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**March 6, 2019/Extended Education/2:30 – 5:00 PM**

Voting Members Present, Bono, Chai (proxy for Andrade), Chhetri, Cutrone, Deng, Dixon, Evans, Heinze-Balcazar, Hirohama, Kalayjian, Keville, Kitching, Krochalk, Ma, Macias, McGlynn, Mendoza Diaz, Monty, Nicol, Park, Pawar, Phan, Pong, JPrice, Radmacher, Sanford, Sharp, Silvanto, Tang, Taylor, Yi

Voting Members Not Present: Benavides Lopez, Ernst, Fortner, Gray-Shellberg, Jarrett, Johnson, Kulikov, Laurent, Morris, Naynaha, VPrice, Skiffer, Still

Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Joseph, Norman, Ortega, Ospina, Pinto, Talamante

Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Celly, Esposito, Gammage, Parham

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Brasley, Davis, Franklin, LaPolt, Spagna, Wen

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Avila, Costino, Driscoll, Goodwin, Manriquez, McNutt, Peyton, O’Donnell, Poltorak, Sayed, Stewart

Guests: T. Caron, E. Cleek, A. Kawakami, W. Velasquez Rivera, D. Roberson Simms, N. Rodriguez, M. Smith, L. Wilson

2018-2019 Academic Senate Executive Committee:

Laura Talamante – Chair, Kate Esposito – Vice Chair, Justin Gammage – Parliamentarian, Dana Ospina – Secretary, Enrique Ortega – EPC Chair, Katy Pinto – FPC Chair, Kirti Celly and Thomas Norman – Statewide Senators

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

Meeting Called to Order: 2:30 PM

Approval of Agenda M/S/P

Approval of Minutes 02/20/19 M/S/P

**Academic Senate Chair Report:**

* Gender Equity Task Force
	+ The Provost and President have signed the Senate resolution in support of the Gender Equity Task Force. Provost Spagna has appointed Dean Costino as the co-chair from Academic Affairs, Vice President Goodwin has appointed Title IX Officer Schrock as the co-chair from Administration & Finance, and the Senate Executive Committee has appointed Chair Talamante as the co-chair from Senate. AVP Roberson-Sims will represent Human Resources. Ms. Kawakami from Faculty Affairs & Development will sit in on meetings until the appointment of the AVP of FAD. The President will update us on who will sit in on meetings until the appointment of the Chief Diversity Officer. The CFA Steering Committee is selecting their representative. Nominations for faculty and staff representatives are underway. The task force will also include CSU Senior Director Human Resources Compliance Stephanie Wright. Our work will help set the curve for gender equity work in the CSUs.
* GE Task Force Report
	+ Senate Exec received a resolution from the floor rejecting the GE Task Force Report. We have shared the resolution with the EPC, GE, and FPC committees. Our plan is to revise the resolution based on broader campus feedback to the report, which has been shared with the deans, department chairs and program coordinators, and the ASI Board of Directors. We have received some feedback and encourage senators to share their feedback today during open mic. ASI will discuss the report at their March 15th meeting, and I will be in attendance as the Senate Liaison. We will bring forth a resolution at the March 20th Senate meeting when Faculty Trustee Romney Sabalius will be attending. Since CSUDH did not object to the original create of the ASCSU GE Task Force, we discussed having the resolution call for the committee to be reconvened and reconstituted if necessary to finish the work they started, including collecting and incorporating CSU GE assessment data. Moreover, the task force must follow through on its promise of direct consultation with the 23 CSUs, which should include time with the Senates, GE Committees, and with CSU faculty experts in US History and Political Science.
* CSU & the Death of History Campaign, California History-Social Science Project and the AHA critiques of the GE Task Force recommendations
	+ The CSU Council on History & American Institutions has begun a campaign against the recommendations of the GE Task Force to gut the American Institutions requirement, currently covered in separate 3-unit courses: one in US History and one in Political Science, by having students enroll in a 3-unit Democracy in the US course. The Council is circulating the document entitled, “The California State University and the Death of History,” They correctly note that if such reforms were adopted, no student in the CSU would be required to take a history course as part of the Bachelor’s degree. The campaign is receiving the support of the leaders of the California History-Social Science Project and emphasizing the negative impact of such changes on the education and training of California teachers. The American Historical Association has also taken a stand in support of the campaign and is urging its members to write to Governor Gavin Newsom, Speaker of the Assembly Anthony Rendon, Assembly Higher Education Committee leaders Jose Medina and Dr. Shirley Weber as well as local state legislators, urging them “to reject the task force proposal and preserve the ‘comprehensive study of American history and government” as the basis for a robust American Institutions mandate in the California State University.”
* CA-AAUP Conference
	+ A CSUDH team of senators, CFA representatives, and the Vice Provost attended the CA-AAUP conference, “Are Academic Freedom and Shared Governance the Same?” on March 2nd at Cal State Maritime. Everyone agreed it was a worthwhile adventure, and we recommend sending such teams in the future. A few take aways from the day included hearing from SFSU professor, Blanca Missé. She was educated and has taught in Spain, France, and Argentina at universities where faculty elect their president. She found it shocking that in the US, one of the most democratic nations in the world, CSU presidents are appointed by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. We found her talking points regarding academic freedom in various university settings provocative and have invited her to be part of the Free Speech Week events. We discovered that librarian rights to academic freedom are better protected in the CSU than in the UC where they do not hold faculty positions. The UC has taken the controversial stance that only faculty have academic freedom. Harvard University has provided an inclusive model by defining academic freedom as protected for all members of their community in a statement by the provost that addresses free speech and academic freedom <https://provost.harvard.edu/university-wide-statement-rights-and-responsibilities>. Senate Exec is currently working with Provost Spagna regarding the resolution passed by the Faculty Policy Committee on Academic Freedom and Free Speech ([**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)) for the possibility of creating a campus policy. The team will meet to discuss other take aways that could benefit our campus and shared governance.

**Parliamentarian Update, Secretary Ospina (filling in for Parliamentarian Gammage)**

Ospina passed out the ballots for the search committee on the AVP of Enrollment Management.

Ospina announced there are four outstanding calls for faculty representatives. One for the Academic Senate election committee, the Gender Equity Task Force, Faculty Advocate and University Scholarship Committee.

