CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY EAST BAY

ACADEMIC SENATE
http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate
510-885-3671

.;pr5

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

TO: Members of the Executive Committee

FROM: Sarah Nielsen, Chair, Academic Senate

SUBJECT: **Executive Committee Agenda**

MEETING DATE: Tuesday, **February 28, 2023**, 12:45pm-2:30pm **by Zoom**

FINAL AGENDA (click to jump to specific minutes)

1. Approval of the agenda [12:48-12:50]
2. Approval of 2/14/23 minutes [12:50-12:51]
3. Reports [12:52-13:19]
    a. Report of the Chair
    b. Report of the President
    c. Report of the Provost
    d. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
    e. Report of the ExCom representative on the CoH Implementation Task Force
4. Appointments/Approvals [13:19-13:22]
    a. Spring 2023 College, Lecturer, SSP, Emeriti & Staff election schedule
    b. Spring 2023 Excom appointments
    c. 22-23 ITAC membership
5. New Business [13:22-14:26]
    a. Memo to the College of Health Implementation Task Force (CHITF)
    b. 23-23 BEC 12: Call for UHP Director 2023-2025 [tabled on 2/14]
    b. 22-23 CIC 28: Updates to CIC Policies and Procedures (P&Ps) [tabled on 2/14]
    c. 22-23 BEC 14: Approval of Bylaw Amendments to CIC Policies and Procedures
    d. 22-23 CIC 25: Change of Majors
    e. 22-23 CR 10: Indirect Cost Policy
    f. 22-23 CR 11: IDC Recovery Distribution Procedures
    g. 22-23 FDEC 3: Adding UDO to ExCom Bylaws
    h. 22-23 FAC 12: Compensation for Lecturer Service in the Academic Senate (time certain 1:45)
    i. 22-23 BDE 5: JEDI revisions to RTP (time certain 1:30pm)
    j. 22-23 CAPR 18: Bachelor of Science in Accounting and Analytics: Program Concentration - Elevation to Full Degree
    k. 22-23 CIC 29: Course reviewed and approved by the General Education, Overlay and Code Subcommittee (GEOC) on 2/8/23 requiring Senate approval
    l. 22-23 CIC 30: Course reviewed and approved by the Writing Skills Subcommittee (WSS) on 2/13/23 requiring Senate approval
6. Information
    a. 22-23 FAC 11: Week of Scholarship (WoS) rebrand as the 'Week of Recognition' (WoR)
7. Discussion
    a. Voting issues
    b. Future Directions and Senate goals [spreadsheet]
    c. Using Slack or other means of communication for ExCom business
    d. Increasing participation in shared governance
    e. AB 1997 and alternatives to policing

8. Academic Senate 3/7/23 draft agenda (2:20 PM time certain) [14:26-14:30]
9. Adjournment

Select Highlights

- Chair's report highlighted the Campus Fee Advisory Committee and potential student fee increase
- President's report highlighted the financial stability message coming soon re: an inclusive process to address our financial stability
- Statewide Senate report noted that the Board of Trustees recently approved CSUs to offer an independent Doctor of Public Health degree
- Election schedule and new appointments approved
- Memo to the College of Health Implementation team was amended and approved
- 23-23 BEC 12 was approved to be put on hold and turned over to Academic Affairs for the next year
- 22-23 CIC 28 was approved
- 22-23 BEC 14 was approved to add to Senate agenda
- 22-23 FAC 12 was approved to add to Senate agenda
- 22-23 BDE 5 was approved to add to Senate agenda

DRAFT MINUTES[1]

Members Present: Sarah Nielsen, Christina Chin-Newman, Juleen Lam, Cathy Sandeen, Christian Roessler, Meiling Wu, Monique Manopoulos, Paul Carpenter, Tayla Kemper, Vanessa Yingling, Walt Jacobs
Guests: Carol Trost, Mark Robinson, Mitch Watnik, Maureen Scharberg, Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Jennifer Sherwood, Jeanne Dittman, Chandra Khan, Alina Engleman, Gretchen Reevy
Members Absent: Monica Green

Meeting called to order at 12:46 and is being recorded

Land Acknowledgement [short version] [12:46-12:48]

Thank you, Jennifer Sherwood, for your reading!

