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**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

**March 14, 2018/EE 2:30 – 5:00 PM**

Voting Members Present: Abdourazakou, Benavides Lopez, Bono, Cutrone, Dam, Deng, Evans, Grasse, Johnson, Kitching, Krochalk, Kulikov, Lacanlale, Laurent, Ledesma, Ma, Macias, McGlynn, Mendoza, Monty, Nelson, Nicol, Pawar, Perez (proxy for Kalayjian) Phan, Pong, Radmacher, Sanford, Skiffer, Still, Tang, Taylor, Villanueva (proxy for Heinze Balcazar), Yi

Voting Members Not Present: Cid, Ernst, Ferris, Furtado, Gaines, Gray-Shellberg, Jarrett, Kaplan, Keville, Naynaha

Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Avila, Celly, Iheke, Ortega, Talamante, Thomas

Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Esposito, Gammage, Hagan, Norman,

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Goodwin, Hill, LaPolt, O’Donnell, Salhi, Spagna, Stewart, Wen

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Avila, Brasley, Davis, Franklin, Carrier, Driscoll, Manriquez, McNutt, Poltorak, Sayed

Guests: K. Boyum, D. Gamboa, C. Gardner, R. Hay, Roberson-Simms

2017-2018 Academic Senate Executive Committee:

Laura Talamante – Chair, Kirti Celly – Vice Chair, Justin Gammage – Parliamentarian, Charles Thomas – Secretary, Enrique Ortega – EPC Chair, Maria Avila – FPC Chair, Kate Esposito and Thomas Norman – Statewide Senators

**Recorded and Edited by SEW and the Executive Committee**

Meeting Called to Order: 2:30 PM

Revised Agenda M/S/P

Minutes 02/14/18 M/S/P

Senate Chair Report

* No report

**Second Reading Items:**

**EPC 17-21 Resolution Calling for the Revision of the General Education Committee (GEC) Charge, EPC Chair Ortega who reviewed revisions made based on suggestions offered at the First Reading on February 14, 2018.**

* **Changed order of the first three resolves.**
* **Changed wording reflecting decision and approval actions to recommendations throughout the resolution**
* **Made it explicit that it is the Dean of Undergraduate Programs for Academic Affairs who would represent the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs**
* **2nd footnote was removed as it was deemed not to have added any clarifying information**
* **The charge now specifies that the appointed GEC chair will have voting rights on the committee and shall serve for a period of one year. They cannot renew their service unless they are elected into the GEC through standard elections and then elected to chair the committee by the committee members.**