**President Parham Report, via Proxy Provost Spagna**

* There was a Cal State Dominguez Hills group that went to Asia as part of the CSU group that went to Taipei, Hong Kong and Tokyo for the purpose of greeting alumni, explore international partnerships and to represent Dominguez Hills as part of this effort. The biggest turnout was in Tokyo. Eleven CSUDH alums were present and 1 of the 11 was present in both Hong Kong and then flew over to Tokyo showing off his Toro pride. It was a successful trip and the 2nd time a group from Dominguez Hills went over there. Spagna commented that it would be a good idea to have a bigger debrief about it and discuss the larger partnerships opportunities and what are they within the CSU scope.
* A team went to Sacramento from Dominguez Hills as part of the legislative agenda. Three CSU legislative priorities are: (1) overall investment by Governor Newsome to the CSU. In the proposed budget, it is the largest budget the CSU has received from a “modern” governor. We need to keep in mind, the need to keep pace with the operational costs in the CSU, to continue in terms of our GI 2025 and accommodate the growing demand for enrollment. The operational cost when you study the budget (before the May revise), there’s $193 million in additional state funds to cover the 3% cost of living increase for employees in the CSU. There is an additional $45 million in state funding for continuing the GI2025, we get $75 million on an annual basis to the baseline; we are requesting an additional $75 million. Investing in CSU facilities is a priority with $248 million in one-time funds allotted for capital needs projects in the CSU system. For expanding access, an additional $62 million has been appropriated with state funding as part of the budget proposal to enable the CSU to serve additional students; this would represent a 2% enrollment growth. We’re going to go back to the table and requesting 5% growth total, which would add millions of dollars to that. (2) There is a CSU sponsored general obligation bond, SB14 – asking for $8 billion for improvements in higher education facilities. If this happens, it will appear on the March 2020 ballot. (3) If we receive the $8 billion it would be split between the UC and the CSU.
* Supporting our Doctorate in Occupational Therapy program: There are only two highlighted programs in terms of the State and the CSU in terms of occupational therapy. This is AB829, which is to offer a doctorate in occupational therapy at Cal State Dominguez Hills and San Jose State.
* Chair Talamante and President Parham have discussed initiating a “Tea with the President”. Tea with the President would happen one time in March, twice in April and once in May. It would include 4 tenure track faculty, 4 non-tenure track faculty and 4 staff. It would be on a first come first served basis with the idea of having this occur on a regular basis going forward.

**Provost’s Report**

* RTP Season – the Provost said his observation as he’s writing 50 letters for Retention, Tenure and Promotion: He said he’s honored to be with colleagues such as these that are in the Senate meeting and across the campus. Spagna noted that our colleagues are doing incredible things. He said he also wished to express his gratitude for those around the Senate room and beyond for the level of work they put into the files. It’s a good problem to have in terms of having 50 people up for building the infrastructure.
* Campus Climate Survey – March 18 – April 19th will be when the survey is open. It will be available through online and mobile devices to students, staff, faculty and administrators. Spagna noted that from March 4 – 8th, they would be notifying the different stakeholders of the upcoming survey, March 11 – 15 will be releasing print and video ads and then it opens on March 18. There is some discussion of incentives for participation.
* **Provost Spagna** introduced the survey on technology research. He said that Dr. Franklin and he are mindful about survey fatigue and will look to stage things in the next year, so that there isn’t survey fatigue. **AVP of University Effectiveness Planning & Analytics, Olschwang** spoke to the Senate about a survey by EDUCAUSE who are looking at how faculty use technology in teaching, service and research and how you use it for your own personal use on campus. It’s going to faculty and students. It’s live now. Olschwang thanked the over 200 students and the 31 faculty who have already filled it out, but they hope to get the numbers much higher. She said for faculty, the areas they’re looking at are how do you use technology for communication, how are you using it in your course media, how does it support your research and looking at teaching and operations. The survey has not gone out since 2014 and a lot has changed since then in terms of technology. For students they’re looking to find out who is using what, how they’re using the different technological tools available to them, how satisfied they are with what is available. It does include things beyond the classroom including student advising, who may help students plan their degree, who may be tracking students who hopefully do, but sometimes do not stay on their path. What opportunities are there to engage students in the online community? EDUCAUSE will be producing a report that includes all faculty and student findings and then we’ll get an individual campus report that she will be sharing. One thing they highlighted in their last report was that there were 4 types of students. A student will spend 12 hours a week studying outside of class. A typical student spends 1 – 4 hours online and 1 – 2 hours on video things they might look at. Gaming students will spend 5 hours in gaming a day. But, according to a prior survey, it seems that those students spend more time studying online as well. This is just one example of some of the things we can learn about our students. We’ll be looking at where they’re spending their time, how they’re spending their time and how we can approach them differently. The url for the faculty survey is [bit.ly/FacultyTech19](https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/4711942/ETRAC-Faculty-Survey-2019-us-inc?eid=60008288&x=42). Participants will be eligible for a drawing for gift cards.
* Spagna announced the interviews for the Chief Diversity Officer for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion set for March 20th, 21st, and 27th.

**Q&A/Comments**

**Senator Bono** asked how long is the survey open and how long does the survey take? Olschwang responded 15 minutes and will be open until the 15th of March. **Talamante** asked if there was an update on how the MPP reviews for how people will understand and prepare for doing the MPP reviews. **Roberson Simms** responded that a communication should be coming from the President within the next few days, announcing the [new revised PM](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/pm/docs/2019-01.pdf) which has been posted. Shortly after that, the feedback form will be circulated to those who will be solicited for feedback.

**CFA Report, D. Cutrone**

CFA Senate Report March 6, 2019

Cutrone communicated that the CFA remains strong and united and deeply committed to their commitment of working to support anti-racism and social justice work, and promote diversity and inclusion on our campus. He provided examples of faculty support, such as CFA encouragement of shared governance on campus. He said their main goal is to communicate a message that our voice is a prime motivation in shaping the direction of our University. Cutrone spoke about the March 5th CFA Semester Luncheon where they informed members of the work they’re doing this semester and heard member concerns on many topics. He highlighted that as was typical attendance was by a small group of devoted members who are always present. He encouraged more faculty to take part in these opportunities and said that CFA cannot help with working conditions unless all voices are heard.

