



ACADEMIC SENATE

MEETING DATE: Tuesday, April 9, 2024, 12:45-2:30pm via Zoom

[PLEASE CLICK HERE FOR ZOOM LINK](#) (opens 12:30pm)

Meeting ID: 956 9552 9684

Passcode: 118310

APPROVED MINUTES

Senators Present: Alex Makarevich, Amy June Rowley, Andrew Kelly, Arran Phipps, Ayona Chatterjee, Chandra Ganesh, Christina Chin-Newman, Dana Rucker, Donna Wiley, Duke Austin, Erik Helgren, Fay Zhong, Hongmin Li, Ian Pollock, Jenny O, Jerome Narvaez, John Tan, Kate Bell, Kathleen Wong Lau, Kaumudi Misra, Kevin Pina, Kim Greer, Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Lan Wang, Li Zou, Lisa Handworker, Maureen Scharberg, Meiling Wu, Michael Lee, Michael Schmeltz, Michelle Rippey, Michelle St. George, Murray Horne, Nina Haft, Paul Carpenter, Sarah Borjas, Sara McDaniel, Sarah Nielsen, Stephanie Alexander, Talya Kemper, Terry Buttchen, Tristan Garcia, Vanessa Yingling, Vibha Puri, Wendy Rummerfield, ASI CLASS Elijah-Immanuel Quineri, ASI CSCI Charan Reddy Doolam

Guests: Mark Robinson, Emilia Ianeva, Chandra Khan, Kelley Ramos, Andy Dobbin, Julie Mielke, Ethel Nicdao, Joshua Kerr, Patricia Jennings, Balvinder Kumar, Lan Wang, Bruce Simon, Michael Rowley, Andrea Lum, Linda Ivey, Kevin Kaatz, Josh Russell, Ana Garcia-Nevarez, Jeff Newcomb, Jason Singley, Sophie Bloch, Gretchen Reeve, Nancy White, Rick Rader, Stephanie Seitz, Wendy Ng, Karen Mucci, Christopher Moreman

Senators Absent: Cathy Sandeen, Jennifer Sherwood, Michelle Gravier, Monique Manopoulos, Patrick Fleming, Ryan Heryford, Sharon Radcliff, Somak Paul, Trinie Dalton, ASI CBE Tanya Gupta, ASI CEAS Teresa Perez-Reyes

1. [Land acknowledgment](#) (short version) Christina Chin-Newman
2. Approval of the agenda

Move: Michael Schmeltz Second: Michelle St. George

Christina Chin-Newman - Any discussion? This is the time to move the order of anything. One thing coming in, I forgot to put in earlier: Kevin Kaatz Director of GE has a time certain for the GEOC Framework CIC 43, I will add that in there. Time certain for item 9.f. at 1:30pm. Any other changes? Anyone opposed? We'll use this agenda.

3. Approval of [3/19/24](#) minutes

Move: Sarah Nielsen Second: Jenny O

Christina Chin-Newman - Any Discussion? Anyone opposed to using this agenda? Ok, looks good.

4. **Reports:**

a. [Report](#) of the Chair

Christina Chin-Newman - We've had some complicated email discussion that actually was over spring break. And I apologize because, actually, faculty are not supposed to be working over spring break. I had initiated something before spring break that I thought might be a simple online vote. But actually, it was more complicated. So what happened was, we did approve. Out of 3 course proposals that were proposing to remove their initial request to make their class a 'W' writing intensive class. We approved the English one, but then there were some questions about the two philosophy classes. So those are still on our agenda, and we'll talk about them today.

I put in some election news, there is also something a little complicated. And unfortunately, we didn't catch this error earlier. And in one of the college elections for CBE. There was someone running who is not eligible because they were actually already on the Senate. And so then we were concerned that the results wouldn't be true results, because all of the votes cast for that person might have gone to somebody else. So we're actually just redoing that one only, the Senators from CBE.

There's some info in Senate relevant to Senate and the Standing Committees, to figuring out who will be the chairs of them, and these people are members of Senate. There will be the opportunity for Senators continuing or incoming to can for Senate Officer or for one of the five at-large ExCom positions. Those are elected by Senators to serve in the Senate for 24-25. Any questions about any of this so far?

And for the last part for my report there were a few things I wanted to say. I did just want to reiterate what I talked about last time, which was, even though we may be discussing the possibility of criticizing the President and her professional performance that we always want to make sure not to dehumanize her or treat her in a sexist way because she's a woman. So we're still allowed to disagree with her professional decisions, right? And that's okay to ask questions of someone who's your executive leader.

What we don't wanna do is go into those more personal things that are not related to her performance, and that's for any leader. So, for example, like someone's hair style, their height, their weight, how attractive they are. Things like that is not relevant to someone's performance. But if you have questions about their decisions that they've made as a leader, it's okay to ask questions.

And so I also have an important message that I wanted to talk about today. Reflecting over the past year something I've heard from lots of faculty members and actually other committee members as well, like administrators and students, is that we have a core value on campus of civil discourse. So I feel like civil

discourse, speaking diplomatically or respectfully to other people, is just a key value that we really feel is part of what the community at Cal State East Bay is all about.

And so I would just say to administrators, just to be careful about how you talk to the person who is in the role of the Senate chair. And this isn't because, a full professor is a more important person, or just that they're a nice person or something like that. But what does that person represent? Right? That person was serving in the role of the Academic Senate chair. And so that person is the voice of the faculty. And so you just want to be careful that you're not speaking to them in a demeaning way or a disrespectful way, because that could be interpreted as not respecting shared governance.