**Discussion: Senator Kalayjian said that the GE Chair could serve a maximum period of one year unless reelected by the committee, Kalayjian suggested that wasn’t clear. She suggested the language for the sixth resolve to say “shall serve as an appointee”. Senator Monty asked if in the sixth resolve where it says that the Academic Senate Chair shall appoint a faculty member to serve as General Education Committee Chair, does this mean a faculty member external to the General Education Committee or one of the committee members. Ortega responded some of the issues that are occurring are that some of the members that are on the committee do not wish to serve as chair. The thought behind that is how can they be encouraged to serve if they’ve already expressed that they do not wish to serve. Monty said he did not believe that to be a good mechanism. He recommended striking it all together. Why would we want to implant in the minds of committee members that they don’t need to elect a chair from among the committee? Monty said he is not comfortable with the Academic Senate Chair appointing someone to chair the committee who was not even elected to the committee. He suggested should the situation arise, it could always be dealt with on an ad hoc basis. Talamante directed a question to Monty, asking if it is not in the charge, where would the authority come from to appoint an outside member? Monty responded it would be an ad hoc decision and it would be an anomalous situation. Senator Thomas offered a friendly amendment to address Senator Kalayjian’s comments, at the end of the sixth resolve stating “and shall serve in the appointed role”. Senator Heinze Balcazar asked what is the rationale to maintaining the election within the committee and not opening it to the campus? Kalayjian said that she believed it to be a practical thing and that if you decided to change this practice for the General Education Committee you would have do also do it for the UCC and the UWC, and other standing committees of the Senate. Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies Salhi thought a possible solution would be instead of electing one chair, the committee would elect a chair and a deputy chair, then the there’s an automatic process for the deputy chair to become the next chair, establishing an automatic process and an assurance that there is a chair always there. Salhi said another possibility is as leaders in shared governance, and then in the absence of a chair, the Academic Affairs Dean of Undergraduate Studies could step in as a temporary chair until a chair is identified. This way it will avoid other problems and ensure continuity. Senator Furtado at Graduate Council, they are very particular about that people who join, they want someone with graduate studies experience and would expect the same for the General Education Committee. Additionally, given this situation came up last year, that whatever is decided be a consideration for all standing committees. Ortega said in response to Senator Furtado, on line 31 they included language that reads “Faculty that are elected from each college should have primary responsibilities in an undergraduate level program.” Senator Heinze Balcazar said it is an issue of shared governance, and while she agrees with Senator Furtado, we would want people with experience, but we would also want people to acquire experience. GE and UCC have a very large impact on our departments. Heinze Balcazar said she believed there is an issue of transparency and accountability with these two committees. Therefore, it is very important for Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate to make sure that these committees are transparent and accountable and there would be an election with at least two candidates telling us what they are proposing to do in GE to improve GE. What are they proposing to improve communication and help us understand how GE works? There are people who are not in GE now, but have had GE experience. She said she finds it problematic that we continue to elect chairs from Academic Affairs or from the Senate and that we don’t open it to other people who have acquired experience. Heinze Balcazar suggested that GE has an image problem. Having an election of the GE and UCC Chair be elected by the Senate which would help the image of the committee and there would be buy in from departments. Monty said he disagrees because committees select their own chairs, which is a very common practice. He said he doesn’t believe there’s any problem with transparency if we have faculty elected to these committees selecting their chair. If we were to do that, we would need to amend the constitution, by-laws and charges for all the standing committees under the senate. This is s 2nd reading, at this point there are a few proposals before you. Monty reminded Ortega that he had suggested striking the language “the Academic Senate Chair shall appoint” on line 44 and that Senator Heinze Balcazar is recommending a change in the voting procedure for the chair of the committee. Monty asked Ortega to state whether or not he felt these to be friendly amendments or whether he disagrees and if Ortega wants the body to vote on the resolution as presented. Senator Norman said he agreed, is it a friendly amendment or we should have amendments on the floor to strike the language. Ortega said there are currently three different options, 1. Keep the sixth resolve updating the language: “shall serve as an appointee”; another was to elect a chair and a deputy chair allowing the Dean of Undergraduate Studies to serve temporarily as a chair if none was elected; and lastly that the chair would be elected by the senate. Norman asked if Monty wished to propose an amendment. Monty said he withdraws. Norman said some perspective on having committees elect their own chair. This body has a chair that was elected by the overall general faculty. Norman noted that the GEC strikes him as a committee of also great importance to the university community and to have a process by which that leadership role is reflecting the overall university; it does not necessarily need to come from the committee. Norman said the amendment he proposes would be in line 44 after the word Academic Senate Chair, add the word, “after consultation with the Academic Senate,” Everything would remain the same and not make this a single person prerogative, to have there be some discussion. Definitely, members of the committee and members of the wider community could be considered. A second was offered and then a discussion ensued. Kalayjian said she considers Senator Norman’s change to that resolve to be friendly as well as the language that both she and Senator Thomas offered to also be friendly and she would support that. Norman repeated the friendly amendment being proposed. The body also accepted the addition of “as an appointee” to line 46, inserted after “shall serve”. Talamante offered the friendly amendment offered from Senator Pawar at the First Reading that on line 27 it read “by faculty from the library and by faculty from each of the following colleges”.**

**Resolution with recommended changes comes to a vote with 44 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.**

**EXEC 17-19 Increasing Faculty Involvement in the University Budgeting Process (Amending PM 2014-04), Statewide Senator Thomas Norman**

Norman presented the changes to the resolution based on discussion from previous senate meeting, stating that some of the changes adopted were to make the resolution not be so prescriptive. The second reading now as the outline of purposes broken down into semesters rather than by month will better meet the desire of the body. Norman read aloud the rest of the proposed changes. A motion was put on the floor and seconded to discuss.

