

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

APPROVED Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting, May 16, 2017

Senators Present:

Steven Borish, Paul Carpenter, John Eros, Amy Furniss, Karina Garbesi, Joanna Giron, Nina Haft, Margaret Harris, Michael Hedrick, Erik Helgren, Thomas Hird, Murray Horne, Edward Inch, Linda Ivey, Pat Jennings, Kevin Kaatz, Mark Karplus, Dawna Komorosky, Sherman Lewis, Robert Loveland, James Mitchell, Matthew Moore, Christopher Moreman, Leroy Morishita, James Murray, Jeffrey Newcomb, Sharon Radcliff, Pradeep Ramanathan, Gretchen Reeve, Jason Smith, Sara Smith, James Tandon, Lan Wang, Mitch Watnik, Andrew Wong, Meiling Wu

Guests Present:

Derek Aitken, Nick Baham, Jairo Barba, Jose Carlos, Linda Dobb, Erika Jimenez Hernandez, Silvina Ituarte, Xinjian Lu, Lindsay McCrea, Courtney Alicia Miles, Sarah Nielsen, Trina Ostrander, Mark Robinson, Sophie Rollins, Maureen Scharberg, Angela Schneider, Jeff Seitz, Carl Stempel, Donna Wiley

Senators Absent:

Stephen Andrews, Gilberto Arriaza, Elizabeth Bergman, Joseph Brandao, Shannon Coskran, Denise Fleming (*plenary*), Chandra Ganesh, Kim Geron, Susan Gubernat (*plenary*), Jennie Guzman, George Hanna, Yi He, Sukari Ivester, Ehsan Kamalinejad, Yi Karnes, Jaiman Khaira, Nancy Mangold, Cassandra Mariscal, Jenny O, Rachael Stryker

1. Approval of the agenda

Garbesi/Newcomb

Amendments:

Smith/Garbesi – Karplus requests addition of new Item #4 to add Election of a Staff Representative to Senate.

– passes unanimously.

Haft/Wu – move to change time certain for Ombuds to 3:25 and FWTF to 3:35 to allow for more discussion. Passes unanimously.

Helgren/Smith – move STEM to an Information Item, to 5o, to the end of the Information Items. No Discussion. Passes.

Agenda as amended passes.

2. Approval of the [5/2/17](#) minutes

Wu/Mitchell – No discussion. Passes with abstentions.

3. **Reports:**

- a. Report of the Chair – No report, recognizes Chair of FAC to make a report. JMurray: Phillips Outstanding Professor of the Year is Rita Liberti.
- b. Report of the President – Budget May revise this past week from Governor reduces the amount by \$4M to \$153M for CSU. Part of that money he took from UC and CSU was to increase CalGrants for students at private universities. Because our funding was not changed or augmented, the student tuition fee increase will remain intact. We are not expecting Trustees to rescind this decision.

There was a free speech issue at Fresno State, some of you may know. A group of people reserved space and said they would chalk on the sidewalk and a faculty member felt that it shouldn't be there, argued with them and erased it with his foot. He and the University are being sued for infringement of free speech rights. We too have areas that are designated for public posting, such as public bulletin boards. It is a strange gray area around free speech. Baham: with respect to free speech issue, SFSU had an issue of a group posting pictures of faculty as being anti-Semitic for supporting Palestinian cause. What would you advise in such an instance? Morishita – if it is posted in an area where we do not regularly have public postings, then call Campus Security to remove anything posted in places where not authorized. Baham: What if they post our pictures? Morishita: I don't know if that crosses the line, I will find out.

