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Approval of Minutes 03/06/19 M/S/P

**Academic Senate Chair Report:**

* Faculty Trustee Romey Sabalius, Member of the Board of Trustees (2017-2019)
Dr. Sabalius has been a Professor of German in the Department of World Languages & Literatures at San José State University since 1995.  He is fluent in five languages.  He has lived on several continents and visited over 120 countries. Multi-ethnic by birth and multi-cultural by choice, he is committed to fostering inclusive excellence.  He is an advocate for broad-based access to higher education and its affordability. Furthermore, he is a strong proponent of providing California students with a global education that ideally would include an international experience such as study abroad. Prior to being appointed to the Board of Trustees, Dr. Sabalius served for 14 years on the Academic Senate of the CSU.  **Talamante** invited Sabalius to share a few words about his experience as Faculty Trustee. **Sabalius** said he appreciated being at CSUDH. In his capacity as Trustee, he has visited 22 campuses, but this is the first one where he’s attended the Academic Senate meeting. Sabalius acknowledged past and current Statewide Senators of Dominguez Hills who, he said, are good advocates for the campus. He said the Board of Trustees doesn’t do much, and you don’t want them to do much because you wouldn’t want them to do curriculum. He said when the GE Task Force Report came out, he was flooded with questions on when the Board of Trustees have the report on their agenda. He said it’s not on their agenda. It’s not their purview to make educational policy. In theory their invested with the authority; they’re responsible for nearly everything within CSU. But they delegate that authority to the Chancellor and the Chancellor delegates that authority to the campus presidents. Sabalius said there’s another reason you don’t want the Board of Trustees to do too much, they’re not from academia. The Board of Trustees are from other walks of life. It’s only the Chancellor, the Faculty Trustee, in some regards the Student Trustees that are from within the CSU. The Trustees are business people, the Hollywood industry, lawyers, and accountants. They are there to serve in an oversight role to ensure that the decisions that the Chancellor makes, and the decisions that the campus president’s make are in the best interest of the system, California, and its citizens. The only thing that the Board of Trustees actively does when they do not delegate is when we hire campus presidents. He noted that this week they convened and over a period of many hours choosing two presidents for San Marcos and Fullerton. It is something that the Board of Trustees takes very seriously, and these decisions will have a lasting effect on the CSUs. He said other than issues of litigation and personnel, which are private meetings, Tuesdays and Wednesday’s meetings are public. Where similarly a campus Senate meets in committees, and prepares resolutions and deliberates, that’s what occurs at their public meetings. The overall meeting is fairly brief, maybe one or two hours at the end of the day on Wednesday. The rest are committee meetings that follow in succession and are all open.

Talamante continued her report

* Reminder: The Campus Climate Survey seeks input from all DH students, faculty, staff and administrators. The survey will inform the work of the incoming Chief Officer of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. The survey is available online and via mobile devices and is open until April 19th
* The Basic Needs Survey has been moved to the fall.
* Discussions following the feedback received regarding the resolution to establish College and Library Budget Committees was very helpful. Senate Exec is working with the Provost on solutions to the issues of concern over the design of the committee and related workload. We welcome more feedback from senators to aid in the revision to the resolution during open mic and via email or come by the Senate office at WH A420. We’re working on revisions and bringing it back before the end of the spring semester.
* General Education Task Force updates from across the CSU continue to critic the process of the committee and the content of the recommendations, including letters of concern emanating outside Academic Senate bodies, such as the one co-authored by CSU Political Science and History department chairs in objection to the recommendation that AI requirements be subsumed into one course. Individuals may voice their reactions to the report at the Feedback on the General Education (GE) Task Force Report website established by the ASCSU <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/Pages/GE-Task-Force-Report-Feedback.aspx>.
* Security concerns have come across the Senate Chair’s desk related to issues of sexual harassment and campus reporting, which is not mandated under the Cleary Act. Talamante has asked Chief Velez to join us during open mic to update us on recent issues.

**Senate Parliamentarian Report**

**Senate Parliamentarian Gammage** laid out the three different elections to be held during the meeting. Faculty Advocate; Gender Equity Task Force; University Scholarship Committee. Ballots were distributed. Additionally, he requested confirmation of the following appointments:

Academic Senate Election Committee - Dana Ospina

Gender Equity Task Force – Charles Thomas

Gammage noted that the Academic Senate Elections Committee will consist of Ann Marie Perez, former Parliamentarian and Dana Ospina, current Senate Secretary. Elections coming up include the Academic Senate Chair, two Senators representing staff and two Senators representing Non-Tenure Track faculty.