This is something that I observed happening to my predecessor, Sarah Nielsen, when she was Senate chair. And then this also happened to me recently at the FAC meeting before spring break. I don't want to see things go downhill anymore. So I just wanted to say this isn't acceptable.

The last thing I wanted to address was this feedback that I did receive and it was not offered in a very constructive or kind way. It wasn't compassionate, but in my role as a middle aged person who is a leader, I'm always open to feedback and improving how I run meetings and how I deal with people. Listening to what they said, I was shocked to realize I had offended at least three people, perhaps many more. The specific thing was when I talked about a vote of no confidence, and it was perceived by some people that I was like smiling and laughing, that I was somehow really advocating for this and happy about it. And you know that is not the truth. I've said this before.

The only feelings I feel are either dread or sadness about questioning our President's leadership to the degree that some faculty are considering having a vote of no confidence.

So I just wanted to also share as a human being, as a Chinese American person, it is very difficult for me to be in this role where I'm questioning someone who is my superior, who has more power than I have, who is sort of my elder. And so I may have smiled because I was uncomfortable talking about this topic.

It's not really acceptable in my culture and as someone of my gender to express a lot of anger, especially to someone in this kind of setting. I think I may have sighed because it's difficult and I wanted to have more time to figure out what I wanted to say, but I understand. Maybe a sigh could be interpreted by someone like an eye roll or something. It's difficult to be in the position of Senate Chair this year.

So I apologize if I have offended you. And you know I'm imperfect. I'd be the first person to say that. I'm just trying my best here to represent the voice of the faculty. And again, the faculty have many different opinions, just like about anything. I think perhaps there's been this impression because there have been a lot of faculty who have come in confidence and talked to me about topics they are not comfortable talking about in public, about their dissatisfaction with administration, that I personally am somehow responsible for all that dissatisfaction, or am making it up, or something. But when I look at the results of the survey, I feel like they are mostly negative. But I did want to take this time today to

elevate the voices of some of the more positive sort of voices of faculty members. And so what I'm hearing from some faculty members is that they definitely don't wanna have a vote of no confidence. They like the President. They might say something like, we feel optimistic with our President, that if we work together with her we can tackle these sort of problems of enrollment and things like that.

You know they're fans of Future Directions, that she works really hard, coming to coffee hours and all kinds of events that you know, prior presidents have not really done and so they are politely asking maybe you could connect the dots and just let us know about the big picture or the long term vision or plan. Just so we understand what's in store for the next two years or five years, because it's just been really hard for everyone with these last two semesters having to pivot with the changes to the schedule at the last minute. And so for this I'm just speaking, I've never been department chair but my heart goes out to the department chairs. I know it's been very difficult for them also to our lecturer faculty with losing their livelihoods.

And also the students being uncertain about getting classes or not having enough classes and people advising them. It's hard for everyone. And that's just all that people are saying. And it's not meant as a personal attack. This is just that there is low morale for many people. That's all. Okay? So those are my comments as the Senate chair today. Did anyone have any questions for me?

Lisa Handwerker - I just want to thank you for saying all of those things. I really appreciate you bringing them all out. The complexities of being on this campus, being women, WOC, other diversities, I really applaud you for that. Thank you.

[Talya Kemper: Christina I have really appreciated your leadership in debate and on campus.]

[Kyzyl Fenno-Smith: Thank you Chair Chin-Newman.]

[Jenny O: Thank you for your vulnerability, Christina. As an Asian-Canadian, I can relate to the discomfort in being in a position where I am questioning the work performance of "superiors". I have my own nervous behavioral expressions of this, one which also is laughing/giggling when I'm really uncomfortable.]

[Sara McDaniel: No questions, just admiration for you!]

[Duke Austin: Agreed! Thank you, Chair Chin-Newman! I also appreciate your leadership.]

[Kevin Pina: Thank you so much for all you do and providing leadership through these difficult and uncertain times. You are an inspiration!]

[GUEST Michael Rowley: Thank you, Christina, for the excellent modeling of leadership.]

[Ian Pollock: Yes]

Christina Chin-Newman - Thank you to Lisa, who is my colleague. I know her outside of Senate too.

- b. Report of the President - Per Provost Greer, President Sandeen is in D.C. for Advocacy Day. ASI President Nolan Calara may be there also.
- c. Report of the Provost

Provost Greer - There is a big agenda today. My only update is to let Senate know I will be sending out a call later this week, because as you know Dr. Kevin Brown who is director of Graduate Studies has a sabbatical this fall. I would like to know if other faculty are interested in filling in for one semester. I am obviously happy to answer any questions.

Christina Chin-Newman - I'm wondering if Senator Donna wanted to ask her question? We did receive some questions about the structure of Academic Affairs without the Dean of APS, including what Mitch Watnik is Associate Dean of. For example, who do people report to for things such as advising?

Provost Greer - My request is to come back and do a fuller report. I understand that question, and if I could do a little research about the changing of Academic Services at the next ExCom meeting and at the next or the last Senate meeting?

Christina Chin-Newman - Yes, that would be a good idea. There is uncertainty so that communication would be good.

Donna Wiley - Yes, that would be great.