- c. Report of the Provost – I really appreciated the Honors Convocation on Saturday. We won the Hayward Energy award for the Solar Suitcase Project. Celebration of Teaching is coming next week. A2E2 is meeting soon, recommendations will be coming out. 1109 seniors are here with more than 200 units. We are encouraging them to graduate as soon as possible. We have 24 faculty hires, 3 pending, 3 tenure line searches rolling over. You will hear the report of workload committee today. They worked hard, talked to a lot of people, dealt with controversial discussions. We need to frame it so we help people with intensive research agenda to pursue it after Conversion. I was told we would be in a better place to inspire people. This is a recommendation, not a decision. I have received many emailed suggestions, and I will share them with the budget committee. Some people at ExCom got heated about implications. Budget, Deans, Senate – it will go through lots of iterations. I hope we approach this as a conversation. Baham – Regarding the East Bay 30 faculty, is there any firm answer that we can make happen for this particular group of faculty? Inch: As I said in November, there will be no adjustment to base pay, but I can do a case by case review of equity issues. Baham: Are we in agreement about the unique circumstances of this faculty, and their diversity? They negotiated their salaries before we got into negotiation of contract. This seems to be a one-time unique situation that this group faced. Inch: I do not have any indication they were promised something and not given it. If we do this, we create inversions. I am not willing to do this. They had until September to change their terms of employment. Baham: That is why we had two meet and confers with Linda Dobb, with many of the affected. If 7% wouldn't work, we could look at other options. Inch: I am not allowed to bargain directly regarding salary. Baham: What about SacState? Inch: I was there, it created inversions because it was done all across the board. Baham: is something besides 7% possible without inversions? Is this issue finished? Inch: I would discuss it if there are equity issues. Not all 30 cases have identified themselves as equity, but if they are, I will review them.
- d. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators – No report, both are in Long Beach for Plenary.
- e. Report of Student Government – Joanna Giron: Please sign a pledge to bring more positivity to campus. May is mental health awareness – random acts of kindness help. Wednesday is Commuter Day – Bkfst/Lunch/Dinner will be offered, and we will be tabling for the Hey, Be Nice! Campaign. Join us to hang out and eat. Shot of reality is an alcohol awareness program, we will be tabling for it on Wednesday. We are focusing on Alcohol safety with summer vacation coming. This past weekend, our incoming board had their retreat, I heard great things. The board was elected for next year. Our term ends this month. It was a pleasure to be here with all of you!
- f. Report of Semester Conversion – MHedrick: We have visitors coming next week from CSU LA and San Bernadino who are changing to semesters in 2020, but the main reason to attend is it to hear about LA's first year under Conversion. Biella Room, May 24th: 12:30 – 1:30pm open session; breakouts for faculty 1:30 – 3:30pm in Biella and for advisors in the Oakland Concord Room. Last week at the Steering Committee meeting we brainstormed questions and topics, and will send out a form for you to generate questions of your own. I will collate them to give our guests background to think about before they arrive. I think it will be a great afternoon for faculty and advisors both. Please tell your colleagues in your departments. Look for a campus wide announcement.
- g. Report of the CFA – Baham: I will start with students from SQE to voice their concerns about ICE and their presence on campus. Student:Border Patrol was on campus for the Academic Career Fair. We have a letter for President Morishita. We request that DACA or Dreamer students be notified when such persons will be on campus. Student: I felt uncomfortable and unwelcome when I encountered them after exiting class. We just need to know that they are coming to school. It is fine to give others that employment opportunity. Student: The lack of notification for students was a big problem, and as an ally, I felt it was in poor judgment. We don't

know the varying degrees of fear that people have. The mission is to be welcoming and inclusive. Student: Some students don't feel welcome or included. Please notify us through email or Bb, and tell us why they are on campus (ie. for a career fair, not for deporting campus members.)

Baham: Thanks for coming to Bargaining Roadshow and Range Elevation Workshops. We are still hoping our legislature will weigh in on the budget. CFA would like to put on record that we are concerned about discussions coming out of the workload committee, a two-tiered system (research and teaching faculty). We would love to have received outreach on this. We do not believe further stratification is warranted or necessary. To further divide faculty is very unwise, we already have MPP, TT and Lecturer. As a person of color, I have received critiques on the value of my research, and am concerned about how this will roll out. The Senate should have received a document from the East Bay 30. It will be sent to you to show the unanimity of that group. There is some dispute with Provost Inch's comments. There are 25 signatures at least on that document. Jennings: I know that this is a budgetary issue, but I am concerned that new faculty is coming to campus and already has a morale issue. We have a search this year and lost 2 really good diversity candidates because of the salary and the length of time it took to make a decision. As a Search Chair, I balance diversity and salary. I am aware of other changes with CBA, that other new faculty are struggling with morale. I hope there is a way to address this that does not require a lot of grievances. Baham: CFA will continue to represent this group of faculty who are in a unique situation.

4. **Elect 2017-19 Academic Senate Staff Representative**

Vote on Staff Self-Nominated Rep by paper ballot.
Michelle Parker, LIB is elected.