**Discussion:** **Senator Monty** asked if UBC members had been consulted and/or invited to Senate Exe meetings to give their feedback. He added that the UBC’s business is beyond the purview of the Academic Senate and the Academic Senate has jurisdiction over Academic Affairs matters, and the UBC is a university committee and Academic Affairs is only part of it. Academic Affairs is already represented fairly well. He said we’re talking about a PM and that this is not an academic policy. He added that he’s not what authority the senate believes it should be doing this especially if they have not consulted with the UBC. **Chair Talamante** responded that the chair of the UBC was invited to Senate Exec in the fall, after he had invited Talamante and Norman to a lunch discussion about ideas he had for strengthening the University Budget Committee. Then he came to Senate Exec and presented those ideas. From that and from feedback we had received from other faculty, both at the Senate Retreat and afterwards, we began with our first draft of the resolution. Then, upon invitation by Dr. Hamden, we sent the UBC the first draft to all members of the committee. They then invited Talamante to present at UBC and gave feedback, some of which was incorporated, some of which were not after discussion in Senate Exec. From the feedback there, we made changes to the resolution as it stands. **Dean LaPolt** said he hoped that a voting member make a motion to clarify what is now on line 45 where it reads “that the Academic Senate Chair (or Senate Executive Committee designee) serve”. He said that it was not clear to him who would makes the decision that it will be the chair or is it the Senate Executive Committee that determines this. **Norman** agreed that it was not explicit. **Monty** said it is his understanding that it would be the senate chair unless the senate chair were unable to attend. **Senator Kaplan** suggested it read, “(or, the chair being unable to serve, a Senate Executive Committee designee)”. **Senator Tang** said as he read through the entire resolution, I see what is currently practiced by UBC and what is proposed here is not much difference. The only difference he sees is to allow the Academic Senate Chair to serve on the UBC as a voting member. Tang added since the UBC already has a representative from each college, what is added by having brought into UBC the Academic Senate Chair as a voting member? **Norman** expressed appreciation for the current approach the UBC is taking and wanted to continue that momentum by institutionalizing that. Norman offered that as new administrators come in there is the possibility of practices that are working well be wavered from and making decisions without consultation. This is why having a formal role and a formal member of the senate body, rather than burden college representatives with that perspective, we would have the Academic Senate with its university wide perspective. **Tang** expressed that this practice may not be necessary, as each college has to elect a faculty to represent. Tang said this is quite strict. He said in his experience, his associate dean emailed faculty in his college three times asking for representation in UBC because a previous representative resigned for another position. Do we really need to make this a resolution or leave it to each college on how to elect their representative? **Senator Celly** said in response to Senator Tang’s last question, it does get down to a matter of shared governance. In one instance we have no one interested and in another instance there could be a lot of people interested. It should come from the faculty and not via dean’s appointee. **Monty** said unless he’s mistaken, UBC meetings are open. **Norman** said yes. **Monty** said there’s plenty of transparency and shared governance in that any interested faculty may attend University Budget Committee meetings at any time. The senate voted to accept the suggested wording from Kaplan, which was approved. The body then voted on the amended resolution.

**Resolution passes by a vote of 34 in favor, 0 against and 8 abstentions.**

**Senate Updates**

**Faculty Policy Committee Chair, Maria Avila**

Avila reported on an update to the faculty climate survey which is that the President's Council on Diversity & Inclusion continues to make progress with a plan on a campus wide climate survey that would include administration, students, staff and faculty. As part of this process, the Council has asked Senate Executive Committee and FPC to participate by providing feedback on survey questions related to faculty. We will be doing this on 3/1. Academic Senate Chair has also invited non-tenure track faculty to participate in this meeting. Avila expressed that her committee is learning a great deal. She noted that each item they have on their plate requires quite a bit of research and consultation with other available units and individuals before we even decide if those items merit moving into a resolution or not. Related to this process of consultation, the FPC has invited Chair Talamante and AVP Hill to the Faculty Policy Committee meeting to discuss together what items can be brought to Senate this semester and which items will expand into next semester.

**Senate Parliamentarian, Justin Gammage**

There are two calls out. One for the University Scholarship Committee and the other for the Planning and Design Committee for the restructuring of Club 1910 that will be on campus. Additionally, Gammage said he will be sending out calls for the annual elections in early to mid-March.

**Educational Policy Committee (EPC) Chair, Enrique Ortega**

* EPC will be meeting the Advising Policy Committee on March 12 to begin discussing administrative graduation issues. We may possibly draft a policy with the group in order to comply with the Chancellor's Office on this issue. Those present will be Academic Advisement, Enrollment Management and the University Registrar.
* EPC has begun to open discussion with the Office of the Provost regarding syllabus requirements that are currently part of the Academic Affairs Policy Manual, specifically Academic Affairs 2015-03. The EPC has received numerous requests to review these requirements and will begin a discussion on how to proceed with these matters.

