



**TO:** Members of the Executive Committee  
**FROM:** Sarah Nielsen, Chair, Academic Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Executive Committee Agenda  
**MEETING DATE:** Tuesday, April 19, 2022, 12:45pm-2:30pm [by Zoom](#)

**FINAL AGENDA (click to jump to specific minutes)**

[Land Acknowledgement \(12:47\)](#)

[Approval of the agenda \(12:49–12:50\)](#)

[Approval of 4/5/22 minutes \(12:50-12:51\)](#)

[Reports \(12:51-13:05\)](#)

[Report of the Chair](#)

[Report of the President](#)

[Report of the Provost](#)

[Report of the Statewide Academic Senator](#)

[Appointments \(13:05-13:11\)](#)

[Exceptional Levels of Service to Students/ExCom Member](#)

[One-semester vacancy for ACIP representative](#)

[Sustainability Liaison Officer](#)

[Consent Calendar \(13:11-13:13\)](#)

[For Senate 4/26](#)

[New Business \(13:13-14:22\)](#)

[21–22 CR 13: Charter Proposal for University Center—Center for Disability Justice Research: Health Equity, Education, and Creativity](#)

[21-22 CR 14: Charter Proposal for University Center—Forensic Science Research Center \(time certain 2:10pm\)](#)

[21-22 FAC 15: Revision of Student Evaluation of Teaching Form](#)

[21-22 BEC 12: Procedure for Electing Senate Officers and At-Large ExCom Members for 2022-23](#)

[21-22 FAC 14: 2023 Summer Calendar](#)

[21-22 BDE 2: Amendments to the Bylaws for FDEC](#)

[21-22 CR 10: Principal Investigator Policy](#)

[21-22 CIC 46: Policies and Procedures for Courses Designated as Service Learning](#)

[21-22 CIC 36: Update to the Course Banking/Unbanking/Discontinuance policies](#)

[21-22 BDE 3: Public Records Act \(PRA\) Request for Faculty Data \[Response\]](#)

[21-22 CIC 42: Request to Remove Quarter Equivalency Information from the Catalog](#)

[21-22 CIC 43: Change Curricular Timeline for non-GEOC course proposals and program revisions](#)

[21-22 CIC 44: Learning Management System Opening Timeline](#)

[21-22 BDE 4: Interim UDO Recommendation](#)

[21-22 FAC 10: Policy Governing Eligibility to Emeritus/a Status](#)

[21-22 FAC 5: Recommended Change to the University By-laws regarding the definition of Emeritus Members of the Faculty](#)

[21-22 CIC 50: Undergraduate Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Policy](#)

[21-22 CIC 55: General Education, Overlay and Code \(GEOC\) Framework \[PDF\]](#)

[Discussion](#)

[Revising the anti-racism policy \(20-21 BAS 2\) - see draft 21-22 FDEC 4](#)

[Senate support for a Mills College cohort](#)

[Academic Senate 4/26/22 draft agenda \(14:22-14:32\)](#)

[Adjournment \(14:32\)](#)



## Select Highlights

- Please consider [signing up](#) to do the land acknowledgement in future ExCom meetings!
- [Chair's report](#) highlighted upcoming campus Earth Week events and call for nominees for Connie Sexauer Treasurer Award
- [President's report](#) highlighted important opportunities for campus feedback: Future Directions report, Childcare Assessment survey, and Housing Demand study
- [Provost's report](#) highlighted updates on current search for CBE dean and next year's tenure track faculty searches
- [Chair Nielsen appointed](#) to serve on Exceptional Levels of Service to Students committee
- [Senator Lee will serve](#) as ACIP representative as one-semester replacement for Dr. Wong
- [21-22 CR 13](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 CR 14](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 FAC 15](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 BEC 12](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 FAC 14](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 BDE 2](#) was [tabled](#)
- [21-22 CR 10](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 CIC 46](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 CIC 36](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 BDE 3](#) was [approved](#) to add to Senate agenda
- [21-22 CIC 50](#) was [tabled](#)

## APPROVED MINUTES<sup>1</sup>

**Members Present:** Paul Carpenter, Christina Chin-Newman, Julie Glass, Kim Greer, Eric Haas, Scott Hopkins, Juleen Lam, Michael Lee, Sarah Nielsen, Cathy Sandeen, Benjamin Smith, Meiling Wu

**Guests:** Jeanne Dittman, Gretchen Reevy, Michelle Rippy, Mark Robinson, Carol Trost

**Members Absent:** Jenny O

**Meeting convened at 12:47 hours and is being recorded**

### Land Acknowledgement (12:47)

#### 1. Approval of the agenda (12:49–12:50)

- a. M/S - Haas/Hopkins
- b. Sen. Hopkins moves to amend agenda to add Items [21-22 CIC 50](#), [21-22 CIC 55](#) and [21-22 FAC 15](#) and move [21-22 CR 13](#) and [21-22 FAC 15](#) to the top of the New Business
  - i. M/S: Hopkins/Chin-Newman
  - ii. **/P - unanimous consent; agenda amended**

