

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

APPROVED Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting, October 25, 2016

Senators Present:

Elizabeth Bergman, Steven Borish, Paul Carpenter, John Eros, Denise Fleming, Chandra Ganesh, Kim Geron, Nina Haft, Margaret Harris, Michael Hedrick, Erik Helgren, Thomas Hird, Murray Horne, Edward Inch, Sukari Ivester, Linda Ivey, Pat Jennings, Kevin Kaatz, Ehsan Kamalinejad, Mark Karplus, Dawna Komorosky, Sherman Lewis, Robert Loveland, Nancy Mangold, Christopher Moreman, James Murray, Jeffrey Newcomb, Sharon Radcliff, Gretchen Reevy, Omri Shimron, Jason Smith, Sara Smith, James Tandon, Mitch Watnik, Meiling Wu

Guests Present:

Nick Baham, Mark Chan, Dennis Chester, Linda Dobb, Lori Erdman, David Lopez, Lindsay McCrea, Glen Perry, Mark Robinson, Sophie Rollins, Maureen Scharberg, Angela Schneider, Lucero Wallace, Donna Wiley, Julie Wong

Senators Absent:

Stephen Andrews, Gilberto Arriaza, Ayona Chatterjee, Shannon Coskran, Eric Fricke (*Fall sabbatical*), Karina Garbesi, Susan Gubernat (*Fall sabbatical*), Jennie Guzman, George Hanna, Yi He, Yi Karnes, Robert Lin, James Mitchell, Matthew Moore, Leroy Morishita, Jenny O, Pradeep Ramanathan, Rachael Stryker, Steve Ugbah, Andrew Wong

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m.

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Ivey/Moreman) to approve the agenda, as clarified to allow the first reading of item 6 (time modules) to take place earlier than its 3:15 time certain in the event all other agenda items are completed.

Since this is the first meeting where items appear on the consent calendar, Chair Karplus explained consent calendar purpose and procedures.

2. Approval of the 10/4/16 minutes

M/S/P (Murray/Smith) to approve

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

- Chair Karplus attended the CSU Senate Chairs meeting in Long Beach, convened by ASCSU Chair Miller. Several items were discussed, including Academic Freedom, which has been a difficult issue. In order to meet with ASCSU and CFA, the CSU has

asked CFA to give up its bargaining rights on the issue. Also discussed was the proposal to increase tuition and the students' (CSSA) response. ASCSU will have the item on the November Plenary.

- Karplus reported that ITAC is looking at a proposed computer refresh policy; there is no current Senate or administrative policy on refreshing faculty and staff computers. Although ITAC is not required to bring any forthcoming policy to the Senate, Karplus stated that he will do so as an information item for Senators. The Chair announced that the next ITAC meeting will be on Monday; anyone who wishes to attend this or any other governance meeting, is free to do so. Also, feedback may be forwarded to Eric Neumann (Director, Academic Technology), Andrew Carlos (16-17 ITAC Chair), or Chair Karplus.
- Vice Chair Karina Garbesi's father passed away; ExCom sent flowers
- President Morishita is out of town and unavailable to attend today's meeting

M/S/P (Lewis/Jennings) to send Garbesi a condolence card on behalf of the Senate

B. Report of the President

No report; out of town

C. Report of the Provost

Provost Inch reported that our enrollment target is 13,371. At present, census count is 13,903; since enrollment tends to be higher in the fall, this number allows for some expected drop off. We have seen a large increase in transfer students and about 50 fewer first-time freshmen. The average load for students is 13.3 units.

The organization Affordable Colleges Online ranked CSUEB the best online college in California for 2016-2017. Chico ranked #3 and UC Berkeley ranked #5.

The Chancellor's Office (CO) allocated CSUEB \$112,373 for course redesign, which is currently funding 35 faculty grants.

There will be 30 new faculty hires for next year; the Provost and deans are working to allocate hires.

Provost Inch attended Alumni Weekend events and was impressed by the common thread of alumni gratitude to faculty for providing them with opportunities to excel as students. Alumni connections with faculty members was in great evidence. One of the distinguished alumni award recipients, Kelly Bowers (Superintendent, Livermore Joint Union School District), spoke of how each K-12 grade is a one-time opportunity. Inch stated that we do similar work.

Inch reported that approximately 20% of our students live with food insecurity. CSUEB's Food Pantry and Project HOPE will provide assistance to these students and the 10% home insecurity.

The CO also provided funding to meet graduation targets set under the Graduation Initiative. CSUEB goals to increase graduation rates by 2025 may be found at

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/about/institutional-effectiveness/ssac/ssac-ees/ssac-gradinitiative/files/csu-eb-gradinit-2025.pdf>

Inch added that the initiative helps us focus on what our efforts should be. For example, approximately 4,000 seniors have yet to take the Graduate Writing Exam; this can delay their graduation. To address achievement gaps, we will target supplemental advising and tutoring; this should allow all students to have an equal chance to advance.

The initiative targets three focus areas: Academic Innovation, (e.g., faculty development to better address the achievement gap, strategic curriculum design), Focused Student Support (e.g., resources to target the high D/F/W rates, supplemental instruction), and Data (e.g., how to find and use data and predictive analytics to target student needs, allocate resources).

Provost stated that members have been appointed to the Workload Committee and the first meeting should take place in about a week.

Finally, Provost Inch stated that the semester schedule is on today's Senate agenda. He encouraged senators to carefully consider factors (e.g., a five-day schedule, University Hour) that may affect students' quality of life and path to degree.

D. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

No report; November Plenary is next week

E. Report of Student Government

No report

F. Report of Semester Conversion

Professor Hedrick reported that the Semester Conversion Planning Committee held its first meeting on October 7. The main topic of discussion was the deadlines for GE and Overlay course proposals. The new deadlines are 12/2/16 for approval by department and 2/10/16 for approval by the college curricular committee. This timing will allow for catalog adjustments and for students' individualized advisement plans.

Hedrick stated that representatives are still needed from CLASS and CEAS for the faculty subcommittee; also, a faculty representative is needed for the student advising subcommittee.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 4.

G. Report of the CFA 4

CSUEB CFA President Baham encouraged all to support Prop 55; he stated that members contributed more than 50 hours of phone banking to the effort. If 55 passes, the ensuing K-14 funding should leave general funds available for allocation to the CSU.

Baham reported on misinformation surrounding the proposed \$270 tuition increase. Students have heard that the increase is due to faculty salary increases.

Finally, Baham encouraged all to complete the bargaining survey, available at <http://www.calfac.org/item/2016-cfa-bargaining-survey>

4. Information Items

- A. 15-16 FAC 9: Response to Executive Committee referral regarding problems with usability and function of Faculty Search online application process

M/S/P (Murry/Wu) to accept

Next, Nine CIC revision request information items (B-J below) were bundled and accepted as a group:

M/S/P (Watnik/Newcomb) to accept 15-16 CIC 69 through 15-16 CIC 77 as a group

- B. 15-16 CIC 69: Revision request for Psychology B.A.
- C. 15-16 CIC 70: Revision request for B.S. Business Administration
- D. 15-16 CIC 71: Revision request for B.S. Health Sciences
- E. 15-16 CIC 72: Revision request for B.S. Nursing
- F. 15-16 CIC 73: Revision request for Statistics M.S.
- G. 15-16 CIC 74: Revision request for Biostatistics M.S.
- H. 15-16 CIC 75: Revision request for Kinesiology M.S.
- I. 15-16 CIC 76: Revision request for M.S. Engineering Management
- J. 15-16 CIC 77: Revision request for M.S. Construction Management

- K. 16-17 BEC 4: 2016-2017 Administrative Review Schedule

M/S/P (Fleming/Geron) to postpone until next Senate meeting

The item was postponed until the next Senate meeting in light of missing information or questions about the Administrative Review Schedule: Dean Scharberg is not included on the review schedule, the Interim APGS has been in place longer than one year and should be reviewed, and what accounts for the differences in review schedules for the CLASS and CEAS Deans?

5. Consent Calendar

- A. 16-17 CIC 2: Honors Policy for Semesters
- B. 16-17 CIC 3: Policy on Changes to a Student's Historical Record
- C. 16-17 CIC 4: Policy on Withdrawals
- D. 16-17 CIC 5: Graduate Academic Probation and Disqualification
- E. 16-17 CIC 6: Online and Hybrid Instruction
- F. 16-17 CIC 7: Registration Order

6. Action Item

A. 16-17 BEC 6: Report of the Time Modules Task Force (3:15 pm time certain)

M/S/ (Hedrick/Reevy) for the Senate to make a final recommendation to the President on Time Modules

Professor Watnik chaired the Time Modules Task Force. The Senate is being asked to recommend one of three proposals advanced by the task force. Two of the proposals include a "University Hour" (noon or 1:45-2:45). All three proposals allow for 3- or 4-unit classes, with some proposals having specific times under which a 3- or 4-unit course could be offered. In addition, the length of a class session could be either 1 hour 40 minutes (with no break) or 1 hour 50 minutes (with a 10-minute break).

Lucero Wallace presented an overview of the modules and the process used to analyze each of them. Factors in running module models include:

- Prime Time: the period of highest class usage, with analysis limited to that period. For purposes of running the models, 9am to 2 pm was considered prime time
- Evening classes not considered as they will not be challenging to schedule
- Inclusion or no inclusion of a University Hour (see above). During the discussion, it was noted that labs could be scheduled during a University Hour.
- None of the models addresses FTES or WTU
- Models run using lecture, seminar, and discussion (i.e., no activities, labs)
- Assumption of 92 available rooms
- No assumption of enrollment caps or classroom caps
- Assumption that the number of class sections needed will be 291 for MWF and 235 for TR
- 25% of the classes are 4-units

Concerns and questions centered around:

- How each model would accommodate labs
- were discussed in terms of their impact on flexibility
- Role of the University hour on students' ability to attend and get classes;
- Do we know what the preferences are for students who are working or may be attending under other constraints?
- How accurate are the models that were run? Margin of error that might not be seen until implementation?
- Are there other universities with comparable schedules?
- Are there any 50-minute time slots? Is it worth it for students to attend a course that lasts only 50 minutes?
- What about 2-day per week classes on MW?
- How might Fridays and Saturdays be used?
- How many upper division and graduate courses fall outside of prime time?

Additional information provided:

- COBRA Chair Mangold stated that class size was not taken into account during the process. Less than 2% of classes enroll 100 or more students. The consistent meeting pattern allows for more common class sizes of 60-75 students.
- Interim APGS Wiley stated that about 23% of undergraduate course proposals are for 4-unit classes.

7. Adjournment

M/S/P (Ivey/Geron) to adjourn at 4:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Denise Fleming, Secretary