

Tab 1

---

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**TO:** Members of the Academic Senate  
**FROM:** Jenny O, Chair, Academic Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Academic Senate Meeting Agenda  
**MEETING DATE:** Tuesday, April 15, 2025, 12:45-2:30pm via Zoom

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**Senators Present:** Alina Engleman, Amy June Rowley, Andrew Kelly, Andrew Yunker, Cathy Sandeen, Christina Chin-Newman, Christopher Palmore, Claire Valderama-Wallace, Dawna Komorosky, Donna Wiley, Duke Austin, Erica Baranski, Gretchen Reevy, Hongmin Li, Ja Won Lee, Jennifer Sherwood, Jenny O, Jessica Santone, Jiyoung Myung, Joshua Kerr, Kate Bell, Kathleen Wong(Lau), Kaumudi Misra, Kim Greer, Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Lan Wang, Levent Ertaul, Mary Fortune, Maureen Scharberg, Mia Livaudais, Meiling Wu, Michael Lee, Michael Rowley, Michelle Gravier, Michelle St. George, Murray Horne, Paul Carpenter, Ryan Heryford, Sara McDaniel, Sarah Taylor, Shubha Kashinath, Stephanie Alexander, Tammie Mosley, Tristan Garcia, Vish Hegde, ASI CLASS Joe Trujillo

**Guests:** Mark Robinson, Jennifer, Stephanie Seitz, Julie Glass, Rick Rader, Kevin Kaatz, Erik Helgren, Jennifer Aure, Danika LeDuc, Derek Aitken, Ethel Nicdao, Jeff Newcomb, Missy Wright, Sweetie Law, Cheryl Saelee, Kevin Brown, Rolando Munoz, Ayona Chatterjee

**Senators Absent:** Dana Rucker, Jerome Narvaez, John Tan, Michelle Rippy, Monika Eckfield, Sara Borjas, Terry Buttchen, Vibha Puri, ASI CBE Nidhi Sharma ASI CEAS Jaalam Jones

**1. Land acknowledgment (short version)**

- a. Senators, please rename yourself to include your group affiliation before your name (e.g., [college acronym], LIB, LEC, SSP, ALUM, STAFF, etc.)

**2. Approval of the agenda**

- a. There will be a motion to add this document from the Department of Theatre & Dance as an information item from the floor: [Theatre and Dance Department - Proposal and Testimonials](#)
- b. There will be a motion from the floor to add [24-25 FAC 21](#): Policy on the Appointment, Placement, and Evaluation of Coaches (business item; first reading)
- c. There will be a motion from the floor to add the following time-sensitive CAPR/CIC items and to bundle all or most agenda item 6 documents (default one-reading business items):
  - i. [24-25 CAPR 39/CIC 62](#): New Certificate: Human Resources Management
  - ii. [24-25 CAPR 40/CIC 63](#): New Certificate: Pre Law Studies
  - iii. [24-25 CAPR 38/CIC 61](#): New Concentration BS Business Administration: Financial Planning
  - iv. [24-25 CAPR 41/CIC 64](#): Multiple Subject Credential Revision

- d. AJ Rowley motioned to add the following four items to the agenda. Chair O clarified these would be added as a bundle to Item 6. AJ Rowley agreed and noted they are non-controversial. Alexander seconded.
  - i. [24-25 CAPR 39/CIC 62](#): New Certificate: Human Resources Management
  - ii. [24-25 CAPR 40/CIC 63](#): New Certificate: Pre Law Studies
  - iii. [24-25 CAPR 38/CIC 61](#): New Concentration BS Business Administration: Financial Planning
  - iv. [24-25 CAPR 41/CIC 64](#): Multiple Subject Credential RevisionApproved by unanimous consent.
- e. Austin motioned to add [24-25 FAC 21](#): Policy on the Appointment, Placement, and Evaluation of Coaches (business item; first reading) to agenda in order to get it through first and second reading before end of semester. Fenno-Smith seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.
- f. M Rowley motioned to add [Theatre and Dance Department - Proposal and Testimonials](#) to the agenda as an Information Item, noted was asked by Theatre and Dance faculty to share with Senate. St. George seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.
- g. Alexander motioned to postpone CAPR 34 to the Senate meeting on Apr 29. CAPR was unable to make the revisions suggested by Ex Com. Garcia seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.

### 3. Approval of [3/25/25](#) minutes

- a. Garcia motioned to approve. St. George seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.