**Senator Hirohama** asked for clarification with regard to the staff positions on the Gender Equity Task Force. When the resolution came out and it included staff electing staff to serve, she said she assumed that the definition of staff would be as described in the constitution. This includes full-time staff, stateside, non-MPP. She said when she took a look at the ballot, there were MPPs included. She wanted to know if the MPPs would be removed from the ballot? **Gammage** said that those who are able to vote are as defined in constitution, but it is the charge which defines who is eligible to actually run for the position itself. **Hirohama** noted that the resolution reads staff elected by staff. **Talamante** said she believed that the intention of the resolution when they were writing it was staff/non MPP and that the Senate Executive Committee would discuss and respond with a determination.

Motion to Table

**EPC Chair Ortega** explained that EPC 19-03, the resolution on Double Counting, they are looking for a motion to table as they continue to receive feedback on the effects that it may have on our campus. The motion was made and passed.

\*W Reading

EXEC 19-05 CSUDH Rejection of GE Task Force Report, Vice Chair Esposito

Motion was made to waive the 2nd reading and move it to the floor.

**Esposito** summarized the resolution and the rationale. **Senator Monty** requested two amendments. He asked to strike “the conclusions of” and so that it reads “That the Academic Senate of California State University Dominguez Hills (ASCSUDH) reject the General Education Task Force (GETF) Report: so that it is consistent with the 2nd resolve. Additionally, Monty requested that the following resolve be added: “RESOLVED: That the ASCSUDH calls for a moratorium on further changes to General Education and graduation requirements in the CSU in light of the curricula erosion and disruption produced by revised EO1100 and EO1110.” **Esposito** said they receive these as friendly amendments. A vote was taken to see if there was agreement to add the resolve. 37 were in favor of adding it, 0 opposed and 0 against. **Statewide Senator** **Celly** said on line 51, she suggested that where it reads: “at the state and national levels that “international” be added and for line 66 have it read, “would be counterproductive to the stated goals of GI 2025.” Celly said on line 75, add a second “that” and add “the” and then add a comma after society**. Senator Nicol** called the question.

**Resolution passed unanimously** by a vote of 41 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

**First Reading Item**

EXEC 19-06 Resolution in Favor of the Creation of a CSU GE Program Review Subcommittee, Vice Chair Esposito. **Esposito** summarized the resolution and noted that it was modeled after a Statewide Senate Resolution. A motion was made to move it to the floor. **Senator Monty** said he’s not opposed to the idea, however, he noted that when you read the first resolve it looks like we’re asking ASCSU to create a subcommittee to coordinate program review that is assessment of GE learning outcomes attainment across the system. He said he believed that would be a good idea. He said he would not vote for it if the 2nd and 3rd resolve were to remain having just voted to reject the GE Task Force Report and this lets it back in. That report should play no role in the deliberations of a body if it were to be created under the ASCSU. The 4th resolve might need to be broken up into a few resolves to communicate more clearly what the committee would be expected to do and what the committee would not be expected to do. He said his fear is creating a permanent body under the ASCSU that might behave in the same way the GE Task Force did. He would like to see the competencies of the subcommittee defined or delineated a little more finely. **Esposito** said they agree with Monty and asked that Statewide Senator Norman provide a little more context**. Norman** said there are two competing resolutions before the statewide body. They were both First Readings. It was asked if Faculty Affairs would work with the Executive Committee. The difference is that the Executive Committee was voting more to accept, where theirs was to refer and not accept. He said the feedback they received was very much in line with Senator Monty. The intention is to have the committee be a very inclusive standing committee of GE that would include the Chairs of History and Political Science if it were constituted. They probably would not be inviting Trustees to membership but to recognize the fact that GE issues are likely not going to go away and that a short-term ad hoc committee looking at things from a system-wide perspective may not be the way to go. One of the challenges they had is that the work isn’t done, the conclusions aren’t done. Usually you would refer it back to committee, but the committee doesn’t exist anymore. Norman said that this was the problem they were trying to solve rather than outright rejecting it. He said he wanted to provide this as a perspective so that we don’t spend a ton of time trying to constitute what the committee should look like. We could have this First Reading and then bring it up at a later date after Statewide has or has not come up with exactly the members of the committee, representing the very valid concerns of the historians, political scientists and the average faculty throughout the system. **Talamante** said the discussions we had at Senate Exec was that the work of the committee wasn’t completed, it didn’t actually meet its goals. The committee itself, its creation wasn’t rejected by the Senates of the CSUs. It’s important work, and we’re unhappy with the results that were achieved, and so we wanted to support a way to have the work done, which is the goal of this resolution. **Monty** said his concern is not about the historians or the political scientists or to see that they’re represented at such of a committee, he’s more concerned about the competency of the committee and that the committee not turn into another GE Task Force that attempts to impose on the system a homogenized standardized radically modified GE program without any data demonstrating the necessity for such. He noted in the first resolve, Program Review is a very specific function. That would mean that making recommendations about system-wide changes of GE would not fall under its purview. This committee would be engaged in assessment and data collection, and it could make recommendations for solutions we might consider. But it would not at any point be producing a report like the one from the GE Task Force. Stanislaus voted to reject the report, Chico voted unanimously to reject the report. The Colleges of Arts and Sciences across the system and another letter of rejection was submitted to the Senate by more than 50 history and political science chairs across the system. There’s a lot of grass roots efforts across the system that people do not want to see this report play any role in future deliberations about GE in the CSU. **Talamante** said we’ll take these comments to the Senate Executive Committee and come back with a Second Reading.