---

<sup>1</sup> **Key:** M/S is motion/second | /P is passed | /F is failed



- c. Chair Nielsen - move to add time certain to [21-22 CR 14](#) at 14:10
  - a. /P - unanimous consent; agenda as amended approved
2. Approval of [4/5/22](#) minutes (12:50-12:51)
  - a. M/S - Wu/Smith
  - b. Discussion
    - i. None
  - a. /P - abst(1); minutes approved
3. Reports (12:51-13:05)
  - a. *Report of the Chair*
    - i. **Earth Week events:** lots of exciting things happening on campus; links contained in Chair's report and featured on university website.
    - ii. **RSCA Meet and Greet:** on May 5. More information in Chair's report.
    - iii. **Anticipated Motion:** may have substitute motion to combine FAC 5 and 10 into one document; document is in Chair's report. There may be incorrect links in the agenda; will talk about more later. Discussed with FAC chair Linda Ivey, but still some confusion.
    - iv. **Next ExCom meeting:** Scheduling conflict for next ExCom meeting (May 3). Campus-wide celebration planned outside Core Building overlaps with start of ExCom meeting. Thoughts on starting meeting late or doing email vote for remaining proposals from standing committees?
    - v. **Connie Sexauer University Treasurer award:** given to university staff member. Normally done in March. Can collect names and nomination statements this week and do email vote next week to announce winner in Senate on May 10.
    - vi. Discussion
      1. No objections to ask for nominations for Connie Sexauer degree
      2. No objections to starting next ExCom meeting at 13:00 on May 3
      3. Chair Nielsen will send out email to confirm
  - b. *Report of the President*
    - i. **Welcome back:** was on vacation during the first week April; last week at Chancellor Senior Leadership Council meeting in person in Long Beach
    - ii. **Future Directions:** latest iteration is out. Appreciate you taking a look and providing feedback. Have heard that it has come together nicely; want to finalize in fall. Colleges and Administrative Units will come up with action items. Not for every desired outcome, but a few key ones. If we all pick a few, will collectively make a difference.
    - iii. **Surveys:** 1) Childcare survey went out this week. Even if you don't have children, please take a look and answer questions that pertain to you. Want to get an overall campus sense of providing some level of support--i.e., center if we can do it, subsidies, partnerships. 2) Housing Demand Study is coming. Based on work of Faculty and Staff Housing Task Force, might be able to build some rental faculty and staff housing on Hayward campus, but before get too far down that road want to assess demand.



- iv. **Interim Chancellor of CSU:** Dr. Jolene Koester will officially start May 1. Professor Emerita from CSU Northridge. Has been retired for about 10 years. Will be a good person to calm the waters over the last 12-15 months. Have already done 30-minute telephone/Zoom call with all campus presidents, Trustees, and Vice-Chancellors that report to her. Big commitment, trying to identify her priorities for the next year. Search for next chancellor will be launched right away.
- v. **Commencement festivities:** May 3 campus event - great to honor new and growing relationship with Muwekma Ohlone Tribal Council who will be here, big part of event. Late-night breakfast starting at 9pm on Friday May 6 to support students studying for finals. Cultural graduation celebrations May 7-8, weekend before commencement. Commencement ceremonies schedule May 12-May 15. 21 ceremonies scheduled. During this period will be awarding 3 honorary degrees from CSUEB – Mr. Wayne Jordan (approved last year in 2021 but elected to wait for in-person event) is an Oakland business leader and founder of Akonadi Foundation. Nominated by Trustee Lateefah Simon. Will receive honorary degree May 12 at 2020-2021 celebration. Dana King - broadcaster and sculptor, will receive honorary degree on May 18. Kristi Yamaguchi, Bay area born and bred Olympic gold medalist and founder of a nonprofit that supports early reading in children will receive honorary degree on Sunday May 15 at 9am.
- vi. Discussion
  - 1. None
- c. *Report of the Provost*
  - i. **Week of Scholarship ceremony:** will be held tomorrow to honor faculty achievements. Saturday is student Honors Ceremony.
  - ii. **Tenure Track Searches:** In collaboration with Deans - is important for searches to begin and faculty and departments to start ASAP. Budget is up in the air, have not had May revised and no idea if there will be new money (skeptical there will be new money for new positions). Authorized 28 positions for next year - mostly replacements, resignations, etc. Will be working with the deans to plan for that.
  - iii. **CBE Dean search:** finished meeting with the four finalists for College and Business and Economics Dean. Will receive information from search committee tomorrow. Will connect with new Provost Walt Jacobs, who has been involved in search process, before the end of the week and hope to make offer soon.
  - iv. **Deans and Chairs meeting:** This Friday will be last Deans and Chairs meeting - will be talking about WASC and where we are in that process. Maureen has some updates and specific asks, particularly about checking on their websites. Will also revisit GI2025 will revisit work around five new equity priorities.
  - v. Discussion
    - 1. None