1. **Approval of the agenda [12:48-12:50]**
    a. M/S - Roessler/Yingling
    b. Discussion
        i. Chair Nielsen - Motion to change Time Certain for 22-23 BDE 5 to 13:30
        ii. M/S - Nielsen/Yingling

[1] **Key:** M/S is motion/second | /P is passed | /F is failed

iii. Discussion
1. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - only issue is if someone was planning on coming at 2PM for that topic. Although it that happened, could allow them to talk at that time

iv. /P - unanimous consent, agenda amendment approved

v. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - motion to move memo to the College of Health Implementation Task Force into New Business as Item A

vi. M/S - Chin-Newman/Wu

vii. Discussion
1. None

viii. /P - unanimous consent, agenda amendment approved

c. /P - unanimous consent, agenda as amended approved

2. Approval of 2/14/23 minutes [12:50-12:51]

a. M/S - Jacobs/Yingling

b. Discussion
i. None

c. /P - abst(1), minutes approved

3. Reports [12:52-13:19]

a. Report of the Chair

i. **Senate-Provost Office Hours:** will be this Thursday during U-Hour on Zoom. Will send message to faculty tomorrow with reminder.

ii. **Campus Fee Advisory Committee:** usually meets twice a year to talk about changes to campus fees. ASI is involved with this - committee has to have quorum of students to meet and vote on anything. Academic Senate Chair is also voting member. Will be meeting more regularly this spring - is a proposal to increase student fees to update RAW and Union. Will be "alternate consultation" process with students and student constituencies through focus groups across campus to get input on fee increase proposal. Will have regular updates on this. Specific question - have long standing meeting this Fridays 2:00-2:45pm; if anyone on ExCom can represent us this Friday, would be appreciated.

iii. Discussion
1. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - recall that students were going to vote on something before the pandemic, but ended up not voting. This is their first time getting closer to putting that to referendum again? Nielsen - yes. Last time voted to increase fees was 2017. Wasn't able to complete this vote when pandemic hit, so this is their first attempt. Follows on a task force that met this fall; ASI has requested last year reconsideration to have ASI manage the Raw and Union. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - if

student is completely online, do they pay those fees? Chair Nielsen - yes, they do. There are online services that are available to them. Can also come to campus for any of the other services as well.

b. *Report of the President*
   i. **Student Fee Increase:** small increase ($100/semester). Is to correct the original budgets that were created for operation of the Unions and RAW. Over time, budgets didn't take into account the right amount of depreciation, deferred maintenance, and inflation. Is necessary to sustain operations of Unions and RAW, including debt service. Had committee that looked into this issue and made this fee increase recommendation - representation by lots of students and faculty. Next academic year, the students may choose to look into a referendum; vote for a major renovation of the UUs. UUs currently don't support the types of activities students are involved in these days compared to when they were built in 1960s-70s. Using alternative consultation - won't be a vote, but multiple layers of consultation with student groups. Senate Chair will also be involved.
   ii. **Financial Stability Message:** Message this or next week going out that will lay out the inclusive process for us to address our financial stability. Reasons discussed are well-known - enrollment decline, which reduces tuition revenue; potential for state to claw back other state support they give us; and the fact we've had a structural deficit for many years, even under President Morishta. Going through process of closing that gap and positioning us for the future. Created Tiger Team on enrollment gap: quick-hit group to harvest as many California resident enrollments. One of the things is shifting summer from self-support to state support, and other things as well. Also have Tiger Team on budget gap. Not making any decisions yet, coming up with ideas to enact. One of those which have implemented is the hiring chill (not hiring freeze) - refers to staff positions only. There are hundreds of unfilled positions that haven't been filled for months/years and functioning without them; maybe need fewer of them based on lower enrollment. Hiring chill → won't automatically replace every staff position. Before going forward with recruitment, will look at how can accomplish work with existing number of employees we have. Obvious first step leaders take to fill budget gaps. This is happening now, only affects staff positions. Will be inclusive process - share ideas for additional input and comments before any decisions are made, starting with this memo. Have to face reality and control our own destiny.
   iii. Discussion
      1. Sen. Carpenter - Do you see a specific role for COBRA as this as part of the Academic Senate? Pres. Sandeen - of course. Will be a process for

including formal and informal groups. Obviously your committee is really relevant to this particular question.

2. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - in terms of the timing, don't have the same big-picture perspective you do. With all the doom and gloom of enrollment, wonder about timing of starting the new college that will cost a million dollars. Have there been discussions about making CEAS bigger, other ideas? Wonder where the money will come from. Pres. Sandeen - will come from reallocation or one-time dollars. Don't think will hit full costs in year one. Think any costs of new college will be far outweighed by potential revenue: enrollment for new healthcare-related programs, partnerships with the community, donors, contracts and grants. We will be going forward with the College of Health.
3. Chair Nielsen - recently had meeting schedule with Cozen that was canceled by their or Chancellor's Office's request. Any update on when we might be getting that report? Pres. Sandeen - thank you for bringing that up. Moved heaven and earth to schedule that meeting; they canceled it the day before without any explanation for "unforeseen circumstances" and no indication of when they would reschedule. Believe they are doing an overall report to Board of Trustees in March, so may hear from them before then or get some information when they report to the Board. It was a privileged meeting between Cozen O'Connor and a relatively small number of groups on campus, providing privileged information about cases. Implementation Team, Senate Chair, Cabinet, etc. was scheduled for last Wednesday but didn't happen. Once that meeting happened, would have done high level report to campus but not now since meeting was canceled. Re: enrollment wouldn't use term doom and gloom; is not great, but have some time to look at this and do it thoughtfully, and possibly regain some enrollment. Appreciate your partnership in this effort. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - shout-out to Registrar. Since my daughter applied, know that CSUEB gets out first year acceptances in a week; didn't think our university could do things that quickly. From faculty perspective, complain about a lot, but was impressed with that. Chair Nielsen - also saw great presentation on the new portal that applicants will use. Not ready to launch yet, but hopefully can have a presentation to ExCom before the end of term.