**President Parham’s Report**

* Parham said that he is doing fine, and his body and mind are strong, and the spirit is willing. He said he made a promise when he came to the campus to be transparent, and the message he sent out to the campus yesterday regarding his current health challenge was him living up to that promise. He thanked everyone for their support, cards, and letters for which he is very grateful.
* He noted that his experience of the investiture was magnificent and as he said then, his goal was not to escalate an individual leader but to elevate the campus. He said he’s so thankful for everyone who participated. He and the First Lady continue to receive accolades regarding the campus and those who have reached out express that they’re excited to see where Dominguez Hills is going.
* In February, he participated the Chancellor's President’s Leadership Council. He noted that Presidents are discussing from policy to budgets. He said he remains optimistic about our current budget scenario, even though we’re moving closer to May revise. He said that we’re hoping that with all of the advocacy Dominguez Hills will show up on a couple of categories of that budget. We’re hoping for a 2-5% bid of the 45 million - $75 million campus bid. We’re waiting to see what happens with regard to the deferred maintenance budget. On the campus’ behalf, he had just sent a message in conjunction with VP Goodwin to Steve Relyea to talk about the formula they’re using to really look at the deferred maintenance piece.
* He said he briefly got to participate in the CSU Asia trip to extend our footprint and to greet our alumni in three places, Tokyo, Hong Kong and Taipei. Tokyo is where we have our largest contingent of alumni. It really was an opportunity for us to extend our reach and make connections with educational academies, to make and explore opportunities for more faculty, students and maybe even staff at some point - research opportunities. Know that those conversations are ongoing.
* He added it’s hard to relate to a global world with just a local identity. As we are global, we also do not want to forget that we are local as well. He said they’ve had several promises to meet with different school districts. In February, he visited with both Englewood and Morningside High School and met with junior and senior students.
* Administrative Review Process – he said it is an initiative that is a hold-over from before he joined Dominguez Hills, and he’s happy to report that we’re close to getting the process to where it needs to be after many discussions and revisions. He said he knows it’s been a priority as a campus. He acknowledged those who have reached out to him about moving it along. He said as we celebrate though, he would like us to be cautious about believing that this is somehow an etched in stone finished process. It is our first run out of the gate; we’re trying to get it right and make sure that people can have broad access. We’re trying to get people reviewed who need to be reviewed and do it in a responsible way, creating a transparent process. While the spirit of it is to provide broad access, we want to be sure that feedback provided is relevant to the evaluation and performance of the candidates. He said he’s glad to start rolling it out and as we get closer to April, we’ll see a whole set of communication to come out. He’ll be speaking to HR and Chair Talamante about it. The communication will roll out the process and the candidates being evaluated.
* We continue to engage with students, to provide them with broader access. One of the ways in which we do that is through the monthly Toro Team Luncheon, which includes the Cabinet, the Chief of Police, Athletics, Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education. It is really improving the lines of communication.
* Coming up shortly is the Free Speech forum, and that is an example of how much collaboration there is in moving forward and making sure that we’re listening and addressing the needs of the students.
* Parham noted that the Provost attended the Board of Trustee meeting on his behalf on 3/19.
* Parham acknowledged Trustee Sabalius. He noted that he and the Trustee have been working together since Parham joined Dominguez Hills. He noted that Sabalius is not only a great advocate for the system, he is a strong voice for Dominguez Hills.

**Chair Talamante** noted that Free Speech Week is going to take place April 8th – 12th. There will be emails going out. It is being coordinated by Dr. Brooke Nelson. If you have something you would like to see part of Free Speech Week, her email is bnelson@csudh.edu. It’s been wonderful to work with her, ASI, the VP of Student Affairs, and the Provost along with the support of President Parham; it’s been a long term goal of ours.