**Discussion:** **Monty** asked what recommendations are going to be made to amend the syllabus policy? Monty suggested a recommendation that had been made previous at the Academic Senate by former Senator Richard Malamud. This recommendation was to take all the policies and information and have them posted on a website with a mandatory link included in the syllabus pointing to all of the policies and information. **Avila** added that longer the syllabus is, the less likely students read them and taken seriously. **Senator Norman** said he wished to second Senator Monty’s suggestion and have EPC seriously consider it. He added that it has become before the Statewide’s Faculty Affairs Committee and they were asked to look at language for all 23 campuses. He said part of that conversation on the committee was that many of our syllabus have become more about policies and procedures. We’re considering the syllabus to be an academic contract representing our content and expertise. **Monty** said currently these are areas that are being dictated to us and perhaps do not belong in our intellectual property. Senator Sanford said that is seems that the syllabus is two things, our intellectual property and then university policies. **Senator Sanford** suggested if we can’t provide a link to it, perhaps we could have two documents, one would be university syllabus policies and the other would be the academic syllabus. **Senator Kulikov** suggested given that the university policies are the same for all classes, it wouldn’t make sense that faculty would print out or send the same university policy syllabus to all students. Making it available online at mycsudh.edu. **Talamante** thanked everyone for their suggestions and said if anyone has additional comments to email them to Ortega.

**ASI VP Iheke** – Iheke said that ASI is in the midst of elections. The candidates’ forum was on 2/27 and the presidential debate will happen on 3/1 from 5 – 6 pm in housing. Iheke requested that faculty encourage their students to join them, as they really want to educate students on how they have the power to elect their student leadership. Elections will run from 3/5 through 3/12. ASI will be attending the California Higher Education Student Summit from 3/9 – 3/12. She said they will be advocating and lobbying regarding tuition and money for our child development center with legislatures like Mike Gipson and Senator Bradford. There was a presentation at the ASI BOD meeting from VPs Franklin and Goodwin regarding a possible merger with LSU possibly dissolving into ASI. It’s in the discussion phase at this point. There are many meetings already booked and so part of the discussion is on what that would look like. ASI is in the midst of reviewing the administrative budget. The budget call did go out and we received a lot of applications. The ASI President Justin Blakely has been asked to help the Black Resource Center at Cal State Fresno and doing a presentation on that over the weekend of March 3rd. Iheke also reported that she is working on getting student representation to serve on the Academic Technology Committee after receiving an email from Senate requesting such. She said she’ll be getting two names for that. Lastly, another merger Iheke said could be happening is the infant/toddler center and the child development center could be merging as well. Iheke said she’ll provide updates on progress at future Senate meetings. **FPC Chair Avila** asked if ASI VP would send to the Senate Chair whatever information we need to help ASI ensure a successful response to the elections.

[Executive Order 1100 Revised & 11110 Implementation, Math Chair M. Jones](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/MathPathways-022818.docx)

Jones began his presentation stating this was an update to what he previously reported on in the fall regarding EO1110 in Mathematics. Jones [shared a PowerPoint](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/MathPathways-022818.docx), which he said should clarify and add the levels (identified by the Chancellor’s Office), that the students are at. Jones said the top group of boxes that most of our students who are not bound for calculus, they can come in at four levels of preparation, and for each of those this shows what the pathways would be for them through GE Mathematics. If they’re in Level IV, those are the students who require early start, in that case they would take ESM 102, which is the beginning of a stretch into statistics during the summer and then in the fall they would be in the GE statistics course that has four units designed to help them be successful in that class. Jones read through the rest of the chart aloud, row-by-row. He said the next section for those who are calculus bound STEM students, he noted that the Chancellor's Office splits out the requirements for STEM slightly differently so that the category two and three STEM are slightly different from the other ones. The students who need Early Start who are not considered GE ready would take college algebra in the summer and then go into a 5-unit preparation for calculus in the fall. If they’re GE ready, we offer something we call the Calculus Success Academy which is an opportunity to advance straight into calculus after passing a placement test.