C. *Report of the Provost*
   i. **Senate Provost Open Forum:** on Thursday, hope to see folks there.
   ii. **AB1997:** have a question on this, will talk about that later today.

iii. **Faculty Service while on Sabbatical:** have question re: whether faculty can participate voluntarily on service while on sabbatical. Question came up, may put it on agenda at a future meeting.

iv. Discussion

1. Sen. Yingling - great to discuss this. Found out while on sabbatical that we lose service year. Feel that sabbatical is part of our job and are still serving the university; don't know if anything can be done about that, whether it is a CBA rule. Provost Jacobs - know that CBA has a couple rules that are in my report; can look into other rules.
2. Sen. Roessler - think we all understand that this is the current process to protect the faculty and make sure they have that time to pursue whatever project they have in mind. Is a philosophic issue - have shared governance, in principle as long as someone is on faculty (which they are while on sabbatical), should have the right to participate in that process and decision-making. Think it must be possible to achieve both at the same time - no one implicitly or explicitly coerced to do service if they don't want to (could involve union/CBA) but not sure we should bar people if there is something they feel like they would like to participate in the shared governance process. Provost Jacobs - that is my concern as well. Worried about coercion. Possible well-intentioned, but slippery slope. Need to protect folks if we go down that road.

d. *Report of the Statewide Academic Senators*

i. California Community Colleges press release

ii. Doctor of Public Health Degree Program

1. Feedback

iii. Sen. Wu - two documents shared. One is about press release from community college board, announced that even there is conflict of interest for two degrees that community colleges are going to offer because of AB927, will move ahead and offer the degree. Will discard objection from CSU. Is something we will have to pay attention to for the future. Not great news for us. Community colleges can offer Bachelors Degrees, and CSU can also offer PhD degree too. Board of Trustees just approved that CSU can offer Doctor of Public Health program. Possibly tied with coming College of Health. Will discuss further later.

iv. Sen. Carpenter - professional doctorate is an interesting one. Community colleges say contradiction if pushing back on community college offering 4-year degree. Key distinction is around workforce development versus applied professional doctorate. May be idea to open new enrollments and potential revenue. Next round of plenary meetings, lots of resolutions up for second reading. In

Academic Preparation Committee - AB130 (subject matter competency for teaching credential). Got some feedback from Math Department, will bring back to committee deliberations in March. Other one is UPK3 credential for elementary education (haven't heard much from our campus on this). Other than that, status quo with ongoing conversations around fourth year of quantitative reasoning and A-G requirements for high school graduation. Uncertainty around AB928, Associate Degree for Transfer, and how that will play out. Hopefully will know more by the end of the spring term.

v. Discussion

1. Provost Jacobs - follow up that might be of interest. Email from Chancellor's Office that Board of Directors has approved adding Doctor of Public Health degree for CSUs and are working on policy to implement it. Sent this to Mitch and Maureen at APS, looks good to them. Soon will have that ability to offer that degree. Sen. Carpenter - some interesting questions around the funding of that. Don't think it will be a cheap degree based on fee structure built into that.
2. Sen. Yingling - not the first clinical doctorate, CSUs have had DPT for many years pushed by the governing body, APTA. Think that is interesting. The PhD is what the UCs will push back on. Put plug in terms of physical therapy and DTP, are in desert: one public program in the area and the other is private. For KIN have quite a few number of students moving on and going into that, going into debt, is not cheap. In terms of servicing our undergrads, is something we need to think about.
3. Sen. Wu - there is request for feedback; can see whether we can come up from something from Senate feedback on draft policy. Deadline is March 10. Short timeline.

e. *Report of the ExCom representative on the CoH Implementation Task Force*

i. Sen. Yingling - Last two weeks, all sub-working groups have been working. Was on staffing one. Think the question of 13-14 CAPR and whether it was resolved in Feasibility Task Force or not is still up in the air, but haven't met as a full group.

ii. Discussion

1. Sen. Wu - campus always has space issue, with College of Health, do you have some ideas of building space for Dean's office? Sen. Yingling - there is a space working group. Not part of, but assume they will report on Friday. Will bring back to Senate.