5. **Consent Calendar:**

- a. [16-17 CAPR 9](#): Name change request from Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders; new proposed name to be Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences (*first appearance*)

6. **Information Items:**

- a. [16-17 CIC 92](#): Revision request for Multiple Subject Credential
- b. [16-17 CIC 94](#): Revision request for the Single Subject Credential Program
- c. [16-17 CIC 99](#): Revision request for MS in Counseling
- d. [16-17 CIC 93](#): General Education Approvals for Semesters from Department of Art
- e. [16-17 CIC 95](#): General Education Approvals for Semesters from Anthropology
- f. [16-17 CIC 108](#): Revision request for Minor in Business Administration
- g. [16-17 CIC 109](#): Revision request for Minor in Computer Science
- h. [16-17 CIC 110](#): Revision request for Minor in Information Technology Management
- i. [16-17 CIC 111](#): Revision request for Minor in International Business
- j. [16-17 CIC 113](#): Revision request for Minor in French
- k. [16-17 CIC 114](#): Revision request for Bachelor of Science Speech Pathology and Audiology

Mitchell/Garbesi – Motion to accept 5 a-k. Passes unanimously.

- l. [16-17 ITAC 1](#): CSUEB Computer Refresh Policy
Murray/JSmith No discussion. Passes unanimously.
- m. [16-17 ITAC 2](#): Faculty Instructional Technology Support at CSUEB
Referred from ExCom to investigate and report back on physical and organizational location of services of faculty. Murray/Reeve: Murray – couple of questions; purpose is in response to FITAC. Is that a subcommittee of ITAC? Karplus: This is the technical name of the committee. Murray: what does EMS refer to? Karplus: I do

not know, and will find out. Murray: I see names below Associate CIO Matt Collins on this chart. Where do they fit in and what are their positions? Karplus: I will find out. Item is accepted. Passes unanimously.

n. [Report](#) of the University Honors Program Director

Newcomb/Mitchell – Watnik asks this document be designated FUFM so it can be stored in the Senate files.

Karplus: I will do that. Garbesi: Who has purview over a program of this sort? It is not proposed by a Department? It is not like a degree program managed by a Department. Karplus: It is housed in Academic Affairs, but the genesis of the guiding document is something I can locate. Garbesi: I am disturbed by the format of having a separate program with additional work (vs. excellent grades), and it appears to be extra work in existing classes that falls on the faculty to do outside their workload, uncompensated and largely unevaluated. From those who spoke up at ExCom about how they handle those courses, these colleagues do work over and above but it is not part of the student's grade, and ends up CR/NC. Students have to do more work to get that designation. Appears that the emphasis is on quantity rather than quality if not evaluated. I think this is discriminatory against those students who have less time. Also by diversity too, because students who have to work more and have less time, will find it more difficult. Watnik: In answer to those concerns, 1415 CAPR 19 included revisions to the University Honors Program from within the Academic Senate. Note to Chair Karplus that UHP Director reports to ExCom once each year. APGS is the unit where it is housed. Director is mandated to deliver an annual report. Karplus: we can reopen the discussion, and start outside of Senate and see where it goes.

7. Action Items:

- a. [16-17 CIC 51](#): Developmental English and Math Policy (*second reading*)
No discussion. Passes unanimously.
- b. [16-17 CAPR 10](#); [16-17 CIC 84](#): Discontinuance of BA Geography (*second reading*)
No discussion. Passes unanimously.
- c. [16-17 CIC 88](#): Policy for second composition for transfer students (*second reading*)
Watnik: I remind the Chair that this document was referred to CIC, and the modified version was not posted.
Watnik/Mitchell – Motion to postpone passes unanimously.
- d. [16-17 CAPR 11](#): Request for University Adoption of Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Written Communication Measurement Rubric (*second reading*)
No discussion. Passes unanimously.
- e. [16-17 CR 1](#): STEM proposal for charter renewal (*first reading*) moved up to be last Information Item
Helgren/Hedrick No discussion. Passes unanimously.
- f. [16-17 CAPR 15](#); [16-17 CIC 117](#): Request for the MS in Accountancy conversion from pilot to regular program status (*first reading*)
Watnik/Wu move– Watnik/Wu move to waive first reading. Like so many programs we have seen under Semester Conversion, this needs approval from CO. The sooner it goes to Long Beach, the more likely it will be reviewed and approved in a timely manner. Garbesi: It would be useful to have it posted in the agenda when the request is to waive first reading. Karplus: Let's take that up at ExCom. Passes unanimously. Now Action Item second reading. No discussion. Passes unanimously.
- g. [16-17 CAPR 5](#): Academic Program Review procedures document suggested revisions (*first reading*)
JSmith/Wu – Smith moves to waive first reading/Seconded by Wu. Smith: Several reasons for doing this. 1) It changes the schedule to Annual Reports to Fall, and if it recommends changes to the program, Academic