### 4. Reports:

- a. [Report](#) of the Chair
  - i. [Timeline](#) for AY25-26 Administrative Officer searches
  - ii. Chair O summarized report items.
- b. Report of the President
  - i. Highlighted success of Welcome Day on Apr 12. Noted that this is a university-wide event, not just student recruitment staff. We tripled attendance this year!
  - ii. Incoming Provost Dr. Anthony Muscat begins July 1 and has already begun meeting with the Dean candidates.
  - iii. SF Bay Region Network update - more to come as the active planning is in progress.
- c. Report of the Provost
  - i. [Foundational Document for Focused Program Review Advisory Task Force](#)
  - ii. Directed Senators to review this linked foundational guiding document for the task force's work. The group has been working during two-hour weekly meetings. Expressed gratitude for the dedication and great work of the task force members. Noted that of the three tiers - retain, revise, and "teach-out". Provost noted that she added the word "Discontinuation" as a possibility for the third tier. Agreed that programs in the process of merging as a result of low-degree conferring programs process last year would not be reviewed at this time. Data dashboard has been shared campus-wide. Task force members have identified five data points that would direct them which programs to focus on: (1) unique student count (<11), (2) decline since 2021 (25%), (3) total cost per SCU, (4) SCU by WTU, (5) tenure-track instruction. Weighted to be out of 7.5.
  - iii. Open Forum - Fri Apr 18, 9-10:30a on [zoom](#).
  - iv. President Sandeen added - thinking about this program review from the students' perspective. CSUEB has the second highest number of degree programs and concentrations of all the CSUs. And we are a smaller CSU. Students are encountering issues getting classes, having sufficient cohort sizes, etc. We should be looking at this every five years or so. This proliferation is not

good for students. Expressed appreciation for faculty who ran for the task force and are putting in a lot of work.

d. Questions:

- i. Wu - Is the criteria for Tier 3 listed as “or” or listed as “and”?
  1. Provost Greer - The task force is going to talk about that tomorrow in the meeting. They will determine exactly where that cutoff is. The scale is 0-7.5 with the weighted scoring.
- ii. Trujillo - No matter what, students are going to be upset about discontinuing programs. Agreed, though, that this is something that needs to happen. We need things to be as clear and concise and accessible to students as possible. Students are confused about why things are getting cut, etc. There is fear that is growing and making things worse. We need to make sure this has to be as perfect and accessible as possible.
  1. President Sandeen - Emphasized that any student currently in a concentration or program will be able to complete that. There will be another open forum once the programs identified for potential discontinuation are identified.
- iii. Chair O noted moving on for time, but encouraged Senators to share questions or concerns via email with Chair O and cc Secretary Rowley.

e. Report of the University Diversity Officer

- i. Four students have had student visas revoked by Department of Homeland Security. Does not seem to be a pattern for those being revoked within the CSU. Center for International Education has messaged students with resources.
- ii. Newcomb - How are visa cancellations being reported or monitored? If we want to find out more about how these students are affected and being supported where do we go?
  1. UDO Wong-Lau - You could reach out to the Center for International Education but know that each student’s situation is confidential. Faculty have been very supportive in helping students finish courses.

f. [Report](#) of the Statewide Academic Senators

- i. [CSU and ASCSU Year of Engagement Faculty Survey](#)
- ii. Carpenter - Discussions happening including CalGETC, STEM and the transfer model curriculum, teacher education, federal grants, admission to programs, credit by examination, student visa cancellations. 40 international students revoked across the system as of Friday. 62 grants have been frozen by federal government. Encouraged everyone to fill out the Year of Engagement survey. Final Plenary will be in May please review the resolutions linked in the report and share any feedback.
- iii. Heryford - Appeals are in progress regarding the grant terminations. Statements to media need to be made carefully so as to not contradict the appeal details.

g. Report of Student Government

- i. No report.

h. [Report](#) of the CFA

- i. Newcomb summarized report items.