- d. *Report of the Statewide Academic Senator*
  - i. Sen. Glass - Nothing to report. Sen. Wu forwarded Trustees report and have interim committee meetings this coming Friday. Excited to hear more about changes in admissions policies, university writing skills, etc.
  - ii. Sen. Wu - My meeting is on Thursday
- 4. **Appointments (13:05-13:11)**
  - a. *Exceptional Levels of Service to Students/ExCom Member*
    - i. Chair Nielsen - Need ExCom member to serve on this committee to review applications. Chair Nielsen can do it as Senate Chair but if anyone on ExCom would like to do it, please let know interest. No volunteers. **Chair Nielsen will nominate herself to serve on committee.**
  - b. *One-semester vacancy for ACIP representative*
    - i. Chair Nielsen - Dr. Andrew Wong selected to be the ACIP representative. However, Dr. Wong will be on sabbatical in fall. Provost Greer had suggestion - splitting 3 units in half would be difficult; person serving in the fall could receive a stipend similar to what was done with Sen. Lee when taking over the Senate Secretary obligations from Sen. Lam when on leave. Reminder that it is a 3-year appointment and would only be fall 2022 appointment.
    - ii. Discussion
      - 1. Sen. Lee - was the plan to get someone who stood for the election to take the spot? Chair Nielsen - wanted to ask, hadn't decided that. Could offer to the second-place person or offer to Sens. Wu or Lee since they have served before. Sen. Lee - Andrew Wong is also the Director of Global Studies. I was going to take over from him and take the 3 units for that. We could split the 3 units for ACIP and GLST and I could do both in the fall, and he could do both in the spring and this would not require any additional money. I was on ACIP for 5.5 years and Director of Study Abroad in Spain, so would not be a difficult thing to do. Chair Nielsen - will go with that plan and will send something to Chancellor's Office confirming our appointment for this next three-year term. Sen. Lee - will send email to Provost, Dean Ng, Chair Nielsen, and Andrew so everyone is on same page. Chair Nielsen - thank you for stepping up to do this.
  - c. *Sustainability Liaison Officer*
    - i. Chair Nielsen - SLO is termed out after this spring. Typically the SLO call has gone out in spring; possible that we could do this in the fall. Should we try to get the call out now or would it be better to wait and have this be an item for next year's Senate to take action on in the fall?
    - ii. Discussion
      - 1. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - what's the history, is the chair of Committee on Sustainability typically the SLO or not? Chair Nielsen - my understanding is that it has varied over time and hasn't always been the same person. Sen. Lee - committees elect their own chairs, while the





chair for Sustainability can be the SLO, the SLO doesn't have to be the chair of the committee. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - so not like DELO and FDEC where it always has been the same person. Sen. Lee - it has always been the same person at FDEC, but it does require a vote of the committee. Vice-Chair Chin-Neman - don't know about waiting for the fall because gives people less options for using the 3 WTU, would have to use it in the spring. Chair Nielsen - I can get the old call, make some changes, send to ExCom this week. Can get approval by email and try to get call out early next week. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman's point is good, to identify SLO sooner rather than later to allow for flexibility.

**5. Consent Calendar (13:11-13:13)**

- a. For [Senate 4/26](#)
- b. Chair Nielsen - asking for items linked here to be added to the Consent Calendar at Senate. Are 12 items on this list; Consent Calendar is typically used for GEOC proposals. Currently getting a lot of proposals from CAPR and are anticipating another chunk of them. The 12 items proposed for Consent Calendar next week; 11 are requests to add hybrid or online version for existing program and one discontinuance request. Curriculog proposals are linked, can see the department's justification for all these items. Request for online/hybrid; always the case that the department is seeking flexibility to accommodate student needs and address concerns about enrollment. In some cases, programs are asking for degree completion program; but most are asking to be certified for distance education for more flexibility on what to offer online because have reached 50% threshold with WASC where have to get certified if want to offer additional courses online. Any objections to putting those items under 5a onto the Consent Calendar?
- a. /P - unanimous consent; items approved to add to Consent Calendar

**6. New Business (13:13-14:22)**

- a. [21-22 CR 13](#): *Charter Proposal for University Center—Center for Disability Justice Research: Health Equity, Education, and Creativity*
  - i. Chair Nielsen - Charter proposal for university center for disability justice research, health equity, education, and creativity. Chair Nielsen did write a letter of support for this proposal; should someone else introduce this? No objections; will continue with overview. The motion would be to refer to the Provost and Vice President Academic Affairs and place proposal as information item to Academic Senate. Overview of proposal grew out of work done by Disability Working Group and FLC on this same topic. Is an Interdisciplinary center with several departments across all colleges and would provide an opportunity to build on faculty efforts to create an inclusive campus with meaningful educational and community partnerships and develop collaborative research opportunities that further the mission of disability justice. Projects and initiatives already developed by several faculty are on the proposal and there's work already in developing new initiatives such as a certificate program for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities as well as research on workforce development and



preparation for neurodiverse adults. Proposal also lists governing board that consists of faculty that have expressed a desire to serve and are committed to success of center; co-directors have proposed budget that involves fundraising to support the Center's activities for the first year and plan to seek additional internal and external funding to sustain the center.

