

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

APPROVED Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting, March 7, 2017

Senators Present:

Elizabeth Bergman, Joseph Brandao, Shannon Coskran, John Eros, Karina Garbesi, Joanna Giron, Kim Geron, Susan Gubernat, Nina Haft, Michael Hedrick, Erik Helgren, Thomas Hird, Murray Horne, Edward Inch, Linda Ivey, Yi Karnes, Mark Karplus, Jaiman Khaira, Dawna Komorosky, Robert Loveland, Nancy Mangold, Kassandra Mariscal, James Mitchell, Matthew Moore, Christopher Moreman, James Murray, Jeffrey Newcomb, Sharon Radcliff, Pradeep Ramanathan, Stephanie Seitz, Jason Smith, Sara Smith, James Tandon, Mitch Watnik

Guests Present:

Nick Baham, Diana Balgas, Melissa Cervantes, Debbie Chaw, Kristopher Disharoon, Lindsay McCrea, Mark Robinson, Sophie Rollins, Angela Schneider, Donna Wiley

Senators Absent:

Stephen Andrews, Gilberto Arriaza, Steven Borish, Paul Carpenter, Denise Fleming, Amy Furniss, Chandra Ganesh, Jennie Guzman, George Hanna, Margaret Harris, Yi He, Sukari Ivester, Kevin Kaatz, Ehsan Kamalinejad, Sherman Lewis, Leroy Morishita, Jenny O, Gretchen Reevy, Rachael Stryker, Andrew Wong, Meiling Wu

1. Approval of the agenda

Murray/Newcomb – Chair Karplus proposes two changes to the agenda: 1) Postpone item 4 d) because it parallels CIC document not yet on the agenda; ideally they will come to Senate Floor together. 2) Assign a time certain of 3pm for item 5a) 16-17 COBRA so that VP Debbie Chaw may participate in discussion. Agenda passed unanimously with these amendments.

2. Approval of the [2/7/17](#) minutes

Helgren/Moreman – no discussion; passed with three abstentions

3. **Reports:**

a. Report of the Chair

MKarplus ceded his time to Diana Balgas (Student Affairs) and Melissa Cervantes (GANAS) to report on recent campus efforts to help our undocumented students. Balgas has been appointed to serve as a liaison between students and involved faculty, staff and administration. She reports receiving a great number of inquiries about what is happening on our campus. We do not have a physical space for these students, so she is working with University Communications to create a virtual space with support, information and resources on our website for undocumented students to see. This space is also for finding allies and for information on ally training. CSUEB has developed symbols for allies to self-identify. Undocumented@csueastbay.edu. Balgas reports that as of Fall 2016, we have 238 self-identified undocumented students. According to the Chancellors' Office new data methodology, our undocumented students are 88% Latino; 10% Asian; 2% other. Since Fall 2012, our numbers have steadily grown from 33 to 238. Balgas' focus is to get a better understanding of their needs. Educators' are also teaming up to do this. She is looking to form an undocumented students' Task Force with students, faculty, staff and administrators which will coordinate with an Action Team. We have created an UndocuEducators' Listserv. It is an open listerv that anyone may join.

Melissa Cervantes reported that CSUEB has presented UndocuAlly trainings for over 200 people at the Hayward and Concord campuses, including classroom presentations. 153 attendees have committed to be Allies. If you want to be an ally, you will receive a placard to put on your office door/wall. The butterfly symbolizes migration. They also do the training for students, and offer a button to help students see and find safe people to whom they may self-identify and to resources and information. Look for this logo if you seek a safe space or support. Diana Balgas will also be working on a video introducing faculty and staff who will speak about why they became Allies. This is to open discussion of this more broadly on our campus.

GANAS received a Presidents' Council Grant for underserved communities to fund an Undocumented Students Resources Summit on May 7th. It has been scheduled as a weekend event so it would be accessible to the larger Hayward community. Some of what will take place here: keynote speaker, ally training and resource fair, among other things. We are partnering with local institutions (such as Berkeley City College and San Francisco City College) to offer Know Your Rights workshops. Email Diana Balgas if you are interested in getting involved.