## 5. Appointments and Elections:

a. **College Elections voting is open now (ballot closes @ noon on 4/24):**

- i. [AY25-26 Senate seats](#) - please consider self-nominating/helping recruit (email Senate Office and Senate Chair directly as nomination forms are now closed). As of [04/11](#):
  1. [CBE](#): 1 position with no self-noms (1 tenured UTP)

2. COH: 4 positions with no self-noms (2 CAPR, 1 CIC, 1 tenured FAC)
3. CLASS: 7 positions with no self-noms (2 senators, 1 CS, 1 FDEC, 1 A2E2, 1 tenured UARC, 1 tenured UTP)
4. CSCI: 7 positions with no self-noms (1 CAPR, 1 CRSCA, 1 CS, 1 tenured FAC, 1 HDC, 1 tenured UARC, 1 tenured UTP)
5. Lecturers: 2 positions with no self-noms (1 CAPR, 1 FDEC)
6. SSP: 1 position with no self-noms (1 CAPR)
7. Staff: Good (5 self-nominees)
8. Alumni & Library run their own elections

**b. AVP for University Extension Search Committee**

- i. Search (and member workload) will occur in Fall 2025
- ii. Faculty representation (per [15-16 FAC 1](#)):
  1. 1 tenured faculty from each college and 1 tenured library faculty; appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate
  2. Deans & COH Department Chairs have been notified and will send a faculty name forward no later than May 2, 2025
    - a. For COH, ExCom will select the college representative

**c. VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Search Committee**

- i. Search (and member workload) will occur in Fall 2025
- ii. Faculty representation (per [15-16 FAC 1](#)):
  1. 3 tenured faculty including library faculty; no more than 1 from each entity; appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate
  2. Nominations will be open Apr 8-14. If more than three nominees, Senate will vote forward on Tues Apr 15 a recommendation to Ex Com. Ex Com will then appoint based on this recommendation.
  3. NOTE: We did not vote today because we do not have more than three nominees (2). Chair O and Senate Coordinator will search for a third nominee and Ex Com will confirm three appointees next week.

**6. Business Items:**

- a. [24-25 CIC 20/FAC 18](#): Clean Curricular Timeline Policy (*second reading*)
  - i. Chair O noted that FAC and CIC collaborated to approve the revisions in the present document.
  - ii. Engelman - Highly encouraged Senators to support passing this item. FAC and CIC have discussed this back and forth. In summary, this process will help things move more smoothly. Passing would be a great step toward improving the efficiency of the university.
  - iii. Trujillo - Asked for clarification - would this make a CIC subcommittee a last stop in the approval process?
    1. Chair O - No. That is oversimplified. Certain documents must come through Senate, others can bypass Senate if not controversial within CIC. The main motivation here was to make it do-able for CIC to get through all this work in the academic year. Some but not all can bypass Senate.
  - iv. Fortune moved to approve. Austin seconded. 38 Approve. 0 Opposed. 1 Abstain.
- b. [24-25 BITAC 1](#): Proposal to make ITAC a Standing Committee of the University Faculty (*second reading*)
  - i. Chair O introduced. No comments or questions.
  - ii. Approved by unanimous consent.

- e. ~~24-25 CAPR 34~~: Revision of “Policy And Procedures For Temporary Suspension Of Academic Programs” (*second reading*)
- d. 24-25 FAC 9: Resolution on the Faculty Workload Program (*second reading*)
- i. Chair O introduced.
  - ii. AJ Rowley - Expressed that the revisions are not “meaty” enough or “have enough teeth”.
    1. Chair O read aloud the two resolved statements. Senate leadership would include the FWRP on meeting agendas each year.
    2. Austin - Noted that the changes to the final resolved came from discussions in Senate during first reading - recommendations from Chair Carpenter about the language. Asked AJ Rowley to specify where the language may be threatening.
  - iii. Garcia motioned to approve. Austin seconded. 31 Approve. 2 Oppose. 1 Abstain. Motion passes.
- e. 24-25 FAC 14: RTP Policy Revisions (*second reading*)
- i. Chair O introduced.
  - ii. Austin motioned to approve. Fenno-Smith seconded. No comments or questions. No opposition or abstentions. Approved by unanimous consent.
- f. 24-25 CIC 47/FAC 16/FDEC 5: The Policy on Accessibility in Textbooks and Instructional Materials (*first reading*)
- i. Chair O introduced. Highlighted that by Apr 2026, all online materials must be fully in compliance with ADA rules.
  - ii. AJ Rowley motioned to waive first reading noting that it’s non-controversial (just in compliance with law) and it has been discussed extensively in three committees. Garcia seconded. No comments or questions. Approved by unanimous consent.
  - iii. Carpenter - No issues with the document itself and the policy. Concern is implementation and the resources and requirements this places on faculty. Do we have the ability to actually comply with this policy?
    1. Kaatz (GUEST) - Chaired this ad hoc committee. Recognize a lot of work to be done by faculty. Some of this work needs to be done this semester or over the summer.
    2. Chair O - Noted that President and Provost are discussing strategies to implement this, including potentially putting together an implementation team with support.
    3. Wright (GUEST) - Co-Chair of Affordable Learning Solutions. Policy says textbook adoption due date is first day of course registration for the term. We need to make sure textbooks are noted as free or low cost before that date. This is a tight deadline to meet.
    4. Santone - Noted that workload may be very different in different departments. Art, for example, is very image-heavy and will face a huge workload. What resources will the university be required to supply? Where is the obligation on the institution for providing support in this policy? At times captioning video art is complicated and cannot be done by IT and Accessibility services. What kinds of additional resources will be supplied, particularly around image description.
    5. Santone - Image description is part of my learning outcomes as an art historian. How will these obligations change learning outcomes?
    6. UDO Wong-Lau - Echoed concerns expressed by Santone. Added that skill and familiarity of faculty varies. Implementation may consider a system-level discussion to pool resources, technology, and AI programs.
  - iv. Engelman - Suggested a revision that allows some flexibility and need for compliance.
    1. Chair O suggested a motion but would require specific language.
    2. Engelman (via chat) - “Given the immense challenges of complying with the policy faculty and administrators recognize the limitations inherent in a shortened timeline for implementation, impact on course learning outcomes. Could motion to add language like this or similar to the document as a revision.”