Affairs would like advance notice. 2) Simplifies the Academic Review process, and has implications for TT Hiring process. Alters 5 Year Review Process which starts in the fall. Moreman: I would hope not to waive first reading since many changes in document are substantial, and germane to hiring. Wu: I support waiving it and effecting it immediately. CAPR has no meeting after this coming week. Then this document will be likely moved to the next year. If we discuss it today, we can keep on track. Hedrick: We have another Senate meeting for further discussion of this item. Even if we waive the first reading and pass it, it does not become policy until the President signs it. Vote 16-12 in favor. Does not meet the 2/3 threshold to waive first reading.

JSmith (CAPR Chair) – Shared a presentation PPT . Desire is to simplify to one report in the fall, transparent and published on EB website so we see what programs are doing. Moreman: How is this connected to TT hiring process? If this serves as annual request, change starts in CLASS starts in Council of Chairs meeting – does this go straight to the Deans? Smith: will not change the process, but the documentation you need for that request is changed. Moreman: Does that document constrain the conversation about a TT hire? Smith: What you put in the document would be up to you. It is the role of faculty to guide the allocation of resources. In CAPR, every program and person states a pronounced need for more resources. No guideposts. This is an attempt to bring all faculty together, given certain metrics and other things, to determine resources. Ivey: My question is about Principle 6. The language of maintaining prestige, and what prestige programs are, and what TT hiring offers enrollment growth. That language feels threatening to me, but it implies that vocationally focused majors vs. liberal arts disciplines. Smith: some of this flows from previous manual. We tried to emphasize head count, but that's not the only measure. We also look at service courses, program courses. Any program could be a mixture. The goal is not to be vocational. Just because a program is massive, we still are a liberal arts institution. If it is so heavily impacted and bottlenecking, that should be taken into account. I understand the concern. We have to try to balance liberal arts education and students are coming here with demand for certain areas. Smith: we could strike the word 'prestige'. Ivey: but does it mean something specific? Watnik: 4.5 years ago, I had a meeting with then Provost, Chair of CAPR and Director of APGS. Provost said bluntly, most reports basically say need more resources. Essentially CAPR provided no advice to administration as to who should get new hires, so he had carte blanche according to his criteria. CAPR is trying to make it more transparent. My other comment is that this document needs to be cleaned up so it does not refer only to quarters so it would not have a short shelf life. Refer it back so it has a longer shelf-life. Smith: CAPR 7 goes into effect in 2018. It would replace dates with semesters, and redoes the calendar. Watnik: Suggest you put something in the background information so it does not overwrite a previously written policy. Nielsen: Any discussion in CAPR about how this new policy would affect smaller programs? Smith: If you do it on head count alone, they have a real problem. So we considered both that and measures of service, and to maintain emphasis on civic responsibility and liberal arts even for highly technical education. It is not prescriptive about criteria. Maybe this program is both small in head count and service, but essential in character and mission of University, so it balances. Wu: In our CAPR discussion we thought about including Minors. Students come to this campus with a major in focus, but a Minor might relate to future careers. Minors data is difficult. Newcomb: Thank you for modifying the language about replacement of lecturers. Karplus: Actually, that change will need to be moved as an amendment to the document at second reading.

h. [16-17 FAC 7](#): Suggested changes to CSUEB Constitution and Bylaws (*first reading*)

Murray/Garbesi – Moreman: Summary Points numbers 4 and 5 are in opposition to each other. Murray: I was looking for best practices procedure. The distinction of number 5 is it is a title that the honoree would choose

their title. SLewis: I think it would be fine to use the word Emeriti. Karplus: We will return to this at second reading. Garbesi: Do we have a division of University Libraries? It looks like it was removed some places and not in others. Murray: Yes, this is the new term. We mean to remove “Division” from the document. Karplus: Likely to be on the Fall ballot, might be helpful to have an effective date. We can deal with this next time.