**Q&A/Discussion: Senator Cid** asked if they already thought about addressing the impact this might have on a certain demographic of students. If it does arise that there is a negative impact on one demographic of students more so than another? **Jones** replied said he believe that’s always been the case that students get sorted by factors that we wouldn’t want them to get sorted on. He added our hope is that by giving them a college credit algebra course right up front, which is a GE course for them, that we will get them to calculus in the first year which is an opportunity they haven’t had in the past. We’re doing everything we can to build support around those courses so that they’re successful. Jones said he hopes it will actually increase the equitability of their access into STEM majors. For the rest of the students who don’t need calculus we’re adopting from Northridge, where they’ve had a lot of success to get students to pass that course and be successful in GE statistics. **Sanford** said he has a concern about the Early Start program in summer and asked how are students expected to pay for these. He shared that he’s had summer students who have said they’ve had to pay for those courses out of pocket. How is it going to be paid for? Does the financial aid department get instructed that they have to include this course in the fall through spring tuition? **Jones** said he knows that all students have been able to take Early Start at effectively no cost to them. **Cid** asked if there was also a plan in place for transfer students that doesn’t include Early Start for summer? **Jones** said that transfer students with very few exceptions come in having completed GE, so they would go through the existing pathway. If they are physics majors likely they would start in pre-calculus unless there was some other data that said they would start in calculus. **Senator Thomas** said it would appear to him that these are stretch courses with larger unit numbers instead of our typical three unit courses, we’re talking four and five unit courses. Given that there was an edict from the Chancellor's Office that all degrees must be 120 units, it would appear that we would be increasing our GE package with these additional units. **Jones** said all the advice they’ve been given by the Chancellor's Office is that as long as there is a three unit course that fulfills the requirement, that is how you would count it in your major. **Celly** thanked Jones for mentioning the CSU Northridge program saying that one of the things that they spoke about was the vital role of supplemental instruction and ensuring that students in these courses actually make it. **Jones** said supplemental instruction has definitely been a vital part of how we’ve been able to support students and we are continuing to revitalize and expand how we support students in these freshmen level courses. **Spagna** said he wanted to compliment Matt Jones, Tim Chin, Siskanna Naynaha on what the English and Math departments are doing on this campus is stellar and he believes that in five years we’re all proudly look back on what we’ve done to remove the stigma of remediation and to get students to be successful coming through Dominguez Hills.

**CFA Senate Report, Daniel Cutrone**

* This past Monday keeping to one our CFA Goals of more “Open Communication” for the semester and beyond our CFA Steering Committee hosted a coffee and muffin “Pop-Up Social” for members to just “Drop by and Say Hello”. It was held on the east Walkway by the free speech area to show “presence” and to be openly available for faculty and Students to become knowledgeable about our ‘Mission and Goals”. Members from our CFA Steering committee were there from 11:00AM to 1:00PM and again from 3:00 to 5:00PM to answer questions, provide information, and updates. There are several important issues being discussed within the CFA at this time and the views and opinions from our members are currently being noted. It is important to also have our students stop in and we encourage everyone to inform students about such events on campus. Once again, our CFA holds the values and opinions of our students and understanding their needs as one of our foremost goals. Through our actions, we hope to educate and demonstrate how “Transparency and “Shared Governance” leads to the betterment of all.
* On Tuesday, Cutrone attended Pizza with the Science Dean on behalf of our CFA, faculty and students. It afforded a great opportunity to allow students to become part of decision making through “shared governance” forum. It also afforded our students a chance to meet with faculty. Our CFA wants to thank Dr. La Polt and Dr. Martinez for sponsoring and speaking to the students personally at this meeting. Once again, an example of the growing effort to reach out to our students that is taking place here on our campus.

Upcoming CFA events

* Third CSU Lecturer Conference on Shared Governance will take place on Saturday, March10, 2018 at San Jose State University. Organized by the Shared Governance Committee of the CFA Lecturers’ Council, this conference will bring together non-tenure-track Unit 3 lecturer faculty, coaches, librarians, counselors, and their tenure-track allies, from across the CSU to connect, coordinate, and advance non-tenure-track representation in shared governance and recognition of lecturers as faculty. A significant goal of this one-day conference is to inspire, produce, and put into practice actions on shared governance and lecturer recognition and representation at all levels (department, college/division, campus, and system-wide). We will be sending two representatives from our CFA to the conference. Although here at CSUDH we have made great strides with supporting the conference goals we still and must continue to instill a sense of inclusion and stand as a united faculty if we are going to continue to include the greatest part of our teaching force as faculty.
* Keeping with another of our goals of working with the students our CFA will be supporting the “MY TIE” Board of Director Event sponsored by our LSU. It will include a free dinner and dialogue on Wednesday March 14 from 5:00 to 7:00PM and give all a chance to meet the LSU Executive Board and find out more about our Loker Student Union. Once again, here is another opportunity to build community by bridging a relationship with the students and Faculty.
* CFA Equity Conference, that will take place on March 16 and 17 in Los Angeles, is also upcoming and if you wish to attend, please let us know at the CFA and we will be happy to assist you in registering.

CFA wishes to congratulate Dr. Hagen for the acknowledgement awards to our faculty. The awards banquet night is one that we will all want to attend. The CFA congratulates all awardees especially Dr. Talamante for her “Excellence in Service Award”. She has truly earned the respect of the CFA for the sincere attention she has given to all faculty issues.

