflict between too prescriptive and then not prescriptive enough

Need conversation about what it means that outcomes be thoroughly incorporated into course
  - Resolve inconsistency between courses as approved and offered
  - Forms may be completed during planning stage of course, and might not reflect actuality of course, so appropriate words to use are “could” and “might” as opposed to directing
  - Should have review process to see extent of deviation between planned course and actual course offering (5 years)
  - ILO assessment may reflect learning from other classes, since data collected at institutional level. Could be assessed within the context of class taken.

As it stands, there are loopholes. Example - sustainability means a specific thing, shouldn’t stretch to use on class
  - Intention of overlays is to be broad - shouldn’t cause sustainability to be more narrow than others
  - Course must have some artifact through which students develop on outcome

Rollover to discussion at next meeting due to time certain

e) Excom review of Honors Program (3:30 PM time certain)

Dr. Yap presentation
  - Is job description accurate: would add to job description
    ▪ Showed marked up document of job description with proposed changes
      - Red: may not be appropriate under UHP director job
      - Purple: Should be changed/added
      - Director/Staff work ratio
  - Questions to Dr. Yap
    - Might add goals/priorities/vision for 2 year term
    - Should consider percentage of students from each major
    - Business processes issues - if they were resolved, how would that affect workload
      - Dr. Yap has been spending a lot of time automating processes, much of staff position work is now automated
        - Funds may be able to be redirected from staff position to other faculty who are now doing work to mentor students as goodwill
    - Is extra coursework in individual classes best model?
    - Excomm should meet with incoming director to continue conversation, and have conversation more frequently.
    - May be appropriate to send to CAPR for program review.
  - Will send out updated job description based on Dr. Yap’s suggestions

d) Possible Ad Hoc Committee on Housing
8) Academic Senate 3/5/19 draft agenda (3:50 PM time certain)

- M/S: Karplus/Garbesi

- Approved items will be added
  - Information item
  - Consent calendar
  - 18-19 FAC 8
  - Religious studies minor
  - To include election of DELO

- /P unanimous

Motion to extend 5 minutes Wu/Garbesi

/P

Meeting adjourned at 4:05