4. **Appointments/Approvals [13:19-13:22]**
    a. *Spring 2023 College, Lecturer, SSP, Emeriti & Staff election schedule*
        i. M/S - Chin-Newman/Yingling
        ii. /P - unanimous consent, election schedule approved
    b. *Spring 2023 Excom appointments*
        i. For reference: Membership rosters of Academic Senate and Standing Committees, 2022-23
        ii. Sen. Makarevich appointed to the Library Relocation Task Force
        iii. /P - unanimous consent, Sen. Makarevich appointment approved
    c. *22-23 ITAC membership*
        i. Did not discuss/no new approvals
5. **New Business [13:22-14:26]**
    a. *Memo to the College of Health Implementation Task Force (CHITF)*
        i. Chair Nielsen - memo was in Chair's Report a few weeks ago. Have incorporated several edits and comments from feedback. Sense is there are differences in opinion about the best way to move forward. Personally had some concerns regarding the Town Hall and how it happened. Other people wanted to look at 13-14 CAPR document more carefully (do need to update that document because starting to have voluntary mergers of departments). Memo is request from me (and others from ExCom if would like to endorse): request for consultation with Senate. Three specific requests: 1) report to Senate before end of Academic Year; 2) seat Task Force's Senate Policy Work Group and include 2-3 members of out own Senate Task Force that is revising Constitution and Bylaws; 3) charge the Senate Policies Working Group to develop an expedited timeline to meet these shared governance requirements.
        ii. Discussion
            1. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - if proposing to seat members on the Senate Policies working group of the College of Health Task Force that are not already College of Health Task Force? Are all members of sub working groups members of the regular task force so far? Sen. Yingling - yes, so far. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - is it possible to expand that College of Health Task Force a little? Wanting to have a bridge here because are having the task force working on all of the Constitutions and Bylaws anyways, which includes adding on the Fifth College. And why not have those people communicate with the task force that is working on the other changes also? Pres. Sandeen - since it is a Presidential Task Force, I get to decide who is on it, so it would be a proposal to me to consider some additions, which I will consider. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - maybe

should change who it's addressed to. recognize if it's a Presidential Task Force then it's the purview of the President. Have been more active in initiatives and forming Task Forces. Is there a way in the spirit of shared governance a way to help the communication so that faculty proactively understand about formation of the College even though these are not required. Pres. Sandeen - thought this was to add people to look at implementation and revision of bylaws? Send suggestions to me - how many, how they would be selected. Won't commit now, but that would be the process. Can also cc Jason and Suzanne.

2. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - do other voting ExCom members have feedback on changes other than changing who the memo would be addressed to?
3. Sen. Carpenter - expressed this last time; feel I am on dodgy ground being on Implementation Task Force and also being on ExCom. See two pieces to memo here - recognition that this is moving forward, being an implementation task force. President reaffirmed that earlier today in this meeting. Piece about concerns expressed on how we got to this point is a very separate issue from moving forward and requesting that some Senate individuals be involved especially with changes (Senate documents, RTP, etc.). Seems like two separate issues going on here.
4. Sen. Yingling - agree with reading of the memo; I have been asking questions from faculty about first Task Force and 13-14 CAPR. This memo seems to be moving forward and getting some bridge to the policy. Not seeing two separate things, although there are two separate things that have been discussed in different meetings.
5. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - move to vote on revised version of memo addressed to President and cc'd the co-chairs of the task force
6. M/S - Chin-Newman/Yingling
7. Discussion
    a. None
8. /P - aye (6), nay(1), abst(1), memo as revised approved
9. Moved to Item I for Time Certain

*b. 23-23 BEC 12: Call for UHP Director 2023-2025 [**tabled on 2/14**]*

i. Chair Nielsen - Provost Jacobs has a proposal to share with the group

ii. Provost Jacobs - instead of having a normal selection of Honor's Director, thinking of doing a special assignment for one person to come in and revise the program. Student numbers have really gone down over the last few years. Back in AY 2021, had 80 students; went down to 47 in 21-22; current year down to 40.

Some of decline due to pandemic, but other changes in how others Honors programs are being done. A couple of institutions that are revamping Honors program to attract students to have rich experience. In a great period now, with previous Honors Director stepping down at end of term. If we appointed someone at end of year to revamp program, something exciting, plan to increase numbers and attract students. Only a few people (3-4) who had applied for next year. Cna tell them it's on hold and have them reapply next year. Some students want to finish up in the Honors program. Will suspend new enrollments for a year while interim director for the year revamps program with lots of input from previous directors, ExCom, other faculty members members, advisory committee, etc.