- d. Report of the University Diversity Officer

Kathleen Wong (Lau) - Only one major thing to report and keep on your radar. Our Belong@EastBay campus climate survey is active. We have people tabling T-TH to help promote participation and in the Dining Commons. Students may see a Canvas announcement about this while the survey runs from yesterday through April 26th. We have a goal of 30% response rate. Students are usually the most difficult to get to participate. We have TShirts to give out. There has been an announcement from the President and me as well. I would appreciate you sharing it with students in your classes, there is the incentive of a TShirt and other swag. Funding for that was from a Diversity grant to encourage students to participate in different activities. We are giving out some swag to faculty who see a lot of students. We also want faculty and staff to respond. If there are any questions about the survey, and how to access it, or any questions about confidentiality, qualtrics, etc., let me know.. We only track whether individuals have taken the survey. We are preserving confidentiality of respondents, the data is stripped from the login, and we only keep the qualitative portions. We contracted with Rankin Associates because of their academic background and because we own the items ourselves and can run them without using the consultants. We took out questions not useful or actionable, added some based on the President's Equity Council and based on current events national and international. Anyone take it yet? Please take the survey. Thank you Ian. That's great. Any questions about the survey?

Christina Chin-Newman - Thanks for all your hard work on that.

Kathleen Wong (Lau) - Thank you and, Christina. I want to thank you for your comments that you made about leadership and critique. Just to share, I'm the person that made the critique during FAC and so I

appreciate your responding to it. And I apologize for maybe the, I'm trying to think maybe the venue I think in the moment I was asked directly what the comment was, and I could have done it in a different way, or maybe even privately. But thank you for your leadership. I do appreciate it.

Christina Chin-Newman - Thanks I accept the apology since we'll be working together in other settings, and it's nice not to have that hanging over us.

e. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Paul Carpenter - Final statewide meetings are in the middle of May for Plenary sessions. Some interim sessions are this month. Big news, last Tuesday the Chancellor's Office sent a memo to Campus Presidents memo about changes to Title V and the common pathways to GE. There was some consternation over how that memo was distributed. April 22nd is the deadline to respond. GEOC meets on April 16th to respond, and the timelines are pretty tight. De facto, it outlines changes to the common GE pathway. I will leave the rest to Kevin to talk about. Other than that, nothing else to report.

Christina Chin-Newman - Another aspect of shared governance is how the Chancellor's Office interacts with us. This is a top-down dynamic and two weeks is not enough time for people to give feedback.

f. Report of Student Government

ASI CLASS Elijah-Immanuel Quineri - Nothing major to report. We are prepping for elections as well as what was Spring Mayhem (Jamboree) and figuring out how things will go on for new Senators. For more info, please see the document view. The Senators and I have been trying to promote Alumni Connect, a program run by Alumni Association. We have sent emails to academic chairs and we could use your help in promoting the app. This is an opportunity for students to be mentored by alumni. At the moment it is in beta testing. Sign up

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fM0kfRWdYpr1i6XzWVtjGzC2voHKeujePhbfEXdE1-g/edit?pli=1>

Christina Chin-Newman - It's exciting to be working together. Any questions for Senator Elijah?

g. Report of the CFA

GUEST Jeff Newcomb - Thank you, Chair Chin Newman, and thank you again for your leadership through all of this difficult time this week. For CFA, the spring General Assembly being conducted virtually on decker. Numerous workshops and opportunities to address CFA's concerns for racial and social justice student enrollment shifts. Developing a strike fund that's for the next time, and choosing a contract bargaining team, some discussion about electing rather than appointing that bargaining team. And significantly addressing the deep and disruptive cuts to instruction now in progress on several CSU campuses, and of course, including our own, so more on that to come for more information on the Assembly week programs. And if you'd like to join any of these workshops or discussions you must register and go to CalFAC.org.

In the coming weeks members of our Executive Board will be meeting with regional elected officials, both locally and in Sacramento for Lobby day, which is April 20th. Our purpose is to seek out and affirm

progressive support for CSU friendly initiatives, and to again urge greater transparency and responsiveness and allocating CSU funds.

And finally, we are conducting here a general, all member meeting on April 19th, from 1- 2 PM. Via zoom. And that's to help to learn more about our CFA membership benefits and to share plans and engage with the ever present need for activism and to discuss the deep cuts. Once again the deep cuts and instruction that impacts students. Faculty shared governance. And this university's reputation. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman - Any questions? Thank you for all your work, and very interesting about electing the Bargaining Team.

5. Election:

- a. Sustainability Liaison Officer (SULO)
 - i. [Sharon Radcliff](#)

Christina Chin-Newman - Sharon Radcliff is the current SULO who has been leading the committee on Sustainability. I move this to a vote, as to whether you approve. Since this is an uncontested election, we elect by acclamation. Sharon is at a conference today, and I will let her know we were enthusiastic about electing her to her second term.

6. Information Items:

- a. Branding initiative presentation - Evelyn Buchanan, VP of University Advancement, and Josh Russell, Chief Communications and Marketing Officer (**time certain: 1:00 pm**)

Christina Chin-Newman - Apologies for the late start. Please introduce yourself, you've been tirelessly going to different meetings and catching us up on the stage you are at with this.

GUEST Josh Russell - Thanks for the opportunity. I am Josh Russell, I am the Chief Communications and Marketing Officer here. This rebranding has been a fun and interesting process, and I will share highlights. Some of you have seen a version of this before. A lot of the messaging is important to highlight with visuals. To Christina's point, as soon as I am done, I have 3 questions I want to pose to this group to help inform the process from where we are at to where we are going. Feel free to email me with direct feedback.