**Provost Spagna’s Remarks (on behalf of President Hagan**

* Exciting news related to the Science and Innovation building fundraising campaign from VP Stewart. President Hagan met with Supervisor Mark Ridley Thomas after a series of meetings his staff had with David Gamboa, Phil LaPolt and Beri Eisenhardt asking for a multi-million dollar commitment for the building. Mark has agreed and the staff is working on the details. This is solid and it will be paid over the next three years.
* There is an intention to hold a mid-April Town Hall. This is in consultation with Rickson Associates about the larger migration and building plans. We, in consultation with the Academic Senate will be co-crafting and co-creating the agenda for that Town Hall.
* Spagna said there is a new General Counsel for the university named John Walsh who will be joining us at the Senate meeting today. He comes from LA Unified School District and had been a Professor of History at University of Claremont.

**Talamante** added with regard to the Town Hall, the intention is to hold it on a Wednesday afternoon opposite Senate when they have their normal Senate meetings to allow for most attendance of our Senators. Thank you to the Cabinet for working with us on that.

**Executive Order 1100 Revised & 1110 Implementation, Dr. H. Oesterheld, English Department**
Oesterheld utilized several resources for her presentation including [Comp program revision](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/CompProgramRevison2018.docx), the [WSCUC Town Hall on Written Communication](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/WSCUC%20Town%20Hall%20Writ%20Comm%20Overview022818.pdf), she provided the Senate with an overview on [assessment based curriculum reform and response to Executive Orders 1110](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/ENGSenate%20handout%20022818.docx) and she gave a [PowerPoint presentation](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/ENG_Sentate%20Presentation%20Slides%202.28.18%20FIN.pdf).

* Resources support from Academic Affairs and CAH Dean’s office, which allowed us to immerse ourselves in the process of assessing and revising the comp program for the past 3.5 years. When the Executive Orders came out, we were well positioned to respond.
* In November 2017, English Chair Tim Chin reported to Senate on the programmatic changes the department has been making in response to the Executive Orders.
* Oesterheld provided an update to that report as well as other steps that have been taken since.
* Previously course learning outcomes did not fully capture the full range of thinking, reading and writing skills that most faculty were asking students to demonstrate and we had not been doing regular assessment in our writing courses. There also was not an opportunity for faculty to communicate with each other about these expectations.
* Curricular change: in 2016-17 a faculty-working group was formed that was comprised of both adjunct and tenure line faculty focused on Early Start English/Summer Bridge program.
* We asked what would happen if we offered students an intensive, challenging but supportive college level writing class that would introduce them to some of the key concepts and practices they would need to draw upon as writers at Dominguez Hills and beyond.
* We ramped up content of classes, we familiarized students with key concepts that were central to the process of composing and gave them the opportunity to begin practicing.
* The faculty-working group worked on new content, new program learning outcomes, new course learning outcomes, new evaluation rubrics, a shared curriculum where before we had wide variation. We also administered student intake and exit surveys so we could see how well the students were engaging with this content.
* We also piloted Directed Self-Placement (DSP). We have approximately 200 students in this pilot program where the students were given guidance in terms of the courses they could pick. Instead of being routed to the regular sequence, they selected their fall writing course. We’re tracking students currently and we’re seeking to expand.
* Fall 2017, after the rollout of the new curriculum, the Composition Task Force was formed. That task force is comprised of English faculty and the Associate dean of the CAH. We’re both working on the new version of ESE and we are responding to the Executive Orders.
* In our inner assessment of the new ESE courses, we found that overall student performance increased notably, compared to spring and summer 2016 where we were meeting right around 50% of expectations compared to now, right around 90% meeting newly stated expectations.