- v. Garcia - Senate should separate policy from implementation. We have to change this policy to be in compliance with law. The implementation should be totally separate. Believe we can vote today on this policy and we can figure out the implementation next.
- vi. Chin-Newman motioned to postpone voting on this item until next Senate meeting. Seconded Trujillo.
  - 1. Reeve - Agree.
  - 2. AJ Rowley - Committee developed this, then it went to CIC, then to FAC, then to FDEC. It's gone through so many different channels - at least 45 different people. There have been several questions as to implementation. If people aren't satisfied with the university's offering of resources, this document will not passed. We can't do anything else between now and the next meeting. Not sure how to meet the concerns that people have unless the University is doing something else in the next two weeks. Not sure what adding or postponing will change.
  - 3. 13 Approve. 18 Oppose. 4 Abstain. Motion fails.
- vii. UDO Wong-Lau - Expressed concerns earlier, but would want to express those concerns as something that could be addressed by a specific statement about implementation. It is important to pass this policy given the federal mandate.
- viii. Engelman motioned to amend document to add: "Given the immense challenges of complying with the policy faculty and administrators recognize the limitations inherent in a shortened timeline for implementation, impact on course learning outcomes." at the beginning to add context. Taylor seconded.
  - 1. Santone - Thanked Engelman for proposing some language that makes this policy sound a little less sharp. It doesn't fully address that the policy puts onus on faculty rather than faculty and administration working together.
  - 2. 25 Approve. 0 Oppose. 5 Abstain. Motion passes.
- ix. Austin motioned to amend document to add: "And that the Administration provide resources in the form of WTUs for faculty who will be overly burdened by implementing these changes." Garcia seconded.
  - 1. President Sandeen - Noted she cannot commit to that and would not approve the document if passed with this language. Will do what she can to advocate for resources.
  - 2. Austin rescinded motion.
- x. Chair O returned to call the vote to approve the document with the single addition from Engelman. 27 Approve. 3 Oppose. 5 Abstain. Motion passes.
- g. [24-25 CIC 60](#): GWAR Policy Update (*first reading*)
  - i. Chair O introduced.
  - ii. Santone moved to waive first reading. St. George seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.
  - iii. Chair O called the vote to approve the document. Approved by unanimous consent.
- h. [24-25 FAC 11](#): Appointment of Administrative Officers of CSUEB, Policies and Procedures (*first reading*)
  - i. Chair O introduced. This is a split of 15-16 FAC 1 into separate appointment (11) and review (12) policy documents. There are other changes to the search committees for administrators (Appendix A) summarized in cover sheet.
  - ii. Wu - We worked on this document for two years. Decided to separate 15-16 FAC 1 into two. Then with enormous efforts, we revised and cleaned up the documents. It has been improved since 15-16 FAC 1 a lot, but there could be some minor things to add on. FAC is happy to hear revisions or suggestions before second reading.
  - iii. Carpenter - Will the items listed as "under consideration" be taken up before second reading?
  - iv. President Sandeen - Would not be in favor of adding all these additional position subject to a formal Senate elected search committee. The existing positions have a direct relationship to faculty work. Adding all the others doesn't make sense to me. And it really slows down the operation of the university. My role is to ensure smooth operations. When faculty are really only



available to serve for 7 or 8 month period that they are on contract, that really restricts our ability to go forward with some of these searches. Would not be in favor of adding these additional positions, but am in favor of keeping the ones that are on there on.