GUEST Josh Russell - There are a lot of reasons for rebranding which enhances our reputation, really connecting with and understanding who our audiences are. It brings credibility for the story we are telling. It provides an opportunity to recalibrate and feel the sense of being comfortable and confident in our own skin. It is an opportunity to identify and really tell our story, about what makes us unique and what should students come for? What makes them stay? Our goal is to increase enrollment and retention. We've been working with VisionPoint for the last year on this, and there's a number of things they are delivering as part of this partnership. Everything on the left is completed, and on the right is being done. This shows how we engage folks in the research. Activities, questionnaires, brand audits, focus groups looking at competitors, workshops, looking at who the audiences are. We are really taking the broad approach to get feedback. We've plotted ourselves in this brand archetype. What's our opportunity to carve out our own

niche, identity? Some of the Universities nearby, based on Jungian Psychology's 12 types, some of them are talking about themselves. Some of you have heard me or the President describe us as a combo of Dunkin Donuts and NASA. Something we've learned through the research process is that Pioneers resonates, but we will also introduce a new mascot that is not Pioneer Pete, but instead a feathery or furry animal indigenous to the land. We are engaging students in the voting for that. I wanted to speak out about our brand positioning statement, which highlights the five attributes.

We've got a lot of language, details for our brand pillars. I thought this was cool and worthy of reading, as we are developing out the support copy. Could be in radio, commercial, lots of purposes, captures who we are and where we're going.

On this side of the bay. We don't wait for opportunities. We create them. We don't entertain doubts, make excuses back down from challenges, dwell on limitations, or stagnate in our careers.

That's not who we are at Cal State East Bay. We take charge of the future and all its uncertainty. Just starting will help you choose your path with a hundred plus degree programs looking for fulfilling career. We have connections with the top Bay Area employers who can't do it alone. Our inclusive community will support you from day one, ready to change your life. You'll have the opportunities of a top notch progressive research institution.

So if you think you're too busy for college worried about the obstacles or find yourself in a standstill in your career. There's a place for you on this side of the Bay, Cal State, East Bay without question.

[Michael Lee: The logo still looks like Texas.]

GUEST Josh Russell - We presented it to our student ambassadors and tour guides, and all 25 of them want to be featured in our campaigns! This sample design, when we replace the light poles it will be conceptually based on this. These are stock photos to give you a sense of the campaign that is bold, authentic to who we are. Some of the swag we're launching, we're talking to ASI about idea of students doing a design contest for sale in the bookstore and giveaways. You can see how this plays out visually in different contexts. So what is the timing of all this? Our plan is to make Convocation the official launch of the new brand, including introduction of the new mascot. It's really exciting. As soon as that's done, we move into a whole new enrollment campaign, and a whole new visual refresh of the website. Lots done, lots still to do. The feedback you have all provided has been really helpful. I'll drop into chat some questions and you can email your responses.

[Michael Lee: Does that mean that all those other things happen on the other side of the Bay? I worry that the "Not on this side of the Bay" is meme worthy - can be subverted. I think Senator's made the same points last time.]

[Andrew Kelly: "Not on this side of the Bay" strikes me as a negative tone. Particularly in comparison to the previous "rising"]

[GUEST Stephanie Seitz: About how much money have the consultants been paid so far?]

[Tristan Garcia: Great question! Especially given our budget issues]

[Lisa Handwerker: Is there a way to make the logo a positive one rather than a “no, not... ?”]

[Kate Bell (she/they): As a communication scholar I am also very worried about the use of the negative on a slogan.]

[GUEST Linda Ivey: Especially when the “not on this side of the bay” is in big black letters and the introductory comments are much less prominent.]

[GUEST Stephanie Seitz: In case my previous comment gets missed, how much did the consultants cost?]

[Kevin Pina, CSUEB_Dept. of Communication: Enrollment...not on this side of the bay!]

[GUEST Stephanie Seitz: Look forward to someone reporting back on that!]

[Vanessa Yingling: Can we get those numbers? This is not very transparent]

[Ian Pollock: The cost has come up in several meetings and should be addressed by now]

Meiling Wu - I like the idea you have invited students to participate in the branding process. For your division, do you have interns or student assistants in your branch?

GUEST Josh Russell - Yes, thank you for asking. Four students from COMM dept who have played an integral part have seen all the drafts, provided feedback and drafts. Our students are essentially running the CSUEB TikTok page. We've got videos on the street, and students really involved.

Michael Lee - Did anyone raise the issue that 'Not on this side of the Bay' is meme worthy and can be subverted? It could be provocative to the mischievous and those who look at the down side of things. Did this come up in your focus groups? Some mentioned that the logo looks like Texas. Given it was mentioned the last time, could you comment on those two things?

GUEST Josh Russell - I think you can take a lot of things and distort them. We looked at it like there's a boldness to it, let's just own it. Also make sure it is in the context of, in response to potential objections and taken in a positive way. Clearly in different conversations Texas has been brought up. Other states have been brought up too. We are trying to pull back on some versions that look more like it. The idea is that the logo is going to have lots of different versions. We've been talking a lot to our patterns, and have made some adjustments to pull back from it feeling like Texas. It is from the story we'll be telling, I don't think that will be an issue. Our target audience are current prospective students, who have not shared that reference at all. We are keeping in mind who the end users are, and this does resonate strongly with them.

Christina Chin-Newman - We'll take one more comment. I will email comments from chat to you.

Duke Austin - Well if there's time for only one more question, I'd like to elevate Stephanie Seitz's question and then I can email my own comment.

GUEST Josh Russell - I don't know how much was spent since it was all in place before I got here. I don't have an amount to give you.