Topics included:

1. Anti-Racism & Social Justice. Although we have done extensive work in these areas there is still concern that about hiring practices, retaliation, and harassment. Our CFA remains committed to establishing a climate of trust between faculty and our administration in these areas.

2. Workload. Here there still is a deep concern involving class size and service demands. Our CFA believes that this is perhaps the most important of the issues facing us.

3. Lecture issues. Our CFA is grateful for the progress that our University has made in the areas of range evaluation and job stability. There still is however still concern about the Range Evaluation process that lacks uniformity across the individual colleges. It is believed that the process is much too complicated and could be simplified especially in the case of Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

4. Salary & Benefits. Although our University has led the way in these areas we must continue to support and update our current practices. There is a strong feeling among members that not enough time and effort is being given to our members in these areas.

5. Continue to work closely with all our members. We remain committed to not only our faculty but strive for inclusiveness among our Counselors, Librarians, and Coaches and the specific challenges that these positions are confronted with.

6. Membership. Membership here at our University continues to be among the strongest and continues to grow. Currently membership among tenure track faculty is at 70%, long term lecturers is at 60% and among those without PhD’s at about 45%. We see a need to reach out more to this last group.

In addition to our work here on campus our CFA sent 4 members to the American Association of University Professors to establish a working relationship with this national group. Workshops that were attended included Academic Freedom beyond the Academic Senate and Service v. Government. The workshops presented information that every CFA member should know more about, especially their right to free speech and ways to ensure inclusiveness among all our CFA members. Overall there was concern that our CSU system does not become a corporate model and instead remain committed to serving our students.

**Upcoming CFA Events:**

11th Annual Labor, Social, and Environmental Justice Fair in April. We are requesting service from our members.

April will be CFA Steering Committee Elections. Dates and time will be set in the coming weeks.

Cutrone emphasized that CFA is an important part of Senate business and of importance to all members of senate who are members. CFA is pleased and appreciates the close working relationship that they have developed with Senate.

Talamante introduced Interim AVP Smith and thanked him and VP Franklin for being inclusive and inviting faculty into the Student Conduct committee meetings. She noted that she and Senator Pinto have been attending those meetings.

**Presentation**

[Student Conduct Update](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/-4%20Student%20Conduct%20%26%20CARE%20Team%20Updates.pptx), Interim AVP Student Life, Matthew Smith

Smith reported that when he assumed the role in August during a busy time of the year and quickly realized with the Conduct Team problems that were getting in the way of our students’ academic experience and getting in the way of faculty’s ability to conduct class and do what it is that they needed to do, specifically around conduct and care. He said they wanted to address that early and invite people from across campus to participate and generate solutions for that. They pulled together a student conduct committee to review what was really happening in student conduct and what were possible solutions moving forward. The first time they met was in November. They created three subcommittees. (1) the Mission and Goals of Student Conduct (2) a committee to look at the policies and procedures to make sure they were adequate and serving everyone appropriately (3) and Educational Interventions. Currently if you have a student who commits plagiarism or academic dishonesty in your courses, we have one solution for them, and you all may be familiar with the Raise program. If you have group work assigned, and you have conduct issues within the group where they are not getting along, and you feel like it deserves to be referred to student conduct, we don’t have a conflict resolution intervention for them to go through. The student(s) come and speak with us, but there’s no real formal intervention to help them develop the skills necessary to prevent them from ending up in student conduct in the future, or to help them navigate their academic career and go on to graduate school and accomplish their goals. We really want to provide that. We’re hoping to have the final recommendations from the committees by the end of May around identifying some of the issues, based on their research and conversations that they’re having.

Smith said they are looking develop reporting that is consistent with regard to handling cases and sanctions. One of the reasons reporting is so important, is if the student is engaging in academic dishonesty in multiple places, we want to be able to hold them accountable for that and take the necessary actions. But we need to have documentation for our student conduct process. We want to make sure sanctions are uniform. If in one space the student commits plagiarism and is put on a year probation, and has to go to Raise training, and on the other one we say “don’t do that again” and send them on their way, that’s not consistent in how we’re handling it. We need to understand why we do it and what action we will take and what action is actually an action of the Dean of Students and what are the academic sanctions that can be placed on them. Sometimes we get requests that are more of an academic affairs things that we don’t have the power to do. We want to make sure that everyone understands what’s in their realm of power and responsibility in terms of addressing some of those challenges. Faculty may refer students to conduct and then never hear from us again about what happened, the follow-up, or if we’re working on it. But nothing has been communicated to the faculty member about what the process is. It is our intention to close those loops with all parties involved, including the students. As far as the training for our hearing officers when some of these cases do go to hearings where management according to our Executive Order across campus are supposed to serve as hearing officers and how to get their report out after the hearing takes place. In Fall of 2018, we had 52 cases of which 73% of those were academic dishonesty. A lot of those we feel we can get ahead of and prevent with good proactive educational resources. By getting those students orientation and getting them in the beginning of the year with workshops and interventions for them in the Toro Learning Center or having conversations with them about what may need to be addressed in certain courses to prevent some of the plagiarism and things that are taking place. Smith said there are certain Executive Orders we have to follow in terms of student conduct. There are certain things that have to be done in a certain amount of time. The Student Conduct Office has been run by one person which has prevented things like proactive educational interventions from taking place. Where sometimes it may seem that we’re delaying, especially in areas where things seem evident, there are timelines we have to follow and certain due process that has to be done. That is reflected in the following chart.



Smith then described the CARE Team as a multi-disciplinary team made up of people from across the campus, and we’re supposed to address students of concern before it arises to a crises. We’re really trying to improve how we market the resources that are available and how to report those cases as well as what we’re doing on the backend when those situations arise, and getting into more conversations with faculty across campus so that they understand how we assess a threat and that we have a specific process that we go through that we’re receive training on in terms of threat assessment, which we want to train more people on, so that we can address those clearly and efficiently and that everyone’s aware. He said that their main goal with the CARE team is to make sure that this is a safe place, that learning can take place inside the classrooms without distractions. As we’re doing that, we want to make sure we respect students’ rights to due process, their rights and responsibilities, and that we don’t overreact, and we take them through the right process. Smith said they want to be in communication with all faculty about it, and one of the things that they’re working on is to really enhance the training both for the CARE Team and for key stakeholders on campus around those conversations so that everyone can feel secure and that we are working diligently to address those issues and concerns. The student conduct website is: <https://www.csudh.edu/student-conduct/student-conduct-procedures/>.