ii. M/S - Smith/Hopkins

iii. Discussion

1. Sen. Wu - Center is confusing because we have the Affinity Centers for students under Student Affairs; these Centers are Institutions under Academic Affairs. Is there a way to make this difference because under Student Affairs it doesn't go through Senate process, but Centers and Institutions are related with research and Academic Affairs do need to go through Senate process. Would like to see better way to differentiate them. Chair Nielsen - there is a Task Force this year related to our policy on Centers and Institutes, this will be work ongoing in the fall and this issue is something that the Task Force could potentially address. Sen. Smith - process by which we approve Centers is interesting. Important to note that at CSU level there is a distinction between Centers that are student-focused versus faculty-driven initiatives like this for research, or educational or helping with community outreach. There is a distinction made at the CSU level between how these need to be approved or handled; is part of the reason why the Affinity Center is handled by a different process. Did want to point out this is not necessarily a research center even though research is involved; pointed out as concern regarding the Committee on Research being primary reviewer for Centers and Institutes; many on campus are not primarily research-focused, so might make more sense to go through Faculty Affairs or different process.
2. Sen. Glass - am puzzled by punctuation in title with colon followed by commas; not sure what this means, but this may not matter. More substantively - worried about sustainability in terms of funding model. Am ignorant about how this works with existing Centers and Institutes so would not hold anything up because of it, but this will certainly require ongoing funding so this is a slight concern. Sen. Smith - agree that for both Centers (less so in the second one and more so in this one), funding is a concern. But there is a catch-22; in the policy of the Center, cannot provide funding for center until it is a center, but can't apply for grants and resources until have mechanism to deposit money into account. Is a problem and hoping the new Task Force can address this; how to ensure they can get off on the right foot if they can't doing anything to raise money and get going until they've gone through this process. Would comment that the individuals behind this proposal have demonstrated a



strong propensity for raising funds and grant-funded research, so in that sense have higher potential.

3. Provost Greer - appreciate the comments that have been made so far. I have been supportive of this proposal as well as the one on Forensic Science Center, and we have another donation that has come to the campus around an Institute for a Sustainable Bay Area. Is different in terms of process; money has come in and have to think about an institute and how to do that. In my conversations with Shuba, Sarah, Michelle and others, recognize the process by which these proposals come through Senate, but agree with everyone else that even from Academic Affairs perspective, would love for them to be engaged in conversations about how together we can help Center or Institutes come to be and have plans strategically for where and how these are located. These are all interdisciplinary programs; do they go to College or under Academic Affairs. How to plan to support them and help them be successful. From Academic Affairs point of view - in the future should be involved so we're having same conversations as in Senate. Great ideas but how to identify strategically or structurally and how to support them. I wrote a letter of support for both Centers and as in discussion with the people putting them forward about coming together later and have conversations with leadership team to answer some of those big questions. A little backwards, but didn't want to hold up process.
  4. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - question for Parliamentarian, Don and I are listed on governing board, so we should abstain from voting on this? Comment from Guest Associate Dean Mitch Watnick (chat): Christina and Scott can vote if wanted
  5. Sen. Smith - there is ambiguity about where these Centers are going to be housed. Have been identified as University Centers, which is appropriate since they are spread across different colleges. Include language saying they will work with Academic Affairs about where they will be housed. Some ambiguity in policy about this; need to be aware of this and once they become housed whether they need to recharter specifying where they are housed? An open question that we could hopefully briefly discuss as ExCom and include guidance for this.
- iv. /P -abst(2); 21-22 CR 13 approved to add to Senate agenda
  - v. Skipped to [Item c](#)
- b. [21-22 CR 14](#): *Charter Proposal for University Center—Forensic Science Research Center (time certain 2:10pm)*
- i. M/S - Smith/Wu
  - ii. Guest Michelle Rippey - Thank you for everyone's time and consideration for the Forensic Science Research Center on campus. Goal is to create an opportunity for students to become engaged with faculty and research in forensic science, could





be faculty from all colleges since forensic sciences touches all areas, and opportunities for outreach. Goal for outreach - provide foundational knowledge of forensic science to K-12 and community college and take social justice lens to work on cold cases to assist law enforcement and District Attorney to assist with caseload since every palace is so low in human power. Center likely housed at Concord campus; some funding associated with that through University Extensions. Have received support from Provost Greer, Dean Dinley and Dean Ng (without formal letter) and Bran Cook from University Extension.

iii. Discussion

1. Sen. Smith - one of the cleanest proposals that CR has reviewed in my time. Very well documented and well crafted, so compliments to them.
2. Sen. Lee - as with everything Michelle Rippy does, is very thorough. Shared with Anthropology in advance; our program is behind this and in favor of it.
3. Sen. Smith - was one thing had promised a member of CR to mention that there is a link here to multiple disciplines in Section 3 (Center Purpose). Some concerns that the examples listed here aren't actually offered at CSUEB, i.e., Forensic Kinesiology; not currently offered by Kinesiology at CSUEB. Guest Michelle Rippy - apologize for not being more clear in proposal, this was just potential for future collaborations as well as potential bringing in subject matter experts for speeches, etc.

iv. **/P - unanimous consent; 21-22 CR 14 approved to refer to Provost and add as Information Item to Senate Agenda**

v. Returned to [Item i](#)

c. [21-22 FAC 15](#): *Revision of Student Evaluation of Teaching Form*

- i. Chair Nielsen - grew out of Pres. Sandeen's response on RTP policy that wasn't approved last year. Pres. Sandeen acknowledged that issues with bias in student evaluations were real; suggested that Senate develop and approve a more objective student evaluation tool. Student Evaluation of Teaching Subcommittee had been working on this issue even before fall 2021; starting fall 2021 a group of faculty from across university have been meeting weekly to work on this document (Lindsay Grubbs, Pascale Guiton, Eve Higby, Michelle Korb, Christian Roessler (chair), Lana Wood). Brief overview - current use of student evaluations of teaching at CSUEB is not aligned with evidence-based best practices according to the committee. Low response rate reflects that students do not find participation worthwhile. Proposed student evaluation survey (page 5) differs from current form fundamentally by taking formative approach rather than evaluative one. This shifts the primary purpose of student evaluations back to its original intended use. Recommended by virtually all scholars on the topic given that basis makes comparison on the basis of scores difficult if not impossible. Is an outline literature review and extensive bibliography in appendices. Document starts with summary of scholarly insight, pointing out bias in student evaluation