Susan Gubernat asked about the recent letter (2/21/17) from the Chancellor's Office about calling Campus Safety if you are approached by ICE, and voiced concern about whether this felt like a viable option for vulnerable members of our campus community. Kim Geron and FDEC are getting involved, inviting Campus Police Chief Boykins to a meeting to discuss this very concern. It will also be discussed at the Board of Trustees Meeting. Some people are fearful of attending that meeting because of the heavy presence of police. Gubernat assured the meeting that this will be brought up at the Statewide Academic Senate Meeting soon, and that she is happy to bring any related concerns to the Chancellor. Balgas has already heard from faculty that students are planning to drop courses, and that Financial Aid applications are down more than 50%, even when students are eligible; DACA students are going back into the shadows because they are afraid of being on some kind of registry.

Chair Karplus thanked Balgas and Cervantes for their reports, and offered a standing invitation to return to do so again. He also showed a slide about What To Do if ICE Comes to Your Door, and he will share it with Senate.

b. Report of the President

President Morishita is away in Contra Costa County today, preparing for an Impaction Meeting at Diablo Valley College.

c. Report of the Provost

Provost Inch: On Monday I was at the Concord Campus Student Success Town Hall. Comments we get back are incredibly positive about the work we do. Students are asking for increased advising and support services; scheduling that allows them to take required courses in sequence; spread out offering courses for a degree. Our curriculum can seem overly complicated. Also, students report a very powerful connection with faculty! 2 more Town Halls: Thurs March 30 in Old UU Rm 311 and April 4 4-5:15 in NU Multipurpose Room. Goal is to identify how might we best deploy resources for increased student success endeavors. There are 3 large issues:

1) How do we create an environment where legislature is likely to give us funding for Student Success initiatives? This year, we were recommended for no additional resources – we need to demonstrate our effectiveness with current resources. 2) Broad recognition of our need to hire more tenure-track faculty for mentoring and advising. 3) Ensure that we provide enough courses that meet student demand in critical areas of curriculum to make timely progress toward a degree. College affordability remains an issue. Not just fees, but length of time to degree and student debt levels. Completion rates remain an issue. We must find structural and administrative ways to help students on a clear pathway.

Friday March 2nd I went to the Puente Breakfast where Diana Balgas gave an outstanding keynote speech. Student testimonials were powerful.

Saturday March 3rd was the first of 3 impactation hearings for our campus. Questions are around our identity as a university. If we impact and we also serve six counties, will we have the same kind of diversity? Many who attended the hearing appreciate the strengths of our diversity, and wanted to know why we are expanding our service area from two counties to six. Many of our sister campuses are struggling with reductions in budget while we anticipate steady funding.

On Sunday March 4th I attended a fundraiser for student scholarships and a performance of the musical Cabaret on our campus. It's a very dark play, really excellent and poignant. It strikes a chord because of the time we live in and how not to be complicit or quiet.

QUESTIONS: Mitch Watnik: What is the status of scheduling courses for Semester Conversion. Drafts of this have already been proposed, yet my understanding from CSCI is that schedule won't be asked for until next year. Can you share details?

Inch: Original plan was to ask chairs to develop for Fall 2018 a final schedule after input from Deans. I was hesitant. After some consideration, I decided it would be more efficient to mock up a schedule without identifying the courses, and then plug in actual courses within these parameters so chairs won't spend so much time and effort on unnecessary revisions. Watnik: Do you mean TTH vs MWF, and proportions that a department might offer? Or should we expect a list of rules that asks us to offer certain numbers of each? Inch: We will discuss in ExCom about how to roll that out. We also need to look at density during prime time and what is offered outside of prime time. A decent mock up ahead of time with feedback from ExCom will streamline this process. The schedule is tight!