**Q&A/Comments:**

**Senator Radmacher** thanked Interim AVP Smith. She said there had been an incident a few year prior where she was unable to find out from the person she called on how to handle a situation. She said one thing she’s seen as department chair that she believes would be important to train all faculty on is what to do in a threatening situation, so that faculty would understand that it is their responsibility to report it. She said often times they contact her, assuming it is the department chairs responsibility to deal with it. She said she wouldn’t have the particulars of the situation and that the person reporting it needs to understand that while the chair should be in the loop, faculty need to know what steps they need to take and provide them a level of comfort that steps will be taken. **Smith** said one of the things they’ve done in the interim until that training can take place is that we created a Dean of Students web page, where you can access the [CARE Team information](https://www.csudh.edu/care-team/). You can now find a lot of information about how to report, when to report, along with the differences between a dangerous student, a distressed student and a disturbed student. We definitely want to cast a wide a net about this information and training as possible. **Talamante** said they’re reviving the Faculty Advocate position, and we’re talking about how we can work together so that they’ll receive the training and help to train other people. **Senator Nicol** asked when we anticipate hiring more people to work in Student Conduct as well as more therapists and more counselors in the Student Health Center because those two need to work in tandem. **Smith** said they do work really closely with our Student Health Center. In terms of the hiring for the Student Conduct Office, Smith said he’s hoping to have someone in place in the summer. But it’s a matter of larger budget conversations and different positions that are being put forward. He said having at least one other person in the student conduct office position is a top priority in terms of his budget request. **Senator McGlynn** said as per the presentation, there were 38 incidents of academic integrity violations that were handled. He noted this represents a tiny fraction of the actual number of incidents of academic integrity that occur. He said likely its likely not unique to our campus that all faculty do not report all incidents. McGlynn asked, what is the Student Conduct Office’s take on this? Under what circumstances would you tell faculty that they should or should not report? If all of the faculty reported every time they catch a student cheating or plagiarizing, then you would need a massive office to handle all of this. **Smith** said what he would advise that although it might seem overwhelming for them, they want faculty to understand that their conduct process, especially around academic dishonesty is a real partnership. He added, if faculty feel like they have a case of academic dishonesty with a student, but they don’t want the student to receive certain sanctions or you determine you can handle it within your department, it’s still good to report. It’s important to communicate to the Student Conduct office so that if it happens again with that same student and another professor also wants to handle it in house, the Student Conduct office will be able to respond that this isn’t the first time this student has been in this situation so we may want to take that into consideration. The sanctions that Student Conduct can provide are different from the academic sanctions that can come down. **Senator Monty** said that this problem is much bigger than is being discussed and bigger than the Student Conduct office. One area is the response that the faculty who do report get from students who are being allowed to get away with it in other classes. Those who do hold them to those standards seem to be arbitrarily punishing the students. One way to improve this would be to have regular trainings for both tenure-track and tenured faculty and part-time faculty. Faculty when they’re hired should go through an orientation, whether part-time or full-time, at the FDC, and it should include a discussion of the handling of academic dishonesty. The kind of reporting asks the faculty to request sanctions without knowing if the student has previously committed a violation. This gets back to communication. Maybe there’s a way to adjust the reporting form and the feedback process. Monty noted that several years prior, he’s not sure who the person was and if it was the Dean of Students, told the student that the faculty was wrong and that it wasn’t plagiarism and encouraged them to challenge the grade for the course that resulted from the sanction imposed without contacting the faculty person and without contacting Monty, who was Chair of the department at the time. The student contacted the faculty member and Monty with the grade appeal, saying the Dean of Students agreed it was not plagiarism. That is something that should never happen. **Smith** said they had a situation in a Chemistry course where the professor thought that it was plagiarism. Smith said they weren’t sure if it was and sat down with the professor to help them understand how this is plagiarism. They had that conversation before meeting with the student. That’s how it should be. **Associate Dean Caron** said with regard to the CARE Team, how does that team interact or liaise with Academic Affairs? He said a lot of those situations have a ripple effect other than just between the faculty member and the student. The whole learning and teaching environment for a class is impacted by some of those incidences. **Smith** responded said when he first came on, they had the Interim AVP of Faculty Affairs on the committee, which he realizes may not be representative of faculty. Smith said they’re in conversations about being able to do more for getting faculty representatives on their committee and/or engaged in our trainings to help support us on that side as well. Smith said ideally they would have that partnership set up and they would be in constant communication with Deans and Chairs and Associate Deans about that. **Provost Spagna** said he and Dr. Franklin have spoken about this, as well as other members of the cabinet. He said he thinks that because there are multiple entry points for students in terms of in class or out of class that there really is the need for a larger case manager kind of ethos on the campus. The case manager ethos could allow you to triage as to whether it’s a conduct, an academic dishonesty, or a code red. We do have a need for a point person, or point group, to be able to monitor it and to handle it. Then that sets up all the rest of the interventions. Spagna said as faculty, we have a responsibility of working with Student Affairs to think about when we see a behavior that’s not proactive, how do we work on substituting something else that’s part of that education for the student? A lot of students are shuffled to different places, and they keep using the same ineffective strategy. **Smith** added in regard to case management, we realize that’s one of the holes that we have on our campus right now that other campuses do have, where they have someone who can really take that role. He said that’s another one on his long request list. **Sanford** said he’s also had to report cases of academic dishonesty and as an adjunct he does not have the same support available to him. Sanford described an incident of plagiarism where he told the student he would be failing the class and a Dean responded to the incident and said it was not plagiarism, but incorrect copying. He said he was pressured to change the grade. Sanford said given he is an adjunct, he had no recourse. He said he would like to see clearly written out what constitutes plagiarism. Additionally, there are other examples of academic integrity that need to be specifically listed out as a lot of times students may not realize that something is a violation of academic integrity. He suggested that a committee be put together to talk about how we are defining academic integrity, how are we identifying low levels of violation, how are we defining high levels of violation, and what do we mean by egregious. How do we protect those who do report but get push back from administration? **Talamante** said that she and EPC Chair Ortega acknowledged each other a moment ago that it would be good for the Educational Policy Committee to take this on.