teaching is significantly impacting BIPOC women more; students can give valuable feedback but are not qualified to assess an instructor. Purpose of form should be to inform teaching and not to gauge effectiveness. Comparison of faculty student evaluation teaching scores is misleading; department averages can be misinterpreted. Key goal of revision: reduce survey length to make more manageable for students, questions as factful as possible, engage respondents better by breaking down questions by theme and including section on students' own participation/approach to class. More open-ended prompt gives students space for narrative process or more specific feedback. In spring 2021 there was an earlier version of this form and students were invited to participate in focus groups and there was trialing of the form across 3 of the 4 colleges. Data gathered in spring 2021 time period informed revisions of form in addition to conversation with FAC. Actual form is included in the policy as well as a comparison chart of old and new survey, appendices with documentation about early focus groups and trials of form and scholarship that the committee drew on.

ii. M/S - Lee/Smith

iii. Discussion

1. Chin-Newman - people have been working hard on this for two years, I piloted this in my class. Christian is teaching and couldn't visit today; but will be at Senate meeting so hopefully can have a good discussion there. As DELO, I appreciate the work they have put into this. Does seem easier for students to fill out than the current one.
2. Sen. Haas - usually improving response rates does include making the survey itself simple, but also how you use survey. Need to make clear to the students/participants filling it out that you are taking this and using it. Think there should be continued efforts to demonstrate to students that we are using this in real ways that make a difference towards improvements in classes and that will be part of increasing response rate.

iv. **/P - unanimous consent; 21-22 FAC 15 approved to add to Senate agenda**

d. 21-22 BEC 12: *Procedure for Electing Senate Officers and At-Large ExCom Members for 2022-23*

- i. Chair Nielsen - asking for motion to approve this as information item for Senate agenda. When approved standing rules for this year, built in more time for self-nominations and for nominee statements to be circulated ahead of the organizational meeting to avoid problems that came up last year (nominations from the floor even though that was not allowed in the standing rules, which were suspended during organizational meeting). People also had issues accessing ballot during the meeting and had to do multiple ballots to elect ExCom members. BEC 12 outlined election procedures to be used and recommends minor modifications to standing rules to accommodate compressed timeline for nominations. Intent was to make it a more inclusive process but in terms of timing don't have enough time to do what was mentioned now in the standing



rules. This hopefully keeps the spirit of standing rules while allowing for more compressed timeline. Minor changes - use the rank choice voting for the at-large ExCom members and cross out Senate Officers since can use regular ballot for that; in Section 8.1 of standing rules rather than circulating nominations statements for 15 days, would ask for this to be one week instead. New timeline would be to send out call, publish first round of statements on April 29 and second round May 10. At the organizational meeting - ballots will be sent by email to those in attendance, go in order of Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary as has been done in the past. Would use rank-choice option if more than 5 people were running for at-large ExCom seats. Once the vote has been completed, if using rank order ballot, nominees would be ranked by average rank scores (sum of rank order divided by number of votes cast) from which the winners would be selected.

ii. M/S - Smith/Wu

iii. Discussion

1. Sen. Smith - highly unlikely given history, if more than 2 candidates for the other positions aside from ExCom overall, would we want to use rank-choice voting for them? Other question - for the procedure for rank choice, why this approach for rank choice voting rather than when people drop off the bottom as they fail to reach the threshold and then votes get move to who their second choice was, basically the opposite of the direction which is going here. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - we are using a procedure that is not difficult to do in Qualtrics and where we can announce the winner in the organizational meeting. In standing rules, didn't specify the procedure for Officers or ExCom members, the way it is technically now we would use rank-order ballots but hadn't worked out details back in August. If we had three or more nominees, would technically use rank-order ballot. Chair Nielsen - so in Section 2, don't need to strike the Senate Officers, should leave them as they are. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - when looking at the timetable, if we change the standing rules technically the Senate needs to vote on that and it feels like we are running out of time. Didn't know if that was important enough to amend the standing rules and send it through the Senate. Sen. Smith - agree don't need to put this through Senate and is unlikely that we will have three or more candidates for Senate officers. Appreciate the point about being able to summarize in Qualtrics. From an equity perspective and best representing the preferences of the electorate, there is a general preference for the reverse of what's doing here where have the rank choice and the person with lowest number of first place votes is removed followed by the second-lowest person; has empirical support behind it as fairest approach for rank-choice ballot. Is more complicated procedure and slower because does require manual approach harder to



automate but would advocate for it if we have the time. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - seems like some of these hotly contested races like mayor where only one person would be voted. But not many cases like ours with multiple seats. In ours, the #1-5 rating doesn't matter. What happened last year was that seat #5 was hotly contested because whether you're #5 or #6 determines if you get a seat. Have provision in there if there is a tie between #5 and #6 will go with the candidate with the highest number of first-place votes.