Christina Chin-Newman - Thank you so much for sharing with us what is going on. I can't remember if it wasn't in a previous presentation, but I heard you explain how the star was related to the Latin motto, so that part I hadn't realized why there was a star, but I think it's through adversity to the stars plural. So maybe if there were more stars it wouldn't seem like the Lone Star State. That just seemed like kind of a simple thing.

Duke Austin - Because the reference to Texas keeps coming up, I was a student at UT in 1990 and their rebranding was 'We're Texas!' Is the similarity known or thought about?

GUEST Josh Russell - First time I've heard about that.

[GUEST Josh Russell:

1. What aspect or aspects of the brand launch do you think will be most effective in connecting with new or prospective students?
 2. What aspects of the presentation/ brand launch resonated most with you specifically?
 3. Any suggestions or ideas for us so we can ensure the most successful brand launch possible?
- You can email your feedback to josh.russell@csueastbay.edu

[Ian Pollock: California has a star on their flag]

[Duke Austin | SOC | he/him: "The university's most recent capital campaign, "We're Texas," ran from 1997-2004 and raised \$1.63 billion."

<https://news.utexas.edu/2008/10/17/the-university-of-texas-at-austin-announces-3-billion-capital-campaign/>

[Kathleen Wong(Lau), she, her: FYI, the Rising in the East tag line was very meme worthy for some APIs in the system, FYI, even with the President being Japanese American.]

Christina Chin-Newman - Thank you. We'll be moving on, we have a big agenda. Thanks for coming here.

- b. [23-24 CAPR 24](#): CAPR Representative from Academic Programs and Services

Christina Chin-Newman - This is an update that Mitch Watnik is serving as the administrative representative on CAPR, replacing the Dean who previously was Maureen Scharberg.

- c. [23-24 BEC 11](#): Convening of Task Force on Equity in Academic Policies

Christina Chin-Newman - This one changes this to two staff positions. We are hoping to have this ready for the task force to hold an organizational meeting this spring.

7. Business Items - One Reading by Default:¹

¹ Consider moving to approve all items in this category together at the same time. This new category was created when changes to the standing rules were passed in [23-24 BEC 16](#) on 2/20/24, in order to shorten the journey of these non-controversial curricular items

- a. [23-24 CIC 45A](#): 2 Course Approvals from CIC Meeting 3/18/24: PHIL 361 & PHIL 362
 - i. [Email discussion of 23-24 CIC 45](#)

Christina Chin-Newman - This is a new category, curricular items with one reading.

Move: Amy June Rowley Second: Ian Pollock

Christina Chin-Newman - Any discussion about these two classes? Some senators read email over Spring Break, sorry for the unanticipated outcome, there ended up being some discussion about these classes. One point is that it changed about Writing Intensive Class. Some wondered why four instead of three unit classes? Lots of discussion. This is common for courses to change the number of units. Amy June, Sarah want to say anything? Controversial if you added on at the last minute, but if we are removing the W designation I had thought that wasn't controversial. Are people ready to vote?

Meiling Wu - My comment, the problem with these two classes they originally raised to four units because they were going to add W to this course. Now they are dropping the W, so the issue is why this course is still four units. The common way of looking at it, without W it drops back to three units. If not, it needs a more convincing argument about content. So this is the issue.

Sarah Nielsen - Thank you Chair Christina. I want to mention as background that the grad writing assessment, all campuses must implement the GVAR requirement. New listing is that GVAR classes can only be three units. The caveat in the Chancellor's Office policy is that four units are allowed if the course is in a major, and it is limited to major enrollment. PHIL removed the W because of those new constraints. The four unit increase was approved all the way up the chain of approvals. Chair Amy June of CIC mentioned that treating these differently from others this year is not fair. I wanted to add this to the context.

Christina Chin-Newman - We haven't gotten to CIC 39 with GVAR changes.

Meiling Wu - Tristan mentioned that when we increased from three to four, we were talking about contact hours. The content needs to increase to meet this.

Amy June Rowley - I'd like to jump in real quick. These are two separate issues. I can't exactly remember if it's this specific class, we might do well to talk to PHIL Chair. We talked in GEOC about courses with heavy writing requirements. We talked about needing more courses with W. We discussed whether it was appropriate to offer support to students in courses that should have been four units anyway. GEOC approved the increase up to four. The Writing Committee looked at other classes, and thought there was enough direct instruction related to writing, so they didn't feel like they needed the W requirement. Writing instruction approach is the issue, there weren't

many courses approved for W but the course is already intensive. We are talking about separate issues, and conflating them.

Ian Pollock - Adding a unit on because of the intensity or modality of instruction, I would say there are other mechanisms to say what happens in the classroom (K Factor) for instance MUSIC uses a different KFactor that addresses the workload of that course.

<https://www.csueastbay.edu/aps/academic-programs/curriculum-development-new/cpm/class-table.html>

Ian Pollock - Instructor work load should not be more units for students. But if students are in class for more hours, that's fine. When we deviate from the three unit model, we have problems with transferring courses in. If someone took a three unit course, they couldn't transfer it in. The three unit issue is a compatibility issue. We should be looking at workload agreements in place to look at the way that is being dealt with.

Amy June Rowley - Can we table this discussion until Chris shows up?

Christina Chin-Newman - Meiling, do you want to second this?

Meiling Wu - Yes, I second the motion.

Christina Chin-Newman - Chris said he could come after 2pm, he'll be here later. We can have a formal vote on tabling, or do this informally. Let's move along.

[Linda Ivey: Changing k-factor for W courses is a really intriguing idea.]

Move to untable: Jenny O Second: Kyzyl Fenno-Smith

Christina Chin-Newman - We had some more discussion before you arrived. Senator Meiling, do you want to summarize your question?