**Secretary Ospina**, sitting in for Parliamentarian Gammage announced the results of the election.

Two faculty elected to serve on the AVP of Enrollment Management Search Committee are Perez and Yang.

Vote totals: Bach – 15/Yang – 17/Perez – 25

**First Reading**

**EXEC 19-02 College Budget Committees Resolution, Statewide Senator Norman**

A motion was made to move the resolution to the floor, which was seconded.

Norman said recent research from Gallup says that the reason 1 in 2 people have left their job is because of poor management and that 70% of the variance in engagement that Gallup measures is due to management. Norman said there are three things that organizations can do: 1. Respect your core employees 2. Communicate what is happening and why it’s happening (budgets do that) 3. Promote accountability and fairness in its decision making. Norman said he just wanted to present some context about the subject matter of the resolution. Norman then provided an overview of the resolution. **Senator Monty** said he thinks a good idea, but he has a few questions and concerns. He said he doubts that we could find 5 faculty and 3 staff from any colleges at this moment that would be capable of understanding the budget information. There would have to be some very significant training in budgeting processes for any members of the committee in order for it to be effective. It’s a very ambitious resolution, and it might be better to set more modest goals and establish a more modest scope of activities for the college budget committees. Based on the resolution, it states that the committee would be meeting four times annually? **Norman** replied yes. **Monty** said he did not believe it would be possible with the exhaustive list of items that they committee is being asked to do. If they are expected to take on the list detailed within the resolution, they would have to meet twice a month, like UCC or GE. If that’s the case, it would need a preset time for meeting that was known to all members head of time. **Senator J. Price** said he felt that the composition of the college budget committees should be re-thought. Specifically, requiring that there by one program coordinator. He said in his college there are very few program coordinators compared with the number of chairs, that would dramatically increase the probability of any particular program coordinator being selected for that committee. He says he speaks as one of the few being selected. He said he’s speaking as one of the few. As a program coordinator, he said he has roughly two-thirds of the actual work of a chair, but at best about half the compensation of a chair. He noted that this would be a significant increase in the work of a program coordinator. With regard to the terms, the resolution states it would be a three year term. Price said he wasn’t sure how it is on the rest of the campus, but in his college, chairs and program coordinators are elected to serve two year terms. **Senator Chai** (proxy for Senator Andrade) said they already have challenges getting people to volunteer to serve on the college RTP committee. Just trying to have the volume of individuals needed to serve on the various committees and then given a committee with the workload that is expected for this committee, she doesn’t see it happening. She reflected that the amount of calls going out lately for service is the same in her college. When they want to hold an election, no one will run. **Senator Sanford** suggested that if these committees have to meet that often to do this work, perhaps then the stipends need to be a lot bigger, especially if one would have to meet 26 times a year. It would seem you would need a group of full-time people doing nothing but this. Can we set more modest goals? Most of us do not have the type of budgetary training to do this job. Perhaps it could be broken down into several proposals, to allow for a learning curve, and to allow for compensation. **Senator McGlynn** said he’s reading it as a mechanism for transparency. He said it’s not so much that they need a committee to make recommendations; they need to know what the heck is going on with college budgets. He said he is also concerned about faculty workload and the inequities involved in faculty workload. Requiring colleges to specify how reassigned time is allocated, how funding is reallocated is foundational to those levels of equity. He said he does not want faculty to have to meet twice a week on some budget committee. He said he’s particularly concerned about a committee making recommendations to a dean, which they can respond to and then ignore. What he does want is to have departments be able to see how the college is allocating resources at the level which is specified in this resolution and having that be published on OpenGov. He said the resolution does not specify that the itemized college-level expenditures, including reassigned time, teaching/research assistant, research/conference travel funding, etc. needs to be broken out on OpenGov. McGlynn said that really what we need. There’s probably going to be some political pushback on suggesting that you need to demonstrate how you’re allocating resources this way. This seems like a way to have a committee to force them to do that. McGlynn wants to make sure that the resolution specifies that it’s not just the committee that sees this data, but the campus that sees this data. **Spagna** said that Vice Provost O’Donnell has just explored that down to department level we now have this available on OpenGov. The notion is to even go further, down into each department into all the colors of money. Spagna said he sees transparency as part of this, he also sees accountability and ultimately, a goal of this is to empower decision making within programs and at the faculty level. Spagna continued, how you craft this in a way that it meets those domains is the right way to do it, and he would also ask that you leverage existing roles and responsibilities to get up to speed on this. We haven’t spoken about chairs. What do we need to do to equip chairs to participate fully in this? Of course it includes compensation, roles and responsibilities, but if we keep adding levels of committees, he sees that as something that will just grind us down, so how do we leverage existing organizations to do it within colleges and departments? **Senator Deng** believed if this were to move forward it would be necessary to train committee members to be able to understand and analyze the kind of detail suggested within the ninth resolve. Understanding procedure and processes for allocating funding would also be different across the colleges and training to this would need to be considered as well. **Senator Norman** said the initial idea was to look at Academic Affairs but, he said, to the Provost’s credit who suggested going right to the colleges and the departments. Norman said he’s also expressed a bit if skepticism on how fast we can go. If we’ve been starved of this information for more than a decade, some people never even thought that this was part of their role.

**First Reading**

**EPC 19-03 Resolution on Double Counting, EPC Chair Ortega**

A motion was made to move it to the floor which was seconded. Ortega gave an overview of the resolution, explaining that it was drafted to address [Executive Order 1100](https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1100-rev-8-23-17.html), specifically the section 2.2.6.1., which asks campuses to institutionalize double counting in GE by requiring that major and minor courses that are approved for GE credit also double count for the major and the minor. And also that students that have catalogue rights to a catalogue prior to the implementation of Executive Order 1100 – Revised be allowed to follow CSUDH policy AA2016-02 on Double –Counting Upper Division General Education Courses and Major/Minor Courses.