**Q&A/Comments**

**Senator Hirohama** said regarding the Performance Evaluation that she noticed the last change that went out. She said before it stated it would be the MPP’s with at least three years of service that will be mandated to undergo the review process. Now it states, “may be mandated.” Hirohama asked why the change was made. **Parham** responded that the change is not to say that people aren’t eligible, it’s more a recognition that when we first started down this road, the list of people who were proposed to be reviewed was long. At that point it becomes a capacity issue and our ability to be able to do a good job. The guidelines are made now so that once you cross a particular threshold of three years, you are eligible to be reviewed and are among the people who may be selected. When the mandate reads to select everyone, it would essentially say that if there were 40 people eligible, that all 40 would have to be done, and we simply do not have the capacity to do so. This is not an attempt to say that someone won’t be reviewed now nor to exclude anyone. It’s merely a capacity issue. **Senator Esposito** said she had two individuals approach her and said they submitted feedback but that they didn’t get anything. They indicated that maybe the screen went blank after they submitted it. Should they have received anything? **AVP Roberson Simms** said that they’re in the process of collaborating with IT to get some kind of automatic receipt, which wasn’t built into the initial form. What they’re doing now is manually responding with an email to individuals who did submit feedback form. There have been some issues on the sender’s side in terms of trying to submit the feedback, and maybe they don’t have the right programing on their computer. We’re engaging IT to assist those individuals with trying to get it submitted. **Esposito** asked, wasn’t the feedback supposed to be anonymous? **Roberson Simms** said the submission is anonymous to this one email of which only she has access to. She prints out the hardcopy that goes to either the President or the Provost. **Talamante** asked if we have someone who is being reviewed, shouldn’t they have received an invite by now that they would have purview to have input on? Roberson Simms said the list went out with everyone who is being reviewed and it provided a link. Roberson Simms said she would resend it. **Senator V. Price** said she’s been approached by a number of individuals who asked if they can just print out the evaluation, fill it out, and then slip it under a door or some designated space. They don’t feel comfortable, and they want to be a participant. Price said she believed it should be feasible to go “old fashioned” and print it out. But how would HR manage it? **Roberson Simms** said in theory it sounds like a good idea, but the concern is that they would have numerous individuals print out the forms without any kind of record that its coming from one email. Then there’s no accountability. This is the flip side of it. **Parham** said it’s not just about accountability, it’s about protecting the integrity of the process. That’s what’s fundamental about this. Whatever we can do is critical. He said will we get it right from the start? No, and that’s why we’ll need the ability to tweak it if necessary. **Celly** said that she appreciates both sides; the issue that was raised about anonymity. She noted that when she was doing the work on the NTTTF, that Pete VanHamersveld stated that was not truly anonymous. You really need to have a paper and pencil option to be truly anonymous. That’s interesting given he was head of Institutional Research for a while. Some people really do not trust the electronic approach.

**Provost Spagna’s Report**

* Discussed at Board of Trustees meeting
	+ the legislative agenda covered about 50 bills that are appearing before the legislature. Most of these bills have to do with reforming student financial aid. What CSU is asking for is to make Cal Grants, Part B, more accessible to students. This process hasn’t been touched since the 70s and does not allow freshmen to receive these Cal Grants, which would greatly support our campus if that happens.
	+ Fourth Year Quantitative Reasoning being required as an admission criterion to come into the CSU -There were several groups that came forward asking about whether or not this created inequities in terms of access. This may be a conversation we’ll want to have at a later date. The quantitative reasoning issue is a complex one; it involves partnerships with P-14 and something that as a group we may want to work with K-12 partners to help us in, because it is not as simple as just adding a fourth year of quantitative reasoning.
	+ Educational policies around service learning. There was a presentation about how service learning is happening across the system. He said he believed there was the equivalent of 170+ years of our students contributing to the community in terms of hours served. The legislature needs to understand the non-pecuniary impact our students have on entire states.
	+ Performance of EO 1110 one year in: one year in students in the same numbers that were taking developmental courses with no college credit, were taking with C or better and passing in same numbers for college credit. Spagna said the real reveal here is it results in students having a better trajectory to go on to second semester freshman year, sophomore year, etc. As was discussed by the Board of Trustees and Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard, the jury is still out. We have to keep monitoring and see what happens.
	+ There was quite a bit of conversation, particularly in the public comment, about Cal State LA declaring impaction. There’s some lessons learned there about how communication happened or didn’t happen, how it’s being shared with students, how it’s being shared with the community.
* We will be having a regional enrollment meeting that will involve the nine CSUs in the LA basin in the middle of April. We’re also having a redirection meeting at the end of March, talking about if students are being redirected to our campus, is money following those students? And how do we support such a redirection.