**Q & A/Comments:**

**Monty** directed a question to the Provost asking what awaits Dominguez Hills in the future for the Writing Across the Curriculum program as it is still not incorporated into the baseline budget, or if it is the budget is inadequate. **Spagna** responded based on conversations he’s had with the President, Hagan has suggested with the University Village coming online he sees that as a revenue stream coming out of that which will support these efforts. We will need to support the scaffolding to get there, the Provost said and we have his commitment as well as trying to seek funds from the Chancellor's Office. He added that Dominguez Hills is seen as the shining light here and that element will be an important light going forward. **Senator Nicol** asked about DSP. She said she was concerned about students having realistic self-appraisal and that they might be quite ready. **Oesterheld** said that Directed Self Placement has been around for a few decades and there’s fairly robust research into its effectiveness. She said they’ve been in contact with San Francisco State University who have been leaders on this issue in the system. Their data is extremely promising about the accuracy and the appropriateness of student self placement. The idea behind it is where students are asked to write a reflective essay with a few writing prompts. It isn’t graded or a test, but they do answer a series of questions that designed to get them to reflect. They’re allowed to take this module over any number of hours. After completing the module, they get a recommendation. Generally speaking, DSP is slowly becoming a system-wide standard. **Celly** asked Oesterheld to speak about class size and the role of supplemental instruction. **Oesterheld** responded that part of the conditions of the work we’ve been doing, because they’re going down to one course we’ve asked for reduced class sizes. We’re hoping to go down to a class size of 15 in the summer and then sections of 17 in the academic year. What we have worked out with Academic Affairs, is that we’re really committing to faculty development to give faculty opportunity to talk about this new pedagogy and new approaches. With regard to supplemental instruction, we have a robust supplemental instruction program right now, mostly attached to developmental courses but we do intend to use them and could expand it if we see what the student need is. **Dean Avila** thanked Oesterheld for the excellent work and for being a model of using data and collecting data to assess what we’re doing. He continued, with regard to the funding model that we need going forward; including the Bridge funding and where the eventual funding will come from. Avila said we’ve crunched the numbers on reduced class sizes, we’ve looked at the impact of that on our lecturer faculty and a three to five year roll-out budget that takes all these things into consideration. We’re in stable funding and there is commitment to this core part of our curriculum. A robust writing program on campus is it not simply the purview of the English department, it will take commitment of departments throughout the university, particularly writing in the major, writing intensive courses at the upper division level.

**Time, place, Manner Policy – Provost Spagna and VP Franklin**

**Spagna** first introduced John Walsh, the new General Counsel for Dominguez Hills and then introduced [the presentation](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/Time%20Place%20and%20Manner.pptx) and VP Franklin. **Franklin** began by saying that universities across the country have been challenged with freedom of expression, which runs into academic freedom, and also microaggressions on some of the issues that marginalized students and students of colors are facing. Our Time, Place & Manner policy was not only outdated there were things in there that were technically restricting students. A year and a half ago we started to readdress the current Time, Place & Manner policy. What must a Time, Place & Manner policy stress – it must be content neutral and narrowly tailored, so that if students, faculty and staff decide that they might want the freedom of expression, the university just can’t shut it down. Can the university impose time, place and manner restrictions? “The U.S. Supreme Court has said that "laws regulating the time, place or manner of speech stand on a different footing than laws prohibiting speech altogether." We will begin a series of town halls to delve more deeply into this. The current presidential memorandum PM 99-04 is outdated and is no longer available online. The new [draft of the policy](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/Senate%20Presentation%20FINAL%20DRAFT%20-%20TIME%20PLACE%20AND%20MANNER%20POLICY%20-%2002-28-18.docx), The revised policy will supersede certain sections of PM 99-04 addressing four major sections: purpose of policy, policy statements on free expression & free speech, policy on use of university property, facilities and services, and specific time-place-manner restrictions. As required by Education Code Section 66303: the President designates the Division of Student Affairs to administer this policy and serve as liaison with students exercising free speech. The President designates Faculty Affairs and Human Resources Management to administer this policy and serve as liaison with faculty and staff exercising free speech. Done with the highest standards of institutional integrity, academic freedom, freedom of expression, and full recognition of the rights, privileges and responsibilities. Universities exist to provide the conditions for hard thought and difficult debate so that individuals can develop the capacity for independent judgment. Of course, freedom of speech is not and cannot be absolute. While there is no hate speech exception to First Amendment protections, threats, harassment, ‘fighting words,’ incitement and defamatory speech are not protected. Franklin also spoke to other points in the presentation regarding the policy on use of university property, facilities and services. He highlighted the section regarding major events. He said that this is something that Fullerton recently had to deal with when Milo Yiannopoulos came. Campus events refer to events where there are over 200 invents and many divisions are going to be involved which have to go through a major litany of conversations over several divisions that may or may not involve a concert or dance; or alcohol is served or amplified sound is requested.