**Senator Kalayjian** said she realizes that we’re trying to come into agreement with EO 1100. She wondered if its necessary to clarify that courses that count for GE cannot be triple counted, so it’s major OR minor. **Senator Pawar** asked if there was any limit to the number of courses that can be double counted. It seems that potentially a student could count 15 units, easily 12 and if departments can have a say in what the limit is. **Ortega** responded that that would be something they could take into consideration. He added that there’s no limit in what’s actually written in EO 1100. Section 2.2.6.1. says: “Major courses and campus-wide required courses that are approved for GE credit shall also fulfill (double count for) the GE requirement.” There’s not limit in what’s written in their recommendation. **Sanford** asked is the limit something that would be done campus by campus or is something that the Chancellor's Office controls. If so, is it possible to put that into the resolution? **Ortega** said that it is a question that can be asked, and we do have a limit on our own policy that currently stands. Right now our own policy AA2016-02 limits the units that can be double counted in upper division GE courses to six. **Kalayjian** said to clarify, student have always been able to double count lower-division classes; this is only a change to upper division courses. Originally we said you can only double count one and then a few years ago we changed it to two. Now the Chancellor's Office has told us that we have to make all upper division GE courses double countable. **Senator Monty** said his understanding of the Executive Order is that it is removing limits to facilitate students through GE and their programs, which is another reason the recommendation of the GE Task Force makes no sense because it contradicts the spirit of Executive Order 1100. Prior to that, one of the reasons we changed our campus policy and allowed programs to double count six as opposed to three is because they were already on the books, many exceptions to the rule. Monty said he believed one of the goals of the Chancellor's Office in addition to allowing students to double count as many double countable courses as they can is to allow students establish a greater degree of uniformity across the system. **Senator Keville** said he wanted to make sure that students understand that double counting does not preclude the need to get 120 units total. **Senator Pawar** said that recently upper division changed and went to departments. Potentially you could have a department that offers 2 courses in C and 2 in D and 2 upper division. So you could potentially have 18 units of GE that they can double count. At what point is that General Education? It’s not general anymore and are we depriving students of something? **Sanford** said he knew of someone who at the community college level as a result of double counting walked out with nine associate degrees by just having one different class. He said he is concerned about a student who could double count enough units so they would walk out with three Bachelor’s degrees. Not that they shouldn’t have Bachelor’s degrees, but if they only needed 145 units to get the three, that’s a problem. **Senator Nicol** said in regard to the comment about courses going back to departments, her department has eight upper division GE courses and we require our students in our upcoming program modification to take two, and then they can conceivably take 24 units of GE courses if we don’t put a cap on this for their concentration. That would pose a problem, because then students would not have to take our 400 level courses which are our specialization mastery courses. We have to book end this at some number that’s much more reasonable. She said she would like to see students take courses that are specialized and courses that cover breadth. **Senator McGlynn** said he is not understanding the conversation. If we have a broad education in a variety of fields and we have curriculum for general education. If students take GE, they fulfill GE and then they take the major. And the major is a matter of specialization. If the major is so full of GE courses that you can complete the major while doing a whole bunch of GE courses, then that’s a curricular issue with the major. **Keville** said he agrees with Senator McGlynn. He said he encourages students that are in his major to take GE classes for Area C outside of art. If a lot of double counting occurs within a major and GE defeats the purpose of broadening that general education requirement. **Pawar** said given the current structure of GE, this impacts the College of Arts & Humanities more than any other college, which may be why the conversation doesn’t make sense to some of the other colleges. She believed the College of Arts & Humanities needs to weigh in on this as well.

**\*W FAC 19-04 Resolution in Memory of Kenneth Ganezer, Senator J. Price**

A motion was made to waive the 2nd reading, which was accepted and agreed to by all. Price read aloud the resolution to the Senate who then gave a round of applause. **Resolution passed unanimously.**

**Senator Hirohama** shared that a lot of the IT staff had the privilege of working with Dr. Ganezer over the years. She said he never made them feel like they were just there to solve problems or make something work. She said we were always colleagues working together. He would talk about what he was doing, and why he was doing it and what the purpose was because he loved what he was doing and he wanted them to love it and be invested in it as well. She said often at the end of a long day everyone would be packed up and ready to go and just moments before closing they would hear someone knocking at the door. Sure enough it was Professor Ganezer. They would open the door, even though they knew it might be another hour or two before they could go home. Hirohama said he remembered the personal things too, he was a gracious man, and he is missed.

**Retreat Report Backs:**

**Table 1—UCC and Curriculum Review**

(Moderators: Kim Costino & Sheela Pawar)

**Senator Pawar** provided the report back on the University Curriculum Committee table from the spring retreat. The University Curriculum Committee table was moderated by both Undergraduate Dean Costino and Senator Pawar, the University Curriculum Committee Chair. She said a process had already begun prior to the retreat to define and simplify the process. Costino has called together regular meetings of the chairs of the various college curriculum committees and members of the University Curriculum Committee and anyone else whose interested to come and discuss the curriculum process. The retreat roundtable occurred in the middle of that. Pawar then gave a summary of some of the feedback from the retreat. Many had offered the opinion that the process is very murky and very long and there’s a lot of focus very minor details that are not really the heart of the curriculum process. She said she hoped the Senate realized that they’re trying to fix that and that there is a lot of momentum happening right now. They’re doing that to be able to put the system online and they hope there will be a lot more clarity of the process itself and that the whole process will take a lot less time and use a lot fewer forms then are required right now.

**Table 6—PM 2018-01 Revision (Administrative Review Process for Administrator III and IV Positions)**

(Moderators: Ivonne Heinze-Balcazar, Thomas Norman & Deborah Roberson-Simms)