**ASI Report**

VP Daylin Joseph – currently ASI is going through their annual elections. There are two candidates for ASI President, Joseph and current ASI President Christian Jackson. They’ll be holding elections all week, and the window to vote will close on Thursday. They’ll be holding a special Board meeting where they should know their results.

Last week the BOD attended the California Higher Education Student Summit. The 23 campus ASI’s come together where they lobby for CSU needs. This year they’ll be lobbying for financial aid reform. She learned that Cal Grant B is super competitive. Last year, 2017-2018, 340,000 applied and were eligible but only 12,000 got it. They say it is easier to get into UC Berkley than to get Cal Grant B. It is the Cal Grant that actually covers the cost of living, food, transportation, your livelihood. It hasn’t changed since the 70s and is in need of change. She noted that they spoke with Senator Bradford where they were able to advocate for our children’s center on campus and our infrastructure on campus.

CFA Report, Senator Cutrone

CFA appreciates the personal informational DH Email message from President Parham who shared his health issues, and we would like him to know that he has our support and prayers. We will stay strong and continue to keep our University on this path of growth that we are now on.

CFA expressed gratitude to the Executive Senate, Chair Talamante, and Vice Provost O’Donnell for hearing CFA’s voice and bridging the divide between our Tenure and Non-Tenure track faculty by establishing assigned time for service for our elected Non-Tenure Track Faculty who serve on our Senate. Under this new agreement, elected Non-Tenure Track Faculty who serve on our senate will be recognized for their contributions and participation by being granted service credit equivalent to three weighted teaching units per semester. This agreement will require preparing for meetings with the advance reading of materials, serving in person and contributing in floor discussions at our Senate meetings. In addition, Non-Tenure Tact Faculty senators will work with Faculty Affairs in creating a means of regular communication with other lectures on senate proceedings. It will also require that they work with the senate parliamentarian to serve on two other committees during their term of service. Our CFA considers this inclusion as a giant step in bridging the gap between our Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track Faculty. It demonstrates the progress that our Senate has made to insure equity among our members, and we applaud this new step.

CFA Steering Committee continues to meet regularly and discuss and plan for activities that support all of our members. The Labor Management Team meets regularly with the Provost to express the concerns of our members. The genuine concern and interest shown by our Provost is appreciated regarding faculty’s concerns with problems involving the changes happening during this growing process that we are undergoing. Although this is not ideal, CFA accepts the fact that there will be some confusion during this time. The Provost assured us that he hears our concerns and is working to continue transparency in our growing process and will not let allow it to hinder our mission of serving our students. Regarding concerns expressed at the last Senate meeting about academic integrity and plagiarism on campus, the Provost said that such issues will be confronted with a mindset that works towards restoration and healing.

Upcoming Events:

CFA Steering Committee Elections. All positions for our Steering committee will be open. Nominations will be held from March 25 through April 8. Voting will then take place from April 15 through April 22. We encourage our faculty to apply for all open positions and would like to see increased support from our members.

[**Research Enterprise Update, Director of Sponsored Research and Programs, G. Fischer**](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/Research%20Enterprise%20Update%20032019.pdf)

Sponsored Research and Programs (SRP) Update

Fischer noted that as of 2016, they had restructured the organization so that both pre and post award were reporting to Academic Affairs. She said while they collaborate with the Foundation, Pre and Post Awards is no longer directly housed within the Foundation. Over the last year they brought in a consultant who has 30 years of CSU experience, and she’s been working to help them update the policies and procedures. Some of them had not been updated since 2007. As part of the rebranding of Research and Programs, they’re starting to slowly pull the outdated policies off of the Foundation website, and the updated policies are being added to their website. They’re hoping by the time that they’re completely done with this they’ll have policies, procedures and different timely information so that it will be a one-stop resource for the faculty. They’re also hoping that by the end of next month that they’ll be able to co-locate pre and post award in WH 478 and 480, which will create a physical one-stop shop as well. One of the implemented policies is a timeline policy. One of the issues they were having was very last-minute proposals. She said it is more helpful to them to be able to thoroughly review and be involved in the development process so that their coming up with the most competitive proposals that they can. They’ve also worked on a couple of audits this year, including working with Admin & Finance on the Chancellor's Office Centers & Institutes audit. This has resulted in a new policy and new procedures. There was a new staff hire who came from another CSU. She will perform services for both areas and be a bridge between the two helping with cross training. They’ve been working on a lot of internal professional development. They’ve also been working with Chandra Khan, who has been expanding the research development area of their office.