- iv. /P - unanimous consent; 21-22 BEC 12 approved to add to Senate agenda as Information Item

e. 21-22 FAC 14: 2023 Summer Calendar

- i. Chair Nielsen - Informational item to Senate to affirm next year's summer semester dates, instructional days, non-instructional duty days for faculty, as well as holidays. Is part of larger 7-year plan approved.
- ii. M/S - Hopkins/Wu
- iii. Discussion
  - 1. Sen. Hopkins - why is May 29 a holiday? Vice Chair Nielsen - that is Memorial day.
  - 2. Sen. Smith - original request was that Senate approve this, should this be an information item or item for approval? Chair Nielsen - thought it was information item, typically these have come through that way. Just approving the dates that have been set.

- iv. /P - unanimous consent; 21-22 FAC 14 approved to add to Senate agenda

f. 21-22 BDE 2: Amendments to the Bylaws for FDEC

- i. Chair Nielsen - focus on duties and membership sections of bylaws. Duty changes include removing liaison language for hiring committees and clarifying language, add study and report on JEDI issues to improve campus climate and membership changes to add DISC coordinator and DISC staff member. If approved, would be on the next university-wide election which would be in the fall. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - procedurally with CORBA changes to bylaws, ran through P&Ps but slightly different. This is just is about the bylaw changes. Sen. Glass - was the removal of liaison role because that role is going to be played by diversity liaison? Haven't heard about that position's interaction with search committees in the coming year. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - wasn't removed; FDEC has primary responsibility, removed the word "primary" because more than one could be responsible. The sentence that is struck out - in reality, FDEC members have not been doing this so misleading to have that sentence to in there. No plans for FDEC members to start acting as liaison for department of college for diversifying hiring of tenure track faculty.
- ii. Sen. Smith - noted in description here that the Constitution specified that standing committees should have two student representatives. Don't think there are any standing committees with two student representatives. Should we be



going through and checking for consistency in constitutions and bylaws? In CR, we have specified that we have 1 student member. Are there other areas where we have lost consistency across documents over the years? There are often inconsistencies comparing what is noted in policies versus Constitution - e.g., CR in bylaws specify we are in charge of policy that no longer exists. Should we consider a broader overview (separate consideration)?

- iii. Point of order to ask for motion to discuss
- iv. M/S - Smith/Lee
- v. Sen. Smith - will argue against approving because of a timing concern. Would argue that it is too late in the year to hold another election required to approve this. Not fair to faculty to hold another election on this so late in the year. Chair Nielsen - in the policy, does say that this would be on the next university-wide election, which would be in the fall.
- vi. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - we have discussed that we may need a Task Force on re-evaluating Constitution and Bylaws for consistency; last time this was done, recommended doing it every 5 years. Doesn't make sense for every Standing Committee propose changes, makes more sense to do them across the board.
- vii. Sen. Lee - technically can't put stuff on to future year's elections. That is the job of next year's Senate. Next year's Senate can bring this forward, but the election is set in the year in which the election is done. Think this is not what should happen. Chair Nielsen - my understanding was we could ask for next university ballot. This means that our COBRA ballot is probably also not. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - move to table BDE 2 and the COBRA. Sen. Lee - these documents exist and can be passed by the chair of a committee to the next committee. Can be on the next election, but would have to come through that process of being renewed with the new membership. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - withdraw motion to table. Sen. Lee - anything on the table that hasn't been voted on that requires Presidential signature in effect dies at the end of the year, but is part of memory so can be passed on to next committee to redo. There is some continuity but generally one year's elected body does not dictate the actions of the next year's elected body.
- viii. Chair Nielsen - will let this die and include in Chair's report and should go in FDEC report as well for institutional memory to come back to next year.
- ix. Sen. Smith - Constitution does specify timeline for election after passing - election needs to be held within 5 days of passing vote. Do think we need a motion to table BDE 2 if we will move on from these items.
- x. M/S - Smith/Hopkins to table 21-22 BDE 2
- xi. /P - unanimous consent; 21-22 BDE 2 tabled
- g. 21-22 CR 10: Principal Investigator Policy
  - i. M/S - Smith/Hopkins
  - ii. Chair Nielsen - CSU policy requires campuses to have principal investigator policy. ORSP director, CR committee, and compliance & standards director





worked on updating current policy. Updated policy covers areas of scope, definition, PI eligibility, provisional PI status, PI responsibilities, PI/Co-PI reassignment, and PI responsibilities when working with multiple institutions.

- iii. Sen. Smith - efficient to have this come through the Senate rather than being something handled exclusively by ORSP in keeping with the Constitution; our responsibility to make recommendations. We have a good working relationship with ORSP, essentially allows for collaboration between two entities. In discussion, did add to this information about PIs clarify the role of lecturers and other non-tenure track faculty and their ability to act as PI for grant-funded research to make as inclusive as possible while also paying attention to logistical issues with temporary faculty. Done best to make this as inclusive as possible, but open to feedback and amendments.