**Senator Norman** said what they discussed at the table on the MPP reviews was the almost universal opinion in terms the importance of faculty and staff being anonymous in the review process. Norman said he was glad that President Parham heard that. Feedback was given that the survey being open for at least two week, and that four weeks was the preference. It was okay to make sure that the Provost or President had a sense of where the feedback was coming from, as staff and faculty voices would be different. There was an acceptance of categories provided they were large enough so that people didn’t feel that they’re anonymity would be compromised. There was recommendations for additional questions. The section of professional development was brought up at the table. The theme that was brought up was fear of retaliation. It is going to take some time for some healing to occur. There are plenty of people who have specific examples of being retaliated against. The purpose of this report is to provide you with the feedback of what was heard. We have kind of moved forward with the information before it was officially reported back. **Chair Talamante** thanked AVP Roberson Simms for all of her efforts as she really has been working diligently on this and has reached out to Senate Executive Committee, working between the Senate and the President and the Provost and others who had weighed in on the resolution. **Senator Hirohama** said this was the first time she had heard that PM 19-01 has been posted. She said after reviewing it there are some things she would like to point out. There was discussion about anonymity being very important and that there’s been some trust issues over the years and anonymity was stressed as being very important. The wording in the PM is a bit unsettling as it states that Feedback provided via this process may be anonymous. Hirohama noted that we all know the different between may and shall. This leaves an open door that it may or may not be anonymous. It was supposed to be clear cut. She said she does not like that wording in there. The other wording that she does not like is that feedback will be broadly solicited from the domains that the MPP impacts such as divisions, colleges and departments. Hirohoma noted that that is very different than all staff and faculty in the department or division that the administrator impacts can participate. What does broadly solicited mean? Is it still a pick and choose kind of thing? She said she thought that everyone was going to be given an opportunity to participate. She said it was clearly stated before, but now the wording is ambiguous. **Provost Spagna** said he spoke with AVP Roberson Simms today and both of those issues came up, and he asked her to address those directly with the President because it wasn’t within the spirit of what was discussed. He said he would look very carefully for a PM that reflects both of those points.

**Statewide Senate Report - Statewide Senator Thomas Norman** – Norman reported that Faculty Trustee candidate presentations will occur at 9:30 am on Thursday and the election will take place at 10:00 am. Two other items of business is that we will be taking up are AS-3360-19/Academic Affairs, The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Higher Education. That’s at the 2nd reading as well as AS-3362-19 Border issues and Separation of Families: Impact on Students, Faculty and Staff is also a 2nd reading. There will be a presentation from Denise Bevly, Director of Student Wellness and Basic Needs Initiatives. On Wednesday, March 13 at the GE Task Force report will be discussed, at both the statewide Faculty Affairs committee as well as other committee meetings.

**Faculty Policy Committee Report, FPC Chair Pinto -** Pinto reported that at FPC the committee wrote a report of chair compensation based on research they did last semester and shared it with the Working Group on Chair Appointments. They’ll also going to be sharing it with the Council of Chairs and Department Coordinators as well. Pinto said after some input, hopefully they’ll be circulate it broadly and have it be part of their end of year report. What they hope to bring this semester are resolutions for updating the FPC Charge, a sabbatical policy update, an update to the Graduate Council charge and hopefully, depending on the timing with Student Conduct, an update to the Faculty Advocate policy.

**OPEN MIC**

**Senator Nicol** on behalf of Senator Monty read aloud his comments on the GE Task Force report. “Why we need a senate resolution and why we need the senate resolution rationale: the process was corrupted. Therefore the GE Task force as a document should play no role in further discussions of GE in the CSU. Many senates are holding discussions or talking about holding Open Forums and commissioning White Papers to address the report’s recommendations. It is essential that we show our colleagues that this is a trap. As I put in my draft Sense of the Senate, the GE Task Force report and recommendations perpetuate the unfounded opinion that existing curricular programs and faculty resistance to innovations are the primary obstacles to student success. At the same time, it does not address the significant resource deficits that cause real obstacles to student learning such as large class sizes, the outsourcing of GE to poorly support to contingent faculty and a decline in support services. In other words, we should not allow the GE Task Force report to frame further discussions about GE and take control of the process and narratives ourselves. All discussions of GE should begin with two questions. 1. Do faculty see any need for GE reform at all? Many campuses have successfully completed significant revisions of their GE programs. They may be happy with the results that they have achieved, or they may be in the process of assessing the impact of such revisions. 2. What do we most need to improve student attainment of GE program learning outcomes, and, by extension, to improve retention and graduation rates and to make GE meaningful to students? I’m confident that every faculty member sitting here would agree that smaller classes, more tenure track faculty, better facilities and more support services, will go much further to achieving improvements across all of these metrics than another round of complex and contentious curricular reform. If we refuse to ask these questions and allow the GE Task Force report to frame further discussions than we will have already given away half of the farm. The GE Task Force report contains too many arguments made in bad faith. Such conduct must be called out always because bad faith actions create a toxic environment. They do so in large part by leveraging collegiality. Those who would say no and those who would defend common standards of personal and professional integrity, too often allow themselves to be shut down by charges like that’s not collegial. When in fact, it is those who intentionally subvert shared governance who are not behaving collegially.” **Senator Nicol** then added her own comments stating that the GE Task Force report is in direct contradiction to the Ethnic Studies Task Force report that was convened by the Chancellor's Office, which clearly states in that report that ethnic studies programs have relied on GE and continue to rely on GE to support small program. So if this GE Task Force were to take effect, I would lose 45% of my total enrollment in one fell swoop, without any consideration for how our students also need to have meaningful conversations about ethnocentrism, racism, sexism, and heterosexism. That is where they are often found in GE courses. That is part of the opposition. Another part of my opposition is that it claims to be a data driven process, but you cannot find any data in the report. Likewise, as told to Nicol by colleagues from CSU Fullerton, that a 1990s Master’s Degree was misquoted as a justification to get rid of GE. There seems to be a lack of data for something that is supposed to be data driven. Nicol said she was on the GE Implementation programs’ recertification and we actually did an assessment of GE at Cal State Fullerton. None of that data has been included into the Task Force report. Where is the data? **Talamante** said that mostly we’ve heard from CAH the Chairs and Dean. Between current Area C & D, you have a lot of Arts & Humanities courses, so the impact hits closer to home. She said she’s heard from one or two chairs that they see it as an opportunity by cutting GE to 42 units to add courses to their majors. She said she’s also reached out to Dean Costino to work together to figure out how many high unit majors do we have on this campus. It seems to her that a lot of the report is aimed at trying to aid high unit majors and that somehow GE impedes the ability of those majors to successfully function. We do want to synthesize the information that we’ve gotten. It’s important that we give specifics in our response because we are complaining about a report that doesn’t give us any data. So it’s important starting to say this is exactly how we see it would impact our campus and the issues that we see. For those who see the opportunities, we don’t want to negate their voices either. **Senator Sanford** said this report basically says that we get rid of the breadth and that all we have is depth, that it’s all specializations. We need both. He said that there have been studies that show that students who take Humanities and so called Liberal Studies have a better understanding of ethics and the communities in which they’re going to go and do their work, whatever their work is. He said he has concerns about the ethics of trying to eliminate GE. He believes it to be an ill-advised push.