**Q&A/Comments**

**Chair Talamante** asked will the updated timeline be communicated broadly to the campus, but also updated each semester, just to remind people that are in the process and preparing grants that they really need to be prepared ahead of time. **Fischer** responded that they’re going to be sending out a notification of all of the policy updates to the full campus and then also they’ll be bringing it up when people interact with their office, and also when they have people working with research development and going through the Grants for my Research cohort. **Vice Chair Esposito** said sometimes they’re waiting for letters from a school district. Is there any way to have a have there be some flexibility in the policy and instead note that 80% of letters or documents of support rather than if you don’t have it, it’s not going to be included? Fischer noted that letter of support aren’t specifically what they’re concerned with rather it is making sure they have enough time to review the required documentation, the budget, the scope of work. For the most part they’re working with drafts and faculty can let them know that letters are coming. They’ve had a lot of instances where they’re getting proposals between 24 and 1 hour in advance of a deadline. Then staff is submitting nights, weekends, and holidays. The documents aren’t coming in in time to make sure that they’re compliant. She said their concern is that faculty has put in many hours of effort and then one small thing is not compliant with the guidelines and then the whole thing is returned. The sponsors are being inundated with so many more proposals than ever, and their response is to weed out anything they can before it even gets to reviewers. They need time to review the substantive part of the proposal, and they need to work with the faculty to develop a budget and budget justification, making sure that everything required by the sponsor is there to make sure that it does receive a review. She concluded by saying they want to protect the faculty members’ time.

[**Presentation**](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/presentations/Task%20Force%20on%20Hybrid%20Learning_3_20_19.pdf) **- Task Force on Hybrid & Distance Learning, EPC Chair Ortega and Co-Director of School of Leadership, Antonia Issa Lahera**. In addition to introducing Co-Director Dr. Lahera, Ortega recognized the rest of the committee members, Hamoud Salhi, Nancy Deng, Betty Vu, Kara Dellacioppa, Karrah Cunningham, ASI CBAPP, Reza Boroon, Joanna Kimmitt, Lynda Wilson, Ashley Stilley, Jenney Hall, Hugo Asencio, Maria Barbosa, Gurpreet Singh, Ruben Caputo, Fidel Garcia, Lupita Garcia, and Steve Williams. He pointed out those who were there at the meeting including Rubin Caputo, Lupita Garcia and Reza Boroon.

Ortega reviewed what the Task Force has done thus far including two Town Hall Meetings, both onsite and via video conference for faculty. They also hosted a student town hall via video conference as well as student-centered focus groups. They also conducted two surveys, one that was focused on faculty online instruction and the other was geared toward students. He said the recommendations that the Task Force is proposing today came about as a result of these activities. He said the recommendations they received echoed themselves across the faculty, staff and students communities. The recommendations are as follows:

**Minimum standards**

* Minimum hours of dedicated instruction time. We recommend that each distance and hybrid course syllabus specify the activities a student must complete to reach an equivalent of a 50-minute credit hour.
* For Distance Courses: The syllabus must describe the activities that the student will be required to complete and indicate the expected minimum time that students will need to devote to each activity. The total expected time spent on course activities must be a minimum of 45 hours per semester for each unit of credit.
* For Hybrid Courses: The syllabus must indicate the credit hour time equivalencies of class seat time and distance work that students will be required to complete to reach a minimum of 45 hours per semester for each unit of credit.
* Minimum requirements of online interaction with instructor. The syllabus must indicate the minimum amount of interaction time and methods by which a student enrolled in a distance or hybrid course must have with the instructor(s) of record (to include: forum discussions, office hours, among other interactions).
* Minimum requirements of online interaction with other course enrolled students. The syllabus must indicate the minimum amount of interaction time and methods by which a student enrolled in a distance or hybrid course must have with fellow course enrolled students (to include forum interactions, group work, among other interactions).

Ortega mentioned that in courses that were fully online, faculty indicated that in the exit surveys, the harshest criticisms had to do with group work. They’re hoping that they will be able to include or recommend specifics ways of interacting and times for interacting. They believe that would help.

With regard to availability of online tutoring, a lot of feedback came from staff who help out in delivering these courses. They receive a lot of calls and emails from students asking for tutoring.

With regard to online examinations, right now we have software, but not in all cases are faculty or students aware of the software that’s utilized, the associated costs or how to receive support.

One of the recommendations that we spoke most about is the recommendation that faculty wishing to teach distance/hybrid courses must be certified to teach online based on course modalities. Respondents to our surveys, 80% agreed with this as did most who came to the town halls. One of the follow-ups to this, if you’re going to require this for online instructors, are you going to do it for face-to-face? This may present an issue with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**Training**

Dr. Lahera spoke to the surveys, town halls, and research they did as it relates to training.