- d. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators - No report.
- e. Report of Student Government – No report.
- f. Report of Semester Conversion - Michael Hedrick reported that the Semester Conversion Subcommittee has its last meeting of the quarter in UU 102 12-2pm this Friday 3/10 At that time, we will discuss and update the structure of the subcommittees going forward from this first 2 years. This is an open meeting and feedback is welcome.
- g. Report of the CFA
Nicholas Baham: We are supporting our staff in their contract negotiations, just as they supported us during bargaining. On March 22nd, Students for Quality Education is going to the Board of Trustees Meeting in Long Beach. They could use help from our faculty - if you can drive, please let them know. On March 23rd, from 2-4pm in Sacramento, we have put together a formal hearing at Assembly to be led by Shirley Weber, calling the CSU with questions on where they are on the Ethnic Studies Task Force. We'll be videotaping it. We'll be asking for an extension on the moratorium and using a score card on the CSU since the Task Force report came out. Chancellor White did not really respond to the call from the Task Force to increase hiring and also the diversity of hiring in Ethnic Studies. Finally, our Annual Lobby Days are in Sacramento on April 4th and 5th to

speak with Assembly people. Please join us.

4. Action Items:

- a. [16-17 CIC 6](#): Online and Hybrid Instruction (*referred to CIC by Senate on 11/29/16; second reading*)

i. [16-17 CIC 6 revised](#)

This document is now posted as a revised document. Watnik/Mitchell moved to substitute this document. No discussion on substitution. Passed with one abstention.

2nd Reading of CIC-6 revised.

CMoreman: References to Curriculog throughout the new version made it seem like we are tied to this system. Inconsistent use of “currently” implies a possible change of the system, or then why do we need to reference it by product name? Garbesi: Agreed. Policy should not refer to specific software.

Watnik: We can edit the document to read “the online curricular management system”.

Watnik/Mitchell move to make these amendments, which passed unanimously with no discussion.

Discussion of main motion: JMurray suggested improvements to formatting around the appendix, consolidating pages.

Watnik: In article 4, section d 3) reads “becomes effective upon signature of the Dean of the College;” but this does not become effective until APGS implements it. Associate VP wanted it to read “and approval of APGS” Watnik/Garbesi – Amended motion to read “Dean of the College and with approval of APGS.” Amendment passes unanimously.

- ii. No further discussion. [16-17 CIC 6 revised](#) passed as amended, with an abstention.

- b. [16-17 FAC 3](#): Quarter to Semester updates for Interpretation of Rights of Faculty with FERP and PRTB Assignments to Participate in Elections and to Serve on Committees (*first reading*)

Murray/Hird – No discussion. Will return in first meeting in Spring 2017.

- c. [16-17 FAC 4](#): Changes to policies and form for Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students (*first reading*) Murray/Komorosky.

Discussion: Murray/Hird move a waiver of the first reading. Murray: This is so we can keep to the schedule that we approved last year; we did not anticipate the cancellation of the last Senate meeting. This will leave adequate time (five weeks) for faculty to apply for this program.

No discussion. Amendment to waive first reading passes unanimously.

Hedrick: In Section 3 b), the strikethrough should have continued through the word “form”; under 4 e) in red, appellant or applicant? Murray: It could be either one. Karplus: leave it same. Geron: 3 f) ‘expected amount of funds’ how far into the future are we projecting? Is that a guarantee? Karplus: It is tied to the CBA in Article 20. The allotment statewide results in this funding on our campus and remains this way until the contract is re-bargained. Moreman: Is formation of the subcommittee for increased efficiency? Murray: This takes the discussion out of a larger committee, which is more efficient. It is a bit of a workload issue, and more confusing when there are 10 independent decisions on these applicants, knowing it will come back to FAC. No further questions. Karplus: I trust this will get out to faculty. We will work with Academic Affairs, Newsletter and Senate lists, Regfac lists, etc., and be sure to circulate it to temporary faculty as well. Thank you to Jim Murray and FAC for fine-tuning this process and document. Passes unanimously.

- d. [16-17 CAPR 6](#): Request for discontinuance of six Kinesiology options (*first reading*)

Postponed during approval of agenda.