8. Discussion items:

- a. Report on [Ombuds Services](#) (*time certain no later than 3:35pm*)(*now no later than 3:25pm*)

Silvina Ituarte: Our services started in September, here for staff and faculty. It is for employees, not for students yet. The services are for any sort of work related to conflict and problems. Main thing is we are a confidential resource, a place to brainstorm and find resources, a place to get referrals, advice about next steps. We’ve had referrals from people who went to HR and the union, as well as the other way around. Our services are informal – no mandated consequences set in motion. We look at best and worst case scenarios, empowering people with information to move forward. Most of what we handle are conflict resolution, respect issues. Out of 30 appointments, we’ve met with 27 individuals, mostly staff who have come in with concerns. 4-5 faculty, 3 MPPs. Main concern were issues of respect (i.e. 2 colleagues who couldn’t get along, or I feel I am treated disrespectfully; and management issues, and communication issues.) We are looking to put up resources and videos soon on our webpage. Please contact Paris Winter by phone so there is no written record, for confidentiality. She sets up appointments and meeting place. JSmith: What about research ethics violations or professional disputes? Do you handle these? Ituarte: not yet. At conferences it seems like this arises at R1 institutions. Also issues of environmental sensitivities (wearing fragrances in work spaces), it can be anything. Lewis: I think your home page looks fine. Ituarte: Our BaySync page looks bad. Gossiping seems to be a concern, so we will be focusing resources on this too. We will have a report. Year ends June 30th. But then in middle of July we’ll have a report, maybe uploaded or sent out, not sure how it will be distributed. We keep records of trends and feedback and pass those on to President. We have seen more women so far, age range quite wide. Murray: phone number for registering a complaint? Is that connecting to you? Ituarte: We are the informal place, and confidential except for Title IX and cases of self-harm. The completely confidential person will be the person who takes Caitlin Kauffman’s place (she is leaving soon.)

- b. Faculty Workload Task Force [Report and Recommendations](#) (*time certain no later than 3:45pm*)(*now 3:35*)

Karplus: ExCom had this as a discussion item, and we agreed to place it as an item here at Senate. No action taken today, a time to listen and get up to speed on the report and recommendations. Keep in mind we have an additional ExCom Mtg and Senate Meeting to discuss this.

Linda Ivey, Chair of Faculty Work Load Task Force gave a PPT presentation.

ERIK HELGREN’S MINUTES HERE:

Taskforce started by previous Provost and continued this year.

These are solely recommendations!

The task was to provide recommendations that were revenue neutral

The Workload refers to everything we do 15 WTU per term

so the keyword is “reapportion”

University RTP policies would not be changed, but Department level RTP documents would need to be generated for the two pathways. It is in the hands of the faculty in the department to decide how meets expectation should be defined in their discipline.

Two prominent, possible ways to achieve the budget neutral requirement:

- 1) increased SFR
- 2) review of assigned time across campus – Specifically the “one-off” course release grants, not the assigned time required to do the University business.

Re. Increased SFR:

Recommend that Colleges look at the numbers college-wide; assign departments the SCU they must generate and the WTU that are budgeted for as initial starting place in scheduling.

Jennings: Appreciates amount of work, but concern is that it has to be budget neutral. If the College is in charge of the overall SFR then they have a role in this decision and it is not “in the hands of the faculty”. I believe we are creating a stratified system. How do we do this equitably, how do we do this for all TT faculty. Quality is going to suffer. Do elder faculty not take this option so younger faculty can do this?

Ivey: Ideally there would be other ways to fund this and hopefully this doesn't come out on the backs of students.

Mitchell: What does this do to Lecturers?

Ivey: In no way is this structured to be on the backs of Lecturers.

Hedrick: At the end of the day, a structural change that allows for more research outweighs the possible problems.

Wu: did a mock schedule that shrunk demand for Lecturers.

Provost Inch: Previous institution had numerous options, three distinct methods, that worked.

Baham: Can you address the issues brought up in the Report of the CFA? Do not use the language of tracks. Had discussed the possibility of dropping the 80/20 entirely.

Motion to extend (M/S/P) Wu/Moreman - ayes have it – to approve 5 minutes.

Moreman: re. the fear of stratification, he disagrees with this notion. Perhaps a poll could be taken, how many faculty would want to?

Garbesi: Current research expectations are incommensurate with the time allotted. How do we rectify this for the two pathways?

9. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:05.

Respectfully submitted,

Nina Haft, Substitute Secretary, assisted by Erik Helgren