We recommend that CSUDH establish an in-house training certificate program that is required for all faculty wishing to teach distance/hybrid courses. This training program should include, but not be limited to:

* Up to date best practices in distance and hybrid course delivery.
* Americans with Disabilities accessibility compliance issues, intellectual property and academic freedom.
* Training on the Learning Management System used at CSUDH.

- If faculty have received formal distance/hybrid course delivery training elsewhere, they can take an assessment to test out upon demonstrating mastery of skills.

An in-house certificate was recommended because Dominguez Hills has specific needs and to further brand Dominguez Hills. Lahera noted that given that technology is changing all the time and that we want to make sure we’re compliant, training could help to ensure that faculty are up to date on best practices. She said that even though she’s taught online for years, she could see herself taking a training to ensure that she remains current.

* The formation of a standing faculty learning community which can engage in transdisciplinary and collaborative programs aimed at integrating the latest pedagogical practices and technologies in the fast-changing environment of
* distance and hybrid teaching. This faculty body can serve as an ongoing resource to faculty wishing to receive technical or pedagogical assistance throughout the semester.
* That CSUDH establish a regular cycle of workshops aimed at faculty development and continuing education on distance and hybrid course delivery.
* She said an online learning community would be a resource for all to learn from each other tools, strategies, and designs that have the highest impact.
* We recommend that CSUDH employ a cadre of dedicated course builders and designers that work with content experts to create optimum distance and hybrid learning environments.
* That this group work closely with Academic Technology specialists to create a vertical integration between our campus learning management system, instruction tool training, distance/hybrid instruction certification, and course satisfaction evaluation.
* That this group maintain a bank of model courses and course templates for faculty consultation.
* Lahera highlighted that while faculty are content experts, there are others who are experts in online course design and having a cadre of course builders that work with content experts. This group would work really closely with Academic Technology specialists and keeping up with the latest technology and software. They would maintain model templates. If you were brand new you could utilize one of the templates and just add in your content.
* That this group offer workshops on course design and how to evaluate student satisfaction of online based instructional environments.
* That this group work closely with content experts and Academic Technology specialists to create tutorials and orientation sessions that educate students how to navigate online course related tools and content.
* That this group work closely with Academic Technology specialists to create new functions within CSUDH’s mobile application for use in the delivery and management of online based courses (session delivery, student interaction, completion of assignment and evaluations, among others).

**Distance/Hybrid Course Evaluation**

* We recommend that CSUDH establish an in-house training certificate program that is required for all faculty wishing to teach distance/hybrid courses. This training program should include, but not be limited to:
	+ Up to date best practices in distance and hybrid course delivery.
	+ Americans with Disabilities accessibility compliance issues, intellectual property and academic freedom.
	+ Training on the Learning Management System used at CSUDH.
		- If faculty have received formal distance/hybrid course delivery training elsewhere, they can take an assessment to test out upon demonstrating mastery of skills.

Ortega said with regard to distance/hybrid course evaluation – faculty, staff, and administrators all alerted the Task Force that they would like to see reviews given how fast the changes in online pedagogy and technology that there should be an established cycle of reviews. He noted that they have been approached from the various curriculum review committees that they would like direction in how to review and approve these courses for distance and hybrid. He said that currently there are conversations about the curriculum review procedure; he believes that this could be part of that conversation.

**Additional Resources:**

* We recommend that the Academic Technology Committee investigate the optimal number of instructional technologists needed to provide development and on-going support to faculty and students engaged in distance/hybrid courses.
* That the Academic Technology Committee investigate if additional software or hardware purchases are necessary to support high quality distance/hybrid course offerings at CSUDH.
* We recommend that IT specialists maintain a dedicated distance/hybrid course help desk to answer questions and solve problems in an expedited manner.

**Create an implementation committee.**

* The implementation committee should receive feedback from Faculty Affairs, the California Faculty Association, the University Curriculum Committee, the Educational Policy Committee

To investigate the possible overlap between the recommendations provided in this report and issues of faculty workload, collective bargaining agreements, existing policies on course requirements

* EPC, FPC and implementation committee should form a joint working group that creates a resolution which recommends minimum standards for distance and hybrid courses.