- e. [16-17 CAPR 8](#): Request for the discontinuance of the MA program in Sociology (*first reading*)
Geron/Smith – Discussion: Murray: If reason is that we have no faculty to handle it, are other universities picking this program up, or is it an unpopular degree? Would allocating more faculty result in greater demand? Motion will return in Spring 2017.
- f. [16-17 CIC 56](#): Graduation Filing Policy (*first reading*)
Watnik/Mitchell – no discussion. Will return in Spring 2017.
- g. [16-17 CIC 58](#): Prerequisite Enforcement for Second-Tier Writing (*first reading*)
Watnik/Newcomb – Murray: How does disenrollment appear to a student on the other end, do they know that it is because they did not have the prerequisite? Are they actively contacted, or do they just find out when they log in? Watnik: I don't know the specifics. Implications of how this is implemented are being discussed. Issue here is that English and Marketing students are signing up for Second-Tier Writing Courses without getting a high enough grade to be eligible. A student should know (either hasn't taken WST or hasn't gotten a score of 7). We don't want to lock students out who are appropriately eligible. Donna Wiley: Hopefully all prerequisites will be enforced for all students by that time, and this point will be moot. Watnik: In Fall 2018, a policy becomes effective that instructors of these courses will be given a list of students who do not have the appropriate prerequisites; instructors will be able to dis-enroll those who are not eligible. If the faculty wishes to have actual enforcement where student does not get a seat in the first place, this would be a new policy that Senate would need to pass. CIC has not considered this yet. Senate could charge me as CIC Chair to have it considered by CIC. Will return in Spring.
- h. [16-17 CAPR 7](#): Suggested changes to submission timelines in the Academic Program Review Procedures document (*first reading*)
Smith/Geron – No Discussion. Will return in Spring 2017.
- i. [16-17 FAC 5](#): Appointment and Review of Department Chairs Policy and Procedures with Quarter to Semester changes (*first reading*)
Murray/Geron – Geron: Is anything proposed for change here besides standard Q2S language? Karplus: one item here about not simply substituting semester for quarter No further discussion. Will return in Spring 2017.
- j. [16-17 FAC 6](#): Evaluation of Tenured Faculty policy with Quarter to Semester changes (*first reading*)
Murray/Geron – No discussion. Will return in Spring 2017.
- k. [16-17 CIC 66](#): Prefix Request for Liberal Studies (*first reading*)
Mitchell/Watnik – No discussion. Will return in Spring 2017.
- l. [16-17 CIC 67](#): Registration Order for Pioneers for Change (*first reading*)
Watnik/Mitchell – Karplus: Kristopher Disharoon shared information at a previous ExCom meeting when we considered other registration orders. Watnik: The previous Senate registration document requested priority registration, which is a step higher than for ASI and SCAA Supplemental Instructors. Pioneers for Change is not getting as high a level of preference, but ultimately requesting early registration instead. This is a day or two later than priority. No further discussion. Will return in Spring 2017.

5. Information Items:

- a. [16-17 COBRA 1](#): Summary of the 2016-17 CSUEB Budget Highlights TIME CERTAIN
Mangold/Newcomb – Karplus: I appreciate the manner in which COBRA and Professor Mangold and Admin and Finance has made this information available. Garbesi: Why does the Office of the President budget amount decrease so drastically? Mangold: In 2016-17, the IT Budget was moved out of this line; if you add them