AJ Rowley motioned to extend meeting 10 minutes. Trujillo seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.

- v. Austin - Asking President Sandeen for follow-up regarding comments. Previously instructed FAC last time this policy revisions and additional positions went through that separating out the policies would be approved. Have things changed?
  1. President Sandeen - Faculty do have a voice in important administrative appointments. Received misinformation last year that separating the two would lead me to approve additional positions in the policy.
  2. Austin - Understand argument is about expediency. Given that these are positions that didn't exist when the original policy was created, and keeping in positions like Associate Provost, why is it that the efficiency only applies to newer positions.
  3. President Sandeen - Would be happy to remove some positions to become even more efficient if the Senate wants to do that. Did not think it would be fair to Senate for me to recommend removal of positions. It is not a democratic process for a search committee - it's input into a process and ultimately I do make the final decision on these positions. It is not a voting process. It is consultative. I value the consultative. If you look at committees I charged that were not on this process, I have always included faculty because I want the input and perspective. We can't fill the Senate committees right now. Adding more official codified committees is not good practice. I will commit to involving faculty in other searches but will do it in a way not through a formal Senate policy.
  4. Austin - Clarified referring to democratically elected reps on committees rather than appointed.
- vi. Chin-Newman - Clarify before second reading - ASI selects - does that mean ASI appoints or that the student rep must be on ASI?
- i. [24-25 FAC 12](#): Review of Administrative Officers of CSUEB, Policies and Procedures (*first reading*)
  - i. Chair O introduced.
  - ii. President Sandeen - Thanked Maureen Scharberg for the great job on this to create a compliant and fair policy.
- j. [24-25 FAC 21](#): Policy on the Appointment, Placement, and Evaluation of Coaches (*first reading*)
  - i. Chair O introduced.
  - ii. Wu - This is also a two-year long process. The previous policy was from 2009-10. It was extremely aged and FAC spent two years and allow coaches (Unit 3) to have a fair evaluation.
  - iii. Sherwood - I'd like to speak specifically against removing the Master's degree requirement for head coaches. Coaches, especially head coaches, are responsible for the development and well-being of their athletes, and they often leave teams of assistant coaches, athletic trainers, and they're all responsible for the experiences and the development of student athletes. The head coach needs a working knowledge of biomechanics, nutrition, exercise, physiology, sports, psychology, training, methodology and injury prevention. In addition to athletic performance coaches play a critical role in supporting the physical, academic and psychosocial development of student athletes. They're responsible for keeping the athletes healthy and safe. A graduate level education provides coaches with the knowledge and skills to critically evaluate and apply data, adopt evidence-informed practices, and distinguish credible information from the abundance of easily accessible misinformation. Requiring head coaches to earn a master's degree, reflects a commitment to the success and well-being of student athletes. Their success and well-being beyond their graduation and research consistently shows that better prepared and more knowledgeable coaches are associated with positive and lasting outcomes for their athletes. As a faculty in kinesiology who teaches many students that are aspiring to be coaches, thank you.



AJ Rowley motioned to move all “Default One-Reading Business Items” below to an online vote. Wu seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.

**6. Default One-Reading Business Items:**

- a. [24-25 CAPR 35/CIC 55](#): New Certificate in Inclusive Performance and Dance
- b. [24-25 CAPR 36/CIC 56](#): New Certificate in Interaction and User Experience Design
- c. [24-25 CAPR 39/CIC 62](#): New Certificate: Human Resources Management
- d. [24-25 CAPR 40/CIC 63](#): New Certificate: Pre Law Studies
- e. [24-25 CAPR 38/CIC 61](#): New Concentration BS Business Administration: Financial Planning
- f. [24-25 CAPR 41/CIC 64](#): Multiple Subject Credential Revision

\*\*\*Meeting adjourned here.\*\*\*

**7. Information Items:**

- a. [24-25 COBRA 11](#): Presentation by Brenda Amenson-Hill Interim Vice President Student Affairs & Enrollment Management on Recruitment Initiatives
- b. [Theatre and Dance Department - Proposal and Testimonials](#)

**8. Discussion**

**9. Roundtable**

**10. Adjournment**