Meiling Wu - We are discussing the dropping of the W, and increasing the units being related to contents of course. Some people talked about KFactor, but that is not my question. Why increase to four units? What is the content you've increased and contact hours that students need this one extra unit?

GUEST Christopher Moreman - Just got here from SFO. Thanks. You will hopefully remember a bunch of revisions to our program, essentially to do a couple of things. We've provided a completely online pathway to the major. In doing so, we've reduced the overall number of units for the major, and changes to the number of units to certain required courses. PHIL 310 was approved as an UDC course. These two have two proposed changes, an increase like with the Ethics course. Partway through, we learned W courses need to be only three units. We believe it is more important to have these courses be four units so we dropped the W. We've talked about this at every level of GE, CIC and everyone approved it along the chain. At CIC, the President's appointee was the only one to object. I am a little surprised to have all these questions. Ethics PHIL 310 and these 361 and 362, History of Phil are prob the most core to the PHIL major. By

raising them from three to four units, this allows instructors to delve more deeply into content, develop content. Students meet 25% more, and time is spent developing these areas of PHIL. What else can I say? In terms of changing the units, we have one seminar course for majors, and in revising our program we reduced the number of units from three to one. There's a calculation of how much time students are spending in different courses. You can imagine the four unit courses delve more into core content. The one unit in seminar they can work together as majors, not with all the GE students who are in the rest of our courses rather than having students in a three unit core course and three unit seminar. We spent time redesigning the major, and part of the programmatic changes is how we allocated the time/hours/units working toward the goals of the major.

Amy June Rowley - The biggest question is the W.

GUEST Christopher Moreman - We dropped it. The course has never had the W. Nowhere in the proposal did we ever tie the W to the change in units.

Tristan Garcia - I just want to add, in CIC we discussed how these are writing intensive classes. Dr. Moreman dropped the W because of the three units requirement of the Chancellor's Office. That was discussed thoroughly in CIC. This change is to have fewer courses, yet still writing intensive.

GUEST Christopher Moreman - Courses will remain writing intensive, just not officially fulfill the W requirement.

Christina Chin-Newman - Does Senate wish to call the question? Or to move the vote to online, to table?

Move: Kate Bell (calls question) Second: Duke Austin

Christina Chin-Newman - Any objections to calling the question? It's ok if it doesn't pass.

Christina Chin-Newman - 26 Yes, 2 No, 7 abstentions. The motion passes. Thanks all for carefully considering and voting.

GUEST Christopher Moremen - Thanks everyone. I am surprised anyone would vote no, curricular changes should be department's purview.

Christina Chin-Newman - Thanks. This does bring up a question, maybe for next year in Senate to consider, which is what is the role of a Presidential appointee on a standing committee? For example, on one of the standing committees, when the chair was not able to attend and had a conflict, the Presidential appointee ran the meeting. Is that their role, or do they help take notes or minutes, for example, or are they a somewhat different category? These may be some bigger questions.

Amy June Rowley - I know I am looking at time, we have several items that are still first reading. May I move to bundle the vote for the catalog issues? H, G, J, I, A, K all the CICs.

Christina Chin-Newman - In terms of where we are CIC 31/FAC 14. Options, if we do nothing, the Senate often suspends standing rules at last meeting, and we vote. We could have a really quick first reading now and then vote. We could try to do this online, better with discussion. No group email discussion but using a google doc, those are the sort of things I would think about. First we should deal with CIC 31/FAC 14. We could vote online on this on Friday with the other thing we will be voting on. Otherwise by default we'll discuss this one.

Move: Amy June Rowley Second: Ian Pollock

Christina Chin-Newman - Any further discussion? This is the concept that faculty supervising MA theses should get more uniform compensation across depts. Let's vote. 29 Yes, 6 abstentions. The motion CIC 31/FAC 14 passes without dissent.

8. Business Items - 2nd reading:²

- a. [23-24 CR 7](#): Updates to the Policy and Procedures for Organization and Administration of Centers and Institutes

Move: Erik Helgren Second: Jenny O

Christina Chin-Newman - Any questions? We may have current and past CR chairs who may respond if you have detailed questions. I feel like a lot of thought went into how to revise these procedures. It hasn't been done that often, all the steps people take. If no objections, let's vote. 32 Yes, 3 abstentions. The motion passes without dissent.

[Ian Pollock: It might also be advisable to create or revise one of the classifications]

[Ian Pollock: Like 1 SCU but 1.3 k-factor]

- b. [23-24 CAPR 21/CIC 37](#): New BS in Data Science

Move: Erik Helgren Second: Stephanie Alexander

Christina Chin-Newman - We have the Department Chair here if you have any questions. We discussed this previously. Shall we move to a vote? 32 Yes, 1 abstention. Motion passes without dissent.

- c. [23-24 FAC 12](#): Interpretation of MPP eligibility as University Faculty

Move: Duke Austin Second: Sara McDaniel

² During second reading, documents may be amended and voted on (or referred or tabled if they are not ready). For discussion of controversial topics, the order of speakers would alternate between 3 in favor and 3 against.

Amy June Rowley - Can we combine 12 and 13 together?

Christina Chin-Newman - Our parliamentarian is not here today.

Duke Austin - FAC sent these as two separate docs, and so I'd like to speak in favor of keeping them separate.