together, it is comparable. Admin/Finance VP Chaw: Nancy is correct. One reason we show the split is because IT is moving back into Admin and Finance, and those dollars will shift to our unit. So we chose to show it separately at this time. Also because we recently advertised our Chief Information Officer position as reporting to me. Garbesi: Why does the compensation line increase from 1.2 to 4.5. VP Chaw: This compensation line is for all divisions. The dollars have since moved into different divisions. Garbesi: Is it correct to clarify that the change reflects an increase in percentage, not amount? Mangold: Compensation reflects the increases, not the salaries themselves therefore, only reflects the delta (amount of change.) Karplus: I have observed that the percentage of increases in Academic Affairs seemed to generate a rather low number, almost down to 30% of the total budget. I was informed it would be higher if we included benefits. But even with that, it strikes me as a number that could or should be larger. Garbesi: When Karplus brought this up at ExCom, it seemed difficult to assess what this really looked like relative to a number let's say 10 years earlier because of salary allocations in different places. What is the total share, up or down, in Academic Affairs? VP Chaw: I don't have an answer right now, but I can look at it. Garbesi: Percentages at five and ten years prior would be interesting data points for comparison. Karplus: Perhaps COBRA could address this. Mangold: COBRA will be working on the overall budget in Spring. Our proportion spent on Academic Affairs is lower than other CSUs, but this could be because of how it is divided in administrative units. It is hard to compare with other CSUs. Karplus: I appreciate that up front. Even if it is difficult to sort, some sort of assessment would be welcome when bringing the Academic Affairs budget forward. Watnik: Thank you Nancy (Mangold) and Debbie (Chaw) for bringing this forward. Senators may not recall before Nancy became chair of COBRA, we did not have this level of information. The fact that COBRA is bringing this to us, and that the VP of Finance is sharing so openly with faculty allows us now to have the insights and questions that we are asking. Garbesi: I suggest we look at total faculty compensation vs. total university compensation. This will allow us to see some kind of a trend.

Passes unanimously.

- b. [16-17 COBRA 2](#): Report on the CSUEB Classroom Renovation Feedback Survey
- c. [16-17 COBRA 3](#): Update on Classroom Upgrade Project and Recommendations on Prioritization of Classrooms for Summer 2017
 - i. Recommendation on Classroom Renovation ([email](#) from Chair Karplus to President Morishita)

Karplus: A motion would be in order to accept all 3 items together as information items.

Mitchell/Garbesi – Moreman: Regarding the conclusion from COBRA 2 on page 3; my reading is that there are serious concerns being raised here. Karplus: These two documents came to ExCom and Senate from COBRA. The explanation for the email is consistent with COBRA 3, (page 3). Consultation with ExCom captures the same gist that when the COBRA Chair gave us a status update on the classroom project, ExCom felt we needed to address the President with these concerns. This may clarify the timeline of these documents. Mangold: When I presented the COBRA recommendations on Summer 2017 classroom renovations to ExCom, my presentation did not include the full survey results from the renovated classrooms. Only the full Senate is seeing this full text now. Smith: As Chris (Moreman) says, the survey doesn't seem to lean strongly either way. Did ExCom have comparative estimates to know this is too much money to spend? Without other estimates, what does it cost to renovate other classrooms? Is this a lot, or competitive? Garbesi: Our reaction was to the overall price per classroom, and also why necessarily these classrooms? There didn't seem to be any kind of prioritization process from Academic Affairs, and even if you just look (page 14) at one classroom in Meiklejohn Hall, it cost over \$700K. Our concern was that the return might not be large enough for the dollars spent, so we wanted more of a justification of the costs. Watnik: 1) if we are going to accept your email as info, it should be documented at BC2; 2) Is ExCom duplicating efforts of a standing committee of the Senate? COBRA must be also have considered these questions, and deliberated on them before presenting their recommendations. But instead of criticizing the committee's document, perhaps ExCom should submit another. Gubernat: Our concerns are legitimated by what such a project would cost, but we are concerned perhaps that we don't have enough information to approve these recommendations. It seems as though Academic Affairs wasn't driving these renovations based on the needs of students and faculty, and students were not involved in determining the initial spending of this money. At this point we felt that