- iv. **/P - unanimous consent; 21-22 CR 10 approved**

h. 21-22 CIC 46: *Policies and Procedures for Courses Designated as Service Learning*

- i. Chair Nielsen - this policy came from Service Learning subcommittee of CIC. Policy provides the guidelines and procedures for courses to be designated with S suffix to designate course as service learning course. Allows campus and Chancellor's Office to better track impact of service learning on student success. Policy specifies course criteria, characteristics, syllabus, and curricular workflow. Similar to GEOC in terms of workflow if a class is trying to get certified for service learning as well as GEOC; would go to GEOC first.

- ii. M/S - Hopkins/Chin-Newman

- iii. Discussion

- 1. Sen. Hopkins - do people have question about this, is that why people are not interested in seconding? Have a service learning organization on campus, work with nurses. Have included service learning in my classes but not as structured as this. Chair Nielsen - part of this is for classes that meet the criteria - is a nice way to track this kind of high-impact practice going on. Also possible to offer internships and do service learning and not apply for this designation. Might be something a department or particular class might seek. S designation also allows one course to be clearly indicated as service learning and different if offering multiple sections of class.

- iv. **/P - unanimous consent; 21-22 CIC 46 approved**

- v. Moved to Item b for time certain

i. 21-22 CIC 36: *Update to the Course Banking/Unbanking/Discontinuance policies*

- i. Chair Nielsen - This policy gets rid of discontinuance altogether. If course is not offered for 3 years, is banked. Can be unbanked at any time. If there are changes the department wants to do after unbanked including GEOC certification, would



go through regular curricular process. Otherwise, if department wants to use course as-is, just needs to request to unbank.

ii. M/S - Smith/Lee

iii. Discussion

1. None

iv. /P - unanimous consent; 21-22 CIC 36 approved to add to Senate Agenda

j. 21-22 BDE 3: Public Records Act (PRA) Request for Faculty Data [Response]

i. Chair Nielsen - information item to let ExCom and Senate know about PRA request that went forward for faculty data. Credit to DELO and Vice-Chair Chin-Newman for extensive work to put together this request. Request asks for data on the breakdown by college, department, and classification of faculty members' race, ethnicity and gender, results of faculty pay audit by race, ethnicity and gender classification, college and department, patterns of departure by race, ethnicity and gender, average time to promotion by same factors and average course reassignment time by those factors. We did already receive a response and were told that none of those were possible to have those data.

ii. M/S - Lee/Wu

iii. Discussion

1. Sen. Lee - read the response of the Interim AVP for Finance & Administration; think there is an element of being very literal. As I read the language, it seems to imply that a search was made for an audit of "xyz," which don't think was the request of AFSA. AFSA wanted to get that information, not have the university do the audit if I'm not incorrect. Am all in favor of doing this study, would help us understand what's happening, why we are losing our faculty of color, why there are morale issues, and why we are losing staff. Heard on Friday that we have lost dozens of African Ancestry staff in the last year. Only have the same number of African ancestry faculty now than in 2017, no increase, there has been turnover. Wondering from the language Andre Johnson provided to us, the way the question that has been asked is part of the reason why the response we have gotten. In many institutions particularly about sensitive data and public information request, if don't ask the right questions don't get the right answer. People answer the questions they perceive to be asked. Happy to have this conversation on the Senate floor as well, important issue.
2. Sen. Glass - agree with Sen. Lee; my experience with faculty and staff data is that HR claims we don't have that information. We are requested to report it on our annual reports, and when we make requests for new faculty and yet that data is not available. In math department, don't have adequate data on the ethnicity of my faculty.



3. Sen. Smith - echo importance of collecting this information and doing this analysis. Wondering whether part of the challenge is the approach being taken - understanding of the relevant public records acts if it hasn't already been compiled in the way that we have asked, that record does not exist so do not have to provide that. Is it simply that no one has done this specific study yet so there is no record to hand over of the study. Better for us to ask that this study be conducted instead?
  4. Chair Nielsen - sounds like something we want to investigate and push for. Right now, the motion on the table is to approve BDE 3 as Information Item to share with Senate and talk about next steps.
  5. Sen. Lee - Sen. Glass is correct that the data as with our students is based on self-reporting. Is imperfect and incomplete like it is for our students. We work with that and get information we can and suspect information we put aside. Asking for audit – but audit has not been done, therefore there is no information to supply here. If we wanted to do this study, could we and with what degree of problems as Sen. Glass has pointed out, that would have to be taken into account. Is discussion that will run and run, won't go away, and need to sit down with incoming CFO and Pres. Sandeen as faculty if we think this is worth doing at institutional level. Have skill set within faculty body to do this – statistics, business professors. We have that expertise, why not do it?
  6. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - has to do with the willpower. In New Jersey they have done this and had equitable payments to even things out to even out the playing field. There are problems with race and ethnicity, but could do gender audits which wouldn't be so hard. Tried to meet with Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Research to work on this but was told have to file public access request. Is the willpower - do I have to get a lawyer and ask for different way? Do the leadership want to find out this information or cover it up which is the CSU way?
  7. Chair Nielsen - is disappointing, but have some potential strategies moving forward to keep this in the forefront and complete a study to get these types of data to help us move forward. Thank Vice-Chair Chin-Newman for work on this and appreciate everyone's comments.
  8. /P - unanimous consent; 21-22 BDE 3 approved to add to Senate agenda
- k. [21-22 CIC 42](#): *Request to Remove Quarter Equivalency Information from the Catalog*
- i. Skipped due to time constraints, will include in email vote
- l. [21-22 CIC 43](#): *Change Curricular Timeline for non-GEOC course proposals and program revisions*
- i. Skipped due to time constraints, will include in email vote