iii. Discussion

1. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - no one has officially applied yet, since haven't released call - just people who have expressed interest. If trying to do things differently, if don't have participation across board (including online programs and transfer students) if 3 different people are interest and are from different colleges, if administration could invest more than 6 WTU, could we have more than one person working on changes? Might be good to try something different and creative. Representing different colleges, in-person versus online, etc. Sounds like same thing, same pace but different individuals. Something different with structure. Provost Jacobs - thinking that the person with appointment would get same assigned time. Would be big lift to lead the process and would make sure they get the support they need. .
2. Provost Jacobs (in chat) Here's an example of a new program: Sen, Yingling (in chat): SDSU has a very robust program
3. Sen. Roessler - strongly in support of this idea, think we really need to rethink it on a different scale from what is probably possible if someone has to run the existing Honors program at the same time. Having just one person responsible for the whole thing may not be the right approach. But need someone accountable for producing change that flows from one idea and not just a mix from lots of people running in different directions. Whoever has responsibility for that needs to connect with sufficient people, connect with resources, and leverage and design new Honor program. Combination to have someone with personal responsibility but incentives to connect with others. Am in support of having full stop and coming up with something very good.
4. Sen. Yingling - does seem that one person reimagining completely on their own is unfeasible. This should be more broad and over the entirety

of at least the academic departments, possibly a task force needed? Provost Jacobs - agreed. Definitely had that in mind, with one person as point-person. They would handle all administrative duties to make sure it gets done, they are accountable. Definitely a committee would be put together.

5. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - to clarify, that committee being put together, is that Provost Task Force not in Senate, or working through Senate? Provost Jacobs - haven't thought about that, could go either way. Could have conversations moving forward to decide. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - could have Task Force that would report to ExCom.
6. Chair Nielsen - seems like there is some support for a pause. May have some details that we need to work out; could come back with more formalized proposal? Unsure of next steps.
7. Sen. Yingling - seems like a motion to pause is getting into the road of whatever the development is to be. Why does Honors Program report to Senate? Is this the structure? Chair Nielsen - yes. Is different from the Center for Student Research and Office of Faculty Development. For these it is actually Academic Affairs who does the appointment. This would potentially be moving the Honors program to be more in line for how we deal with the Director for CSR and other programs (move from Senate to Academic Affairs).
8. Sen. Yingling - motion to pause the call for UHP director for next year
9. M/S - Yingling/Roessler
10. Discussion
    a. Sen. Carpenter - effectively have been on pause for two years. Other aspect - interested in timeline given that we are deep into spring semester? On hold for another full academic year? Or is the intent to get something started for fall 2023? Chair Nielsen - understanding is that this pause would be starting fall 2023. Would not be a full year of pause. Folks in program would finish but wouldn't take new applicants in program. Would give new person/committee more space cognitively to develop something new. Provost Jacobs - would likely start fall 2024. Over the year, would develop a robust program. Chair Nielsen - yes, work to revamp would take place over the next year with the program starting back up fall 2024.
    b. Sen. Carpenter - am getting confused with number of Task Forces and working parties going on. From COBRA perspective,

have Tiger Task Force addressing deficit, low enrollment, etc. but as put these proposals together how can have eye on budget and fiscal implications. Can sit down and re-envision something, but need the resources to support it otherwise would be back to square one again. Provost Jacobs - good point. Is part of planning. Folks would figure out how to develop program that would fit into our budget and priorities. San Jose State University - idea was grand, but then with budget realities this narrowed, COBRA participation in process would be key.

c. Maureen Scharberg (in chat): Question: Who will oversee the students next year so they can complete the Honors Program? Would it be this individual? Provost Jacobs - interim director would also oversee current students.
d. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - so we would forget about the document we had and hand it over to Academic Affairs to figure out their own call and recruit someone for next year? If someone is receiving release time next year, would want to get that done before the end of the semester. Had put this on the agenda for January for that purpose. Similar thing happened to FDEC with working on diverse faculty hiring. But is not in Senate any more, is with the Diversity Fellows team. Same thing would now happen? Chair Nielsen - right, important change to consider. Suppose the person in charge of doing the research and getting input, could propose potentially that it stays with Senate. Hasn't been predetermined. Provost Jacobs - for this year, Provost Office would do appointment, with input from ExCom on folks interested in being appointed for the year.
e. /P - abst(1), proposal approved

b. *22-23 CIC 28: Updates to CIC Policies and Procedures (P&Ps)* ***[tabled on 2/14]***

i. [CIC P&P draft 22-23 CIC 28 with CIC edits and comments] [clean version; amendments in red]
ii. Chair Nielsen - tabled this on Feb. 14 because running out of time. Have divided document and talked to CIC about this. First document (CIC 28) is request to ExCom to approve changes from CIC to Policies and Procedures. Changes are summarized at beginning of document - pronoun use has been updated to align with inclusive language guide; have revised name, membership, and change of Writing Skills subcommittee to reflect new campus commitment to writing across the curriculum; revised charge of GEOC to clarify their role in the course

approval process; revised order of business to include land acknowledgment; revised duties of committee (last one will have to go to full senate).