Facilities was driving these decisions about which classrooms would be renovated, and about how much money should be spent. We think these decisions should be determined through Academic Affairs. We were not simply appalled by the costs, but we were also concerned that Academic Affairs should be driving this spending. Mitchell: There was in fact a one week window early last winter when faculty had input on the actual expenditures. I commend COBRA on this work. I also read some of the comments, but there are decisions are being made and I wonder if we are buying a bunch of white elephants. Newcomb: I second all of that. Another concern is the magnitude of the remodeling, and the amount being spent on just a few classrooms, and how this classroom renovation plan would roll out in the future. ExCom members and other instructors using these classrooms indicate that there is much left wanting – serious problems from a functional point of view – even after expensive renovations. And there are other subsidiary concerns. Moreman: The conclusion of the survey in COBRA 2 says it is neither overwhelmingly positive or negative. We need to look at these surveys in qualitative ways; if you read the comments, they reveal many substantial problems with the technology design. The survey questions don't even get to the heart of the problems with classroom equipment that did not even work, or did not get installed on time. Garbesi: I am glad to have seen a survey, but when I look at those numbers, the prices aren't necessarily justified. If we get prices like that, we do need to know just what adds up to \$700K and what is the value on the return? We are poor. We need to push back more to know whether these monies are being spent appropriately. I want to see price justification, not just total dollar amounts from contractors. Karplus: Beyond how the discussion is captured in minutes, perhaps Senate could give further direction to this topic. Watnik: I asked the President about this a few meetings ago, because the janitors weren't maintaining these rooms, which is needed to make these upgrades useful. We need to look at our maintenance of these spaces. COBRA might also come up with a budget for that. Mangold: We showed Facilities our survey results and relayed all the concerns. Their next step is to address all the concerns in the survey. They say custodians are not responsible for cleaning the boards, for example. Gubernat: I want to return to the most important aspect of this email, which is that Academic Affairs rather than Facilities should be driving the plan. \$2M looks like a lot, but it's not much buying power. Students and faculty should be prioritizing how it is spent. None of us felt like that happened. ExCom thought, and Provost Inch joined us in this sentiment, that Academic Affairs should drive these decisions. Smith: I don't understand the process. ExCom made a recommendation, but what happens now? Karplus: The email was sent because it was felt time sensitive. Smith: These process issues remain. We don't have to get into the weeds if we have standing committees. Watnik: [13-14 COBRA 4](#), was passed by Senate and approved by the President. Such consultation would be under the purview of COBRA to make sure that the appropriate faculty are consulted. I think ExCom should be consulting with COBRA appropriately in this issue, and let them represent us. Garbesi: I agree completely with what Mark said: there was a sense of urgency. \$2M could be spent without the critical information that we want. ExCom responded appropriately so more information could be brought to light. Moreman: Why is this an Information Item then, instead of an Action Item? Mangold: COBRA's role is really consultation. Facilities consults COBRA in their renovation. When I first became COBRA Chair, administration brought all their Facilities projects to us to get faculty input. This is an Information Item based on what Facilities needs, but it is not up to us. The President's cabinet determines how and where to spend this money. Additionally, we may be facing a budget deficit, and there is a possibility there won't be any renovation in summer 2017. Another possibility is they will go forward with a smaller renovation program. Karplus: I wish to respond to the question about why this is an Information item. It is not a brand new issue coming to us this year. There was considerable discussion and criticism last year when the first wave of renovations began. Nancy was kind enough to offer an update to ExCom in light of that. As things stand now, with the structure we have, including the document Mitch (Watnik) cited, in the future it will be 2 years of concerns expressed. It's possible that if faculty wanted to do so, this could be reformatted as an Action Item. Passed as an Information Item, with absentions.

Mitchell/Watnik moved to accept remaining documents as Information Items. No discussion. Passed unanimously.

- d. [16-17 CIC 55](#): Revision request for B.A. Environmental Studies
- e. [16-17 CIC 59](#): Revision request for B.A. History
- f. [16-17 CIC 60](#): Revision request for Certificate in Public History
- g. [16-17 CIC 61](#): Revision request for B.S. in Psychology
- h. [16-17 CIC 63](#): Revision request for B.A. Ethnic Studies
- i. [16-17 CIC 64](#): Revision request for Minors in Ethnic Studies

All items accepted as Information Items.

6. Adjournment

Moremen/Newcomb – Passes unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 3:45pm.