The policy is far reaching, it’s about more than the “Milos” of the world, it’s about the Educational Conference, the High Impact Practices conference and events such as the Spring Fling. The policy contains specific time, place and manner restrictions in areas such as public forums and free speech, amplified sound, posting policy, chalking guidelines and display and distribution of published materials. It guides how we move forward. Franklin encouraged everyone when they had an opportunity to view [the draft policy](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/Senate%20Presentation%20FINAL%20DRAFT%20-%20TIME%20PLACE%20AND%20MANNER%20POLICY%20-%2002-28-18.docx) in preparation for more robust discussion to be had about free speech and academic freedom. We really want faculty feedback. **Spagna** said we started this conversation with ASI as well. The Academic Senate passed a resolution last spring ([FPC 17-03](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/documents/fpc%2017-03%20resolution%20on%20academic%20freedom%20and%20free%20speech.docx)) that Academic Affairs is reviewing regarding academic freedom. Spagna encouraged people to consider an AAUP article called [Freedom in the Classroom](https://www.aaup.org/report/freedom-classroom). He described some of the contemporary criticisms noted in the article of what we do in our classrooms. Spagna said they’re also looking at what our sister campuses are doing, and noted Long Beach that [has a splash page](http://web.csulb.edu/divisions/students/freespeech/time_place_manner.html), where they reference not only their Time, Place, and Manner policy but also a piece on freedom of expression, FAQs and support services. Spagna asked for faculty to read the existing [draft of the policy](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/Senate%20Presentation%20FINAL%20DRAFT%20-%20TIME%20PLACE%20AND%20MANNER%20POLICY%20-%2002-28-18.docx) so that we can have a meaningful dialogue of where we wish to go on our campus. **Celly** said while it was suggested that we haven’t really had to deal with these issues on our campus, she recalls something that came up last year around the Labor Fair where an alt-right organization wanted to come. The students voted on that and the organization did get to come but didn’t care for the reception they received. They thought their ideas would go down smoothly, but they didn’t. She continued its great that we’ll have a policy like this. She noted that a one institution that’s been in the press quite a bit, UC Berkeley. The costs of trying to manage such events were steep. As we think about implementing and enforcing these policies, have we given thought on how will we fund these major events? Police forces don’t just show up, they need to be paid. **Franklin** said these are some things we are going to have to talk about. The Labor and Social Justice Fair incident was a clear example of how these things can run a campus. The amount of time invested in trying to “right that ship”, was very cumbersome. So if you have several outside agitators coming, and you get thousands of people coming who may not have a stake in it other than they just want to level their opinions. The campus has to manage which takes outside law enforcement which goes beyond the resources we have as a campus. **Thomas** thanked Spagna and Franklin for the presentation. He said his concern is that we may be taking an expanded definition for what a major event is, in particular with regard to amplified sound. Under our new time place manner proposal, he is concerned that having a microphone in the east walkway may require additional approvals that were not present before and may change the character of what we want to do with the east walkway. **Franklin** responded it does not and everything that they previously been doing is still in place. This policy does not supersede the existing amplified sound policy. **Norman** asked do you think we have an advantage given we have the StubHub Center on campus. **Franklin** responded logistically it helps, as we now know how to manage an NFL size crowd and the logistics that comes along with it. However, logistics are not finances. We’re not as worried about logistics, but whose going to pay if we have to go to that scale. **Talamante** asked what the anticipated schedule of town halls was to discuss this more deeply. **Franklin** responded that the President first wanted there to be a conversation with Senate and ASI. He saw that opening up with something very keynote around the First Amendment, freedom of speech, freedom of expression and academic freedom.

**OPEN MIC**

* Senator Krochalk announced a symposium being held on March 7th which is one component of the Adelante, Action for Health Equity in the Latinx Community that will be happening over the next month. The March 7th program will begin with several screenings of a documentary in LSU, a keynote speaker in the afternoon, a panel presentation and discussion and a reception, featuring live music.
* Senator Keville announced that Self Help Graphics will be on campus with their Barrio Mobile Art Studio from 12 – 3 pm on March 1st. All students are welcome to come create screen printings with activist themes. The BMAS is free and open to the campus community on a first come first served basis.
* Keville also spoke to a survey he will be sending out from the Council of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators. He’s in the early stages. The survey will inquire about what resources and support are needed to assist Chairs and Program Coordinators be more successful.
* Celly brought up the topic of inclusion and what Senator Cutrone spoke to during his report. La Polt’s Donuts with the Dean seemed like a wonderful idea to promote inclusion and share their thoughts. Celly also suggested using student generated content (art, writing, film) in our education to reinforce inclusion.
* Iheke spoke about the following:
	+ They’ll be having the same Time, Place, Manner presentation on March 16th with the Provost and VP of Student Affairs.
	+ Iheke also noted that ASI will be adopting a University Toro Hour resolution this Friday; however they’re still encouraging feedback and input from students.
	+ Elections for ASI Board opens up March 5th through March 12, 2018, please encourage students to vote.
	+ Presidents Student Service Award also opens up on Monday, March 5th, please ask students to look for that email as well as others.

**Meeting adjourned**