Christina Chin-Newman - We'll keep them separate. The first item is a memo, where FAC is issuing an interpretation. 27 Yes, 6 abstentions. Motion passes without dissent.

d. [23-24 FAC 13](#): Constitution and Bylaws Amendments - Faculty with MPP appointments

Move: Duke Austin Second: Kevin Pina

Christina Chin-Newman - What is different with this, Senate is a gatekeeper for this one. The question is not whether you agree, it is whether it should go to the Regular Faculty to decide whether administrators should be included with the privileges of University Faculty, or should we call them Administrative Members of the University Faculty so they cannot run for office. Any questions? Let's move to a vote. Per standing rules, if your zoom reactions are not working, use your chat. If you are not comfortable, we could move to a secret ballot. I wasn't thinking that was needed, but you're welcome to do that if you prefer.

Christina Chin-Newman - 28 Yes, 3 abstentions. The motion passes without dissent and moves to the ballot for tenure-line faculty to consider.

e. [23-24 BEC 18](#): Constitution Amendments to Ratification Requirements for Amending Bylaws and Constitution

Move: Kyzyl Fenno-Smith Second: Kevin Pina

Christina Chin-Newman - To make a long story short, right now the voting requirement to change the Bylaws is somewhat determined by turnout of people who come. This proposed change would be to make it a percentage of eligible voters. We don't need to agree or approve right now, but do you think it is important enough to put on the ballot for all tenure-line faculty to decide to change?

Erik Helgren - I am not in favor of this resolution coming out of BEC. I think it is a solution looking for a problem. The background says it's hard to get something passed. The votes are there when the votes are there. This is not justified to be coming to Senate. I am not a fan of the complicated explanation. It doesn't make a simple solution. I urge my fellow senators not to vote yes on this.

Christina Chin-Newman - Thanks. The history there is it used to be a simple majority as long as you had majority turnout. President Morishita had a turnout requirement. The broken part is if you are voting no on it, you could be helping it to pass by lowering the threshold to 0.5. If it is not bothering people, like the electoral college, then we do not need to change it.

Provost Greer - Maybe I am having trouble with the math. I want to follow up with Senator Helgren's comments. It looks like a smaller and smaller number of faculty would be needed to approve something. Chair Chin-Newman, you and I have talked about this. I am looking at the minimum of $\frac{1}{4}$ of eligible voters, and if that is not the result, I would withdraw my concern.

Christina Chin-Newman - This is not time-sensitive, so if people want more time, we can postpone.
GUEST Michael Rowley can speak to this.

GUEST Michael Rowley - I worked with Chair Chin-Newman, please see the comparison table of current and proposed. [Comparison table

[-https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rP-DKtTbLJYiB1944UijXPyy1oEASkkg7nrLbrdoy8/edit?usp=sharing\]](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rP-DKtTbLJYiB1944UijXPyy1oEASkkg7nrLbrdoy8/edit?usp=sharing)

The problem is at the 50 or 51% mark, you need 34% of all eligible faculty. This prevents the jump from 50 - 51, where under the current version the percentage drops. Under the proposed system, it is a smooth step. A second benefit at the low end, under the current system where we see $\frac{1}{3}$ turnout and need $\frac{2}{3}$ approve. You could instead go with 25% turnout. So this moves it to a percent of voters, and a more solid baseline. Not based on eligible voters.

[Kevin Pina: Clearly put Michael]

Kaumudi Misra - Thank you Senator Rowley for that explanation. Wouldn't the majority be more than 25%? Am I understanding it?

GUEST Michael Rowley - Is the language "at least"?

Kaumudi Misra - Yes!

GUEST Michael Rowley - You all could propose to edit it to be +1.

Christina Chin-Newman - I think most are not at that level of detail.

Ian Pollock - I guess this issue, maybe ties into another one, we are always operating on a particular calendar. The problem that is behind this whole conversation is that the turnout is diminishing. My questions is why is the turnout diminishing? Why lower threshold, instead of asking how can we get the turnout we need? I am curious to what extent, have we looked at how turnout could be increased for these kinds of elections. I have talked with people not on Senate and who are not clear on role of Faculty Governancy, not aware of what Senate does and the role of participation. I am always shocked. Can we improve the election schedule so more are comfortable participating? At very end of the semester there is a pile of things to read and think about for the General Election. Maybe we could move to middle of the year instead? Maybe it will be more celebrated or engaged with. That's my main concern.

GUEST Michael Rowley - This doesn't lower threshold. It lowers it specifically between 50-51%. So yes, it does lower it in that range to smooth out the abrupt step between the turnout of 50% vs. 51% turnout.

Christina Chin-Newman - In the past, it was really hard to get things passed. We're supposed to do this every five years. People didn't understand all the changes, and trusted their colleagues to vote. We've

moved it to end of semester so it is not confused with elections. If we pass this, we could actually combine on the same ballot, because it wouldn't matter that there were many abstentions. We could change it to the beginning of the semester, though that is not so practical. Committees need time to come up with proposals. Does anyone want to call the question, or table?

Meiling Wu - I don't want to table because I want discussion to continue. Can we delay the voting via email to give Senators time to talk to their colleagues about what people would prefer? This is about Constitution & Bylaws change, so people need more time. I am not calling the question. Is there another way, best way to give people more time to decide later?

Christina Chin-Newman - Timeline: if we want it to get in at the end of this semester, we still have 2-3 weeks. Not a bad idea to move this to an online vote. Should I interpret that as your motion?

[Kevin Pina, CSUEB_Dept. of Communication: Under the current policy all you need is small percentage to NOT vote for a proposed change to fail. As such, under the current numbers not voting is the same as voting no.]