iii. Discussion

1. Sen. Carpenter - with COBRA, integrated focus on DEI into each of the duties. Here, have it at the top, which is almost overarching principle for everything that follows. Can read this as one separate recommendation here - does it apply to everything that follows? This the answer is yes. But seems as if this is the guiding principle for everything that committee does, which is then laid out in 2-7. Chair Nielsen - yes, this was the committee's intention. Had originally put it at the bottom but moved to top to frame discussion. For CIC in particular, where many decisions affect students and faculty it seems that if we could incorporate this in our process and how we execute duties it could make difference in how we think about the policies we pass. Related thing - Vice-Chair Chin-Newman and I through FDEC and CIC have been working on guiding language that would suggest what DEI/JEDI lens would look like on campus with the four questions listed in background of CIC 28. Received feedback from CIC thinking that should come from ExCom or FDEC. Will continue discussions on how to move the DEI lens working definition through Senate. Didn't seem appropriate to put those questions into the Bylaws. Idea is that those considerations would be guiding the rest of the work we do.
2. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - great as separate document; starting next fall if it passes could start using it. Was going to discuss this in FDEC next Wednesday, but now discussing RTP so not sure if we will have time.

iv. M/S - Yingling/Chin-Newman

v. /P - abst(1), 22-23 CIC 28 approved

c. *22-23 BEC 14: Approval of Bylaw Amendments to CIC Policies and Procedures*

i. Chair Nielsen - basically same changes that you saw, but what would go to Senate to ask for approval of the changes to duties and approval for consideration on the next University-wide ballot. Shows in red proposed amendments to the Bylaws.

ii. M/S - Manopoulos/Chin-Newman

iii. Discussion

1. None

iv. /P - unanimous consent, 22-23 BEC 14 approved to add to Senate agenda

v. Moved to Item 8 for Time Certain

d. *22-23 CIC 25: Change of Majors*

i. Did not discuss

e. *22-23 CR 10: Indirect Cost Policy*

i. Did not discuss

f. *22-23 CR 11: IDC Recovery Distribution Procedures*
   i. Did not discuss
g. *22-23 FDEC 3: Adding UDO to ExCom Bylaws*
   i. Did not discuss
h. *22-23 FAC 12: Compensation for Lecturer Service in the Academic Senate (**time certain 1:45**)*
   i. Chair Nielsen - Lecturers are not currently compensated as members of Senate or Standing Committees. Do make up 60% of faculty. FAC consulted with Academic Planning and Services; no objection in principle to doing so. Are four CSUs that compensate lecturers on Senate. Compensating lectures in this way supports our equity goals. Specific policy is that the university would compensate lecturer faculty who serve on Senate or on Standing Committee for one WTU per academic year (or 0.5 WTU per semester). From informal consultation with people on campus to see whether this could be funded through Colleges, that potentially creates an equity issue if some Colleges have more lecturers participating.
   ii. Discussion
      1. Sen. Wu - Can the 1 WTU be translated into monetary or does it have to be taken as course release? Guest Gretchen Reevy - in FAC lecturer subcommittee, invited Rafael Hernandez. He said compensation would be in the form of WTU and not stipend. Some ways stipends are used are apparently problematic, is done through Article 12 and convinced us would be compensation. Sen. Wu - how does it work, full time lecturer would be required to teach 15 WTU then required to do 14 that semester? Guest Reevy - in general, WTU would occur on top of an appointment instead of reducing appointment unless reducing wouldn't harm the lecturer. It could be taken as assigned time but shouldn't reduce entitlement or could be taken on top of entitlement. Chair Nielsen - intention is the 1 WTU would not be used as part of the regular entitlement? Reevy - but it could be. Rafael said in some departments, lecturer faculty get WTU for some work (i.e., activity classes). Could choose to take it as assigned time and go below entitlement if they wish. Shouldn't be compensated in such a way it reduces part of their entitlement. Could be on top of their entitlement. For me, when I had a Faculty Support Grant, took it on top of entitlement and once took it as assigned time.
      2. Sen. Yingling - if taking above entitlement, that would be extra pay? Load can't be averaged over a couple years, so you could be working more sometimes depending on how the year works out. Seems very stringent. Seems like 1 unit can really mess everyone up depending on what their workload is and what their courses are. A problem sometimes

as full time faculty. Don't know if it is a union thing, why we can't average over say three years. Guest Reevy - think this issue Sen. Yingling is describing seems to be more problematic for tenured or tenure-track faculty. We are used to taking the 16th unit. Not like we lose a unit if we go over full time. We are paid for the 16th unit, doesn't count towards CALPIRS, etc. A different way of taking pay. Doesn't disappear like it does sometimes for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

3. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - let me see if I understand, lecturer faculty could get assigned time on top of what they would teach and then they would get money, or could use as reassigned time which would be on top of their entitlement and would be part of their teaching load? Guest Reevy - is called WTU rather than stipend because if person is still under 15 units, would get paid the WTU which includes health insurance, CALPIRS, etc. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - then that's different than 16th unit and money not counting towards entitlement? Guest Reevy - can't get entitlement for more than 30 WTU over the year. If lecturer receives over 15 units for entitlement for 3-year appointees only if in the third year would add to entitlement in third year and in first and second year it wouldn't if they go above their entitlement. For CFA, see lecturers sometimes doing one or the other, for instance if they get a FSG.
4. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - In the RTP subcommittee, did you discuss ITAC? We have lecturer faculty Steven Cleveland there. Nielsen - Steven is our lecturer rep on ITAC, is his second year doing that.
5. Provost Jacobs - is a really important question and want to support lecturers doing service as much as they want. At a previous institution, this worked as reassigned time. If your entitlement was 12 units but wanted to do Senate Service as part of contract for that year. Would teach 9 WTU and do service for 3. Each year, would be part of contract that would spell out what you would teach and what service you would do. That is the method I would recommend, but open to other options.
6. Guest Reevy - regarding other forms of service aside from Senate and Standing Committees, we did discuss that and someone brought up ITAC. Reason we left it at those positions is that we could easily quantify the amount of work. ITAC isn't a Standing Committee, don't know if it meets regularly. Included sentence at bottom that said compensation for other forms of service are encouraged.
7. Chair Nielsen - Provost Jacob's recommendation was that the WTU for service would be part of regular entitlement. The way policy is written now it is broader, possible for someone to take as assigned time rather

than regular entitlement. Then it's possible it would raise entitlement by 1 WTU the way the policy is written now.

8. Guest Reevy - re: Mitch's comment about teaching one semester and not the other, that's why we put it in the document that it would be 0.5WTU per semester and if they didn't teach that semester, they wouldn't get that WTU. Account for possibility that lecturer could lose their work in the middle of the year.

iii. M/S - Chin-Newman/Yingling

iv. Discussion

1. None

v. /P - unanimous consent, 22-23 FAC 12 approved to add to Senate agenda

vi. Moved to Item B

i. *22-23 BDE 5: JEDI revisions to RTP* ***(time certain 1:30pm)***

i. Chair Nielsen - welcome to Guest Alina Engelmen who is joining us to speak on this policy. Many thanks for Vice-Chair Chin-Newman, our DELO, for working on this with input from various people. This would be an Information Item to Senate. FDEC and FAC are holding joint meeting tomorrow to work on an actual policy proposal for some of these suggested JEDI revisions.The background section has a nice complete history of the RTP document, revisions, or attempts to revise it in the last couple of years. Five suggestions: 1) making UTP larger and including DELO; 2) changing appeals process when candidate disagrees with a decision at any level; 3) changing timeline to have some levels of review occur in parallel instead of sequentially; 4) making the criteria for early tenure and early promotion uniform; 5) single review process for tenure and promotion rather than the separate processes.

ii. Vie-Chair Chin-Newman - thanks to Sen. Roessler for assistance because some of those ideas were from conversations with him and other people.

iii. Discussion

1. Pres. Sandeen- applaud these efforts, look forward to seeing them. Other things interested in seeing from equity perspective: 1) linking tenure and proportion rather than separate, and 2) adding specific criterion re: DEI work in scholarship achievements and service. Are these off the table or just doing those first. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - to clarify, usual structure is having RTP subcommittee of FAC work on this. Wanted to make space for my ideas. They have other changes they are working on not in this document that they are working on. This includes some language in Professional Achievement related to DEI. Wonder if we can do something bigger than that. Kyzyl Fenno-Smith - suggested applying

a DEI rubric developed by FDEC for use for 5-year annual reports. Could include some of those categories here in the RTP document. There are other changes that could be more in-depth but might take a bit more time. Medium- and long-term changes with all of these. Think with linking those two decisions, could clarify in what seems very different for early tenure and promotion, then wouldn't be an issue at each letter and maybe people could write just the one letter instead of two? Pres. Sandeen - cases where individuals have received tenure but not promotion. Hard to understand why. Think that if we do an analysis and look back to see who saw that result, perhaps may have some patterns that don't support our equity and anti-racism goals. Don't understand the rationale for separating them - most universities link them. It's not just that there is one letter, but one action. Vice-Chair Chin-Newman - appreciate you as a leader recognizing this. From my two years' involvement with UTP committee, feel there is not strong understanding of what is required for early tenure and promotion. A lot of time spent discussing what is meant. This should not depend on who is on their RTP committees this year or if they are less liked in their department or belong to marginalized groups - people should just meet the criteria or not. And they should have constructive feedback of what to do next. Would be nice to have that at all levels; have different opinions about how to interpret the language that we have right now.