- m. 21-22 CIC 44: *Learning Management System Opening Timeline*
  - i. Skipped due to time constraints, will include in email vote
- n. 21-22 BDE 4: *Interim UDO Recommendation*
  - i. Skipped due to time constraints, will include in email vote
- o. 21-22 FAC 10: *Policy Governing Eligibility to Emeritus/a Status*
  - i. Skipped due to time constraints, will include in email vote
- p. 21-22 FAC 5: *Recommended Change to the University By-laws regarding the definition of Emeritus Members of the Faculty*
  - i. Skipped due to time constraints, will include in email vote
- q. 21-22 CIC 50: *Undergraduate Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Policy*
  - i. Chair Nielsen - Undergraduate Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) policy comes from EO 665. All CSU campuses are required to have some sort of GWAR. WST and GWAR courses we used to have were suspended at the beginning of the pandemic. Given a recent memo from the Chancellor's Office, we can have no more high stakes testing to satisfy this requirement; have to use a course-based approach. Waiver for GWAR will be in effect through fall 2023, but we are expected to have our GWAR requirement set and implement by fall 2023. Writing Skills Subcommittee tasked with making recommendations for how GWAR will work on our campus; policy is divided into several different sections. Guidelines are that students will fulfill this requirement by earning C- or better in an upper division writing-intensive class. No standardized testing to place students in the class.. Students will be eligible to take writing assessment class when reach junior status and have completed second composition. Can be major course or another discipline like English or GE-certified course. Writing intensive class would be expected to integrate course content with reading and writing pedagogy. Course would be assessed when the ILO and written communication is assessed as part of long-term ILO plan. Student learning outcomes are drawn from existing student learning outcomes for GWAR classes and second composition classes and there is a focus on SLO on audience and purpose and how you shift communication when you take those two factors into consideration, the use of critical thinking and logical reasoning for organizing ideas, ability to present multiple perspectives and include interdisciplinary concepts when appropriate, and revise writing in response to feedback. In terms of characteristics of class - WI or W classes would be expected to have scaffolded writing assignments and substantive instruction in writing, and multiple drafts, requirement of at least two multidraft pieces of work (could be part of larger piece). Would be 4,000 word minimum for writing but could be spread across multiple assignments. Course caps are recommended to be no more than 30 with recommended course cap of 25 and/or use of K factor of 1.3 (a 3 unit class would be 3.9 WTU for the person teaching it). Certification process -



similar to GEOC and it would go to CIC, Excom and Senate (GEOC first if also seeking GEOC certification). Proposal includes communication plan for students, professional advisors, faculty and staff. Professional development plan including recommendation for FLC (for summer/fall), Back to the Bay, and ongoing support for faculty teaching for the first time. Suggestion to not penalize faculty or instructors for small classes to do this in a meaningful way.

ii. Discussion

1. Sen Wu - review process would be similar to GEOC process, but would it be reviewed by GEOC or CIC Subcommittee on Writing Skills? Chair Nielsen - right, would be reviewed by Writing Skills Subcommittee, then it would go to CIC and forwarded to ExCom/Senate. If the course is also seeking recertification or certification for GEOC, would go to GEOC first then Writing Skills.
2. Sen. Glass - how would this apply to graduate students? How does this interact with upper division C and D whose course characteristics essentially identical to this. Whether upper division Area C and D would be able to have an overlay as well as this? The K factor of 1.3 is quite objectionable and wouldn't support this without substantive discussion. Chair Nielsen- there is a policy on here about the graduate GEAR, can link. This is gone, has retired. Departments if they want to have writing as a requirement can add that, but no longer required by Chancellor's Office. GEOC courses do have 4,000 word requirement, but no requirement to include reading/writing pedagogy so there is a distinction here. Not all courses would want to be certified because of intensive work that would be required with individual students. Appreciate feedback on K-factor of 1.3, will add in more details about that.

iii. 21-22 CIC 50 will be sent to ExCom for email vote

r. [21-22 CIC 55: General Education, Overlay and Code \(GEOC\) Framework \[PDF\]](#)

i. Skipped due to time constraints, will be sent to ExCom for email vote

7. Discussion

a. *Revising the anti-racism policy (20-21 BAS 2) - see draft [21-22 FDEC 4](#)*

i. Skipped due to time constraints, will include on next ExCom agenda

b. [Senate support for a Mills College cohort](#)

i. Skipped due to time constraints, will include on next ExCom agenda

8. Academic Senate [4/26/22](#) draft agenda (14:22-14:32)

- a. Chair Nielsen - still have several items on today's agenda; several are big and complicated, but wondering if people would be willing to take email vote on these because of time constraints. In particular, the GEAR and FEOC Framework update - a lot of time and effort went into these and would like to have these out publicly to have more time for discussion and to vote on them. No objections.
- b. M/S -Smith/Hopkins to approve agenda pending approval from email vote





CALIFORNIA STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
E A S T B A Y

## ACADEMIC SENATE

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate>

510-885-3671

- c. /P - unanimous consent; agenda pending email vote approval
  - d. Returned to [Item q](#)
9. Adjournment (14:32)