**Senator Macias** announced that the COE is hosting an event coming up on March 27th from 11 - 1. It is meant to help expose our students across all departments and colleges about teaching careers. There is a teacher shortage in our area going on. Macias said it’s important that we start talking to students early and often about these potential careers. She said while we don’t want to shove people into teaching who don’t belong there, so we would like for you to go back and look at your roster and identify a few students who maybe have that potential. We’re looking for people who have proficiency in the content area but also a passion to giving back to their community. The event is fun with guest speakers, prizes, food, and alumni from our campus who are teaching now. Please share this among your colleagues. They can sign up at <https://goo.gl/mcRRke>.

**Senator Pinto** offered her sentiments about Ken Ganezer. She thanked Senator Price and Senator Hirohama for sharing their remark. She noted that as a result of getting out of her comfort zone and approaching Dr. Ganezer, someone who was not in her discipline and someone she did not know, she was able to forge a friendship with him. She appreciated his passion for running. She appreciated how because of our small campus, it affords all of us the opportunity to step out of our comfort zones and engage with folks from other colleges and other disciplines. She said he really did inspire someone in Sociology. She said he worked a lot and she looks for role models on how do you do this job for more than 20 or 30 years. He was that model, always doing research, working with his students and mentoring everyone. She said this is a group that meets every other week and maybe there’s someone here that you’ve never spoken to before and you should talk to.

**Senator Radmacher** said she wished to address the GE Task Force report on behalf of our students regarding GE. She said even though her comments are not about GE, they’re about her program, but she thinks it something we should consider with regard to GE. She said in her program, they have concentrations. She said when she first took over her program, students just picked 12 units out anywhere, and they had to come to their faculty advisor and tell them why they were choosing those 12 units as their concentration. She said what she was finding was that students had no clue why they were taking these classes. But they would talk to her about what they were interested in and what were careers they were looking for and towards. And so, she invited them to look at these classes and other majors that might be related to education, psychology, or business. Let’s see if we can’t pick some of the classes that might fit for you. From that they developed as a faculty for specific concentrations that were more relevant to the majority of the student interests that we were seeing coming into our program. So we looked over all of the courses throughout the curriculum at CSUDH and the different departments that seemed reasonable for them and gave them options to choose from. You would not believe how our students loved this. They loved the fact that we gave them breadth as well as some depth in two different areas. They were relying upon us as the experts. Our students rely upon us to let them know what is important for them to know about. They don’t necessarily know that on their own. That is an important thing for us to consider, because that’s what GE does. By us deciding what we feel is important for them to understand and to know about. The breadth and the depth that we want them to have in those areas is crucial. Our students want that direction. We also had to cut down in some areas because we needed to articulate with the transfer associate degree in both Early Childhood Education and Child Development. We had to cut down some of our major courses in order to do that. However, for our students who begin here at CSUDH, they now depending on which GE courses they select, may have anywhere from 9 – 12 units that are just free electives that they didn’t used to have before because we had to change our program. We’ve also had students, who didn’t realize have these other 12 units left to take and don’t have any idea what to do with those 12 units. She believes it would be better for us to give them some ideas about what choices they should be making. But cutting GE so much it’s going to put too much choice out there. Choice can sometimes be a problem. Sometimes we can get overwhelmed with the choices that we have and sometimes we need a little help to make those decisions.

**Senator Krochalk** said that in Health Sciences it has been a wrenching discussion over time about what we need for a viable program to make our students competitive, not only for the workforce but for graduate school. Now, with the increasing pressure towards accreditation, certification, etc. There is the fundamental belief by department faculty about the importance of GE and having that breadth. But by the same token, if we don’t’ double count, we are absolutely short changing our students on a handful of courses that they absolutely require. She said they find themselves in a quagmire, and they are going to move ahead for a course or two for double counting. She said it’s important for all of us to know that this is hard for departments. And we want our students to have GE. But we are in a position now where they’re taking 18 units a semester in order to meet requirements all the way around. These are tough decisions. From their perspective, in order to come to terms with it, is to be absolutely clear and precise that whatever course we want to put up for GE, that it meets the learning objectives and the student learning outcomes. Krochalk said she says this is because departments aren’t taking this lightly and they’re very difficult decisions for faculty but she wanted to put it into the pot as general information when we continue to discuss this issue.

**Senator Macias** said they rely heavily on GE, it is the nature of Liberal Studies. If you’re going to teach every subject, you’ve got to know something about every subject. She said she realizes they’re in a unique situation. However, something that has been occurring among her colleagues is within a large listserv on Outlook there’s a discussion among all the department chairs for Liberal Studies and faculty for all the CSUs. They’re now drafting comment letter from all Liberal Studies to submit, expressing their concern. She suggested there may be chairs would consider talking to other departments from other CSUs to find out what they’re doing and thinking about it to unify us on these issues.

**Senator Norman** said he wanted to speak about academic freedom related the conversation about GE. He said he will be in discussions about it at the Statewide Senate meeting the week of March 11th. He said he often gets asked by colleagues why he’s so passionate about it given he teaches business. He explains to them that the business leaders or public administrators he teaches, he wants them to understand the importance of vaccines; he wants them to understand what climate change is; he wants to understand that the Constitution says that the Senate and the Executive Branch are different. He said those are good business reasons to advocate for a strong General Education He said his call to action is to look at the American Association University Professors (AAUP) material and to be aware that CFA has purchased membership for at least 12 of you, it might be for all 50. Why not take advantage of a free resource. If you go to the CFA site, and you want to join, they will pay for your membership. Norman said it helped him be a better Senator because their focus is on shared governance and academic freedom. Norman said his reflection on Dr. Ganezer said he learned a bit about particle physics and his interests and he learned that Norman had a ninth grader who is interested in physics. Norman said his regret is that his son won’t have the opportunity to physics with Dr. Ganezer. He said he’ll always remember his sunny disposition and his great love to talk about physics.

**Meeting adjourned.**