2. Guest Alina Engeleman - thank you for recognition. Here to comment specifically on early tenure and early promotion. Am a fairly newly tenured person and on RTP committee for the first time; think it is wonderful that this is being done. Will be helpful and wish it could have been done earlier. This is an East Bay problem. Key issue we need to address is that it doesn't make sense that the bar for early tenure is so extraordinary high. Don't think this is the case at other schools. Other schools have people go up early using the same criteria. I was given the message that our criteria was that there had to be extraordinary high achievement. The discrepancy between early tenure and promotion needs to be fixed. Think this will help make the process more clear for everyone. Wanted to say that appreciate the attention this has been given and too bad that it didn't happen sooner. Thank you for considering this.
3. Provost Jacobs - thanks to Vice-Chair Chin-Newman and the committee for working on this important process. In regards to Proposal #3 - changing timeline so that some reviews occur parallel instead of

sequentially. Worries me a bit; each level has to do independent review, but it is powerful to compare initial reactions with reviews at levels below. Helps understand cultural nuances that you might not get. For instance, as Provost looking at all departments, colleges, etc. Can educate me on things that are really important for me to know. Maybe can adjust timeline but keep sequential and not parallel process.

4. Sen. Roessler - thank everyone who has spoken up so far bringing urgency to this. Has been long time in the making working on RTP changes and bring innovative forward-thinking to it. Two things - Provost Jacobs, there is clearly purpose to have ability to see what other levels of review have been saying. Think the way this is intended right now, concurrent process, is that it would be at the same level. Department chair and committee would write their reviews at the same time and college level committee and dean would write at the same time. Some of this would be still preserved. Boas propagates nicely when things are done in sequence. Might be helpful to see how committee and an administrator at the same level and looking at same criteria with same focus and similar information might arrive at different conclusions. Early tenure: this is a particularly pressing issues. Not clear that the current RTP process is being correctly interpreted by the committees. Unclear whether standard is supposed to be higher for early tenure than tenure at the usual point in time or just the criteria would be higher for someone in their fifth year than someone being retained in their fifth year. Right now committees are choosing an interpretation of it. Encourage administrators to keep an eye on that right now and not just when the policy is passed. There is some language in the Ed Code which suggests what we call early tenure in the fifth year is not intended to have different standards legally, and we might be out of compliance. Think we need to stop this process immediately. Our RTP process tends to leave people demotivated, not feeling appreciated. Especially for people so engaged and at the level where they can submit their dossier early with a reasonable expectation of it being accepted, it just backfires in so many different ways. We should start this year to apply a standard for early tenure that they should meet the same criteria than someone who goes up in year 6.
5. M/S - Chin-Newman/Wu
6. Discussion
    a. None

7. /P - unanimous consent, 22-23 BDE 5 approved to add to Senate agenda
8. Moved to Item I for Time Certain

j. *22-23 CAPR 18: Bachelor of Science in Accounting and Analytics: Program Concentration - Elevation to Full Degree*
   i. Did not discuss

k. *22-23 CIC 29: Course reviewed and approved by the General Education, Overlay and Code Subcommittee (GEOC) on 2/8/23 requiring Senate approval*
   i. Did not discuss

l. *22-23 CIC 30: Course reviewed and approved by the Writing Skills Subcommittee (WSS) on 2/13/23 requiring Senate approval*
   i. Did not discuss

6. Information

a. *22-23 FAC 11: Week of Scholarship (WoS) rebrand as the 'Week of Recognition' (WoR)*
   i. Did not discuss

7. Discussion

a. *Voting issues*
   i. Voting method in Senate
   ii. Approvals/voting in ExCom
   iii. Did not discuss

b. *Future Directions and Senate goals [spreadsheet]*
   i. Did not discuss

c. *Using Slack or other means of communication for ExCom business*
   i. Did not discuss

d. *Increasing participation in shared governance*
   i. Did not discuss

e. *AB 1997 and alternatives to policing*
   i. Did not discuss

8. Academic Senate 3/7/23 draft agenda (*2:20 PM time certain*) [14:26-14:30]

a. Chair Nielsen - do have a few items left on the agenda; propose doing an email vote? Will write a brief description of each policy considering to put on Senate agenda and relevant section; if anyone objects to a particular item, would keep that one and bring it back to ExCom. There are several items for the Consent Calendar that don't appear controversial.
b. M/S - Chin-Newman/Carpenter
c. /P - unanimous consent, approved to do an email vote for remaining agenda items
d. M/S - Yingling/Wu
e. /P - unanimous consent, Senate agenda approved

9. Adjournment

a. Meeting adjourned at 14:30