[GUEST Michael Rowley: Just a reminder that this vote is whether or not to send it to the university faculty for a vote, right? So, voting yes on this would achieve Meiling's purpose of getting input from the university faculty.]

Meiling - Yes, thank you!

Move: Meiling Wu Second: Ian Pollock

Christina Chin-Newman - This is to move it to an online vote. Ok, some are not sure. Yes means I want this to be an online vote Friday. No means we vote on it or we table it in this meeting. 18 Yes, 11 No, 5 abstentions. The majority wants to move this to an online vote.

- f. [23-24 CIC 31/FAC 14](#): Recommendation regarding compensation for supervision of master's theses and projects

Move: Kaumudi Misra Second: Jenny O

9. Business Items - 1st Reading:³

- a. [23-24 CIC 32](#): Recommendation regarding format review for master's theses⁴
- b. [23-24 CIC 33](#): Recommendation regarding graduate reinstatement policy⁵
- c. [23-24 CIC 36](#): Timeline Change for Minors⁵
- d. [23-24 CIC 39](#): GVAR Revisions⁵
- e. [23-24 FAC 11](#): Revisions to Policy for Compensation for Lecturer Service in the Academic Senate⁵

³ According to our standing rules, discussion at first readings should be limited to 10 minutes. A Senator can always move to extend discussion of an item by a certain number of minutes. We don't have enough time for 10 minutes for every item, so hopefully some items will go faster.

⁴ 3rd time on Senate agenda

⁵ 2nd time on Senate agenda

- f. [23-24 CIC 43](#): Revisions to the General Education, Overlay, and Code (GEOC) Framework⁶ (**time certain 1:30 PM**)

Move: Sarah Nielsen Second: Elijah-Immanuel Quineri

GUEST Kevin Kaatz - On page three of the document I put all listed changes. Some are blacked out too. GEOC was charged a few years ago with updating this every year. We wrapped that up in late January. As Paul mentioned, the Board of Trustees placed us under a new GE pattern. Some of this is contingency language. For example, Info Literacy was put back in. We updated sustainability outcomes. Nancy White and I invited faculty teaching in these areas to look at current learning outcomes and to update. A lot of language is directly from EO 1100. Some of that is unclear and not fitting to our campus in particular. Those are some of the changes we made on this.

Michael Lee - I'd like to ask if Kevin, I believe that this is a time sensitive issue because it needs to feature in our next 24-25 catalog. If that's the case, I propose we waive the first reading if Kevin feels appropriate to do so.

GUEST Kevin Kaatz - Yes, a good idea. We've already been contacted by catalog for updates on learning outcomes.

Michael Lee - I move to waive the first reading, and go straight on to 2nd reading.

Move: Michael Lee Second: Michelle St. George

Christina Chin-Newman - Any objections to waiving first reading? We can do a full vote. Any further discussion? If not, let's vote. Senators only use Zoom reactions. This is to approve the changes to our GE framework. I see 36 Yes, 1 abstention. The motion passes. Thanks, we really appreciate all your hard work on curricular work for Senate.

- g. [23-24 CIC 44](#): Updated Criteria for Second Composition Proposals in Curriculog⁶
h. [23-24 CIC 42](#): Description of New GE Area Breadth Requirement
i. [23-24 CAPR 25/CIC 48](#): Degree revision proposal, Computer Science MS
j. [23-24 CAPR 26/CIC 49](#): New degree concentration proposal (Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning), Computer Science MS
k. [23-24 CIC 46](#): Criteria for UWR Proposals in Curriculog

Christina Chin-Newman - Amy June, would you like to make your motion to waive the first reading for a bundle of CIC motions now?

Amy June Rowley - I would like to waive first reading for CIC 44, 42, 46.

Christina Chin-Newman - Waive first reading, then online vote?

Amy June Rowley - Sure.

Christina Chin-Newman - It's the ones that are CIC 44, 42, CAPR 25, CAPR 26, CIC 46.

Amy June Rowley - GHIJK. I am not sure about 32 and 33, not sure if they are catalog sensitive or not. They've all been sitting here for more than two meetings so they should all be put to an online vote.

Christina Chin-Newman - A-K? There are non-CIC ones in there.

Meiling Wu - FAC 11 is also time sensitive, so I want to be fair to all committees. If it is catalog sensitive, let's be clear. We only have two minutes.

Christina Chin-Newman - Would someone like to move to waive first reading for 10 items from A-K excluding CIC 43 which we already voted on, so waiving the first reading for these and moving them to an online vote.

Move: Amy June Rowley Second: Michelle St. George

Christina Chin-Newman - Any discussion? Anyone opposed to waiving first reading on these things and doing an online vote? I am seeing none. For that other item about the Constitutional amendments, that one needs to be voted on by Friday. So that will be an exception. But these other ones we could go through our normal process: 48 hours of discussion, google doc (no mass emails) and at least five days to online vote on that. I will check the calendar to see if we can put them on the same timeline. I need to check the Constitution & Bylaws. I am seeing no objections. These items will move to second reading.

- l. [23-24 FAC 9](#): Proposed Summer Calendars 2025-27 and Winter Calendars 2024-2027
- m. [23-24 FAC 15](#): Revised Student Evaluation of Learning Policy
- n. [23-24 FAC 16](#): Revised PSYC Department RTP Criteria for Professional Achievement

10. Discussion:

- a. How to handle backlog on Senate agenda

11. Roundtable⁶

12. Adjournment

Move: Kate Bell Second: Michelle St. George

⁶ You may make general announcements or ask any questions/bring up any issues not on the agenda.