**Q & A/Comments**

**Senator Monty** thanked the body and noted that it was likely one of the more impressive task force reports and sets of recommendations he’s seen. He said two of the recommendations pertain to students and the rest are about faculty training, course design, and resources. He said that every bit as much attention should be given to students to learn effectively and what it takes to learn effectively in this modality. In particular, he said he cannot imagine under any circumstances, that a course that can be delivered on a mobile device would have sufficient academic rigor to be worthy of an accredited university. He said although he’s inquired over the years, no one could tell him how many students actually owned desktops, laptops, tablets or iPad that would be appropriate tools for learning in a hybrid or an online course and how many have had access to a reliable internet connection so that they could engage in that work. He asked if we’ve ever solicited that data and if we have it. He said he would want students to be made to understand that you’re still going to have to go to the library, they’re still going to have to have tools more than mobile devices in order to learn effectively to learn these courses. **Lahera** said she would love to show Dr. Monty some of the work one of her employees is doing earning her MFA online. **Stephen “Alex” Marositz**, Accessibility Technology Initiative (ATI) Coordinator for the Division of Information Technology introduced himself. He offered some recommendations and his background is in universal design. He pointed to the section regarding what should be covered under a course outline, to the point about teaching students about what needs to be available for them in order to be successful in a class. He recommended that there be time taken out to educate students on what constitutes a functional limitation as the result of a disability. It’s extraordinarily difficult to do an online class without accommodations if you suffer from ADHD for example. In the section regarding faculty not being allowed to release their content without written permission, he said it states under no circumstances; however, he felt it should read, except where for when reasonable accommodations are requested. **Senator Bono** said he also believed that student training be part of the recommendations. **Senator Sanford** said he would like to echo what Senators Monty and Bono said, if a student is not savvy on online coursework, you cannot design your way out of it. He said before we begin to redesign our coursework, it is necessary to find out if the student is ready. **Senator Kulikov** said that online classes take at least 1 hour per student for a professor per week. It is very hard work. Faculty who teach online, would welcome additional training. She said with regard to assessment, she would recommend not to specify how often the assessment is going to happen, but to tie it to the learning outcomes. **Senator Phan** said he would offer a clarification, he assumes what is meant with regard to tutoring was the university would provide it, otherwise the instructor would then become the tutor. Ortega clarified that this came from the feedback of a number of students that online students, when they’re on campus, would want to be able to access different services such as the Toro Learning Center and the Writing Center. **Senator Ma** said that there needs to be a lot more focus on the students and make sure they have the right equipment. She said she’s worked with students who did not have equipment, and she helped them to check out two laptops, however what was needed required an administrative password which made it very difficult for the students. Ma said ensuring students’ access needs to be at the forefront of our efforts.

**Senate Retreat Executive Summary Excerpts, Tables 3 (Cultural Pluralism) and Table 5 (Faculty & Setting the Curve for Student Retention/Graduation)**

Table 3 – Cultural Pluralism, Moderators Esposito and Ortega

**Esposito** noted that the summary of responses to question five really provides a grand summary of what everyone said. When asked if we should look at GE and what does it look like with regard to Cultural Pluralism, lots of Senators asked, who’s going to define what cultural pluralism is, how are we using it right now, what is it? In the first question, Senators responded that it has gotten to be too broad of a definition. Even in asking, we had a wide range of answers. There’s a lot more work to be done with it, and a lot of it will continue to come out as we review GE.

**Summary:**

As a result of requirements in EO 1100R, Cultural Pluralism is now a stand along requirement outside of G.E. We are using the current change to initiate dialog on the topic. Senators and guest participants discussed five questions.

1) What do we mean by the term "cultural pluralism"?

*Senators observed that the term cultural pluralism should go beyond a dictionary definition. They also stated that they would not want the term to become a “catch all” or “loaded” phrase that ends up with a broad meaning like “what has happened to the term diversity (“It has become everything and nothing”).*

*Senators stated that Cultural Pluralism should allow students to study, respect, tolerate, and accept ideas from people with a different background from their own. A number of senators indicated that we had to allow for the fact that cultures are constantly changing and that imposing definitions may sometimes not allow a culture to change or be fluid. The term should also allow for a review or reflection of how cultures emerge, how they are experienced, and how they change.*

*Senators also stated that we must integrate social justice to the working definition of the term.*

2) What do we want students to know and be able to do with respect to the term?

*Students should be encouraged to value and understand their roots. They should also be encouraged to reflect on the fact that cultures evolve.*

*Students should be taught to be aware of the dominant narrative in their field and to recognize that the narratives or stories of some social groups are not represented in the narratives that drive many academic fields.*

*Students should be presented with the term culture from local to global meanings of the word and what it means to understand one’s own background in light of one’s local, state, national, continental, and global context.*

3) Do we like this term, or do we want to modify it?

*We need to define the term.*

4) In what ways and to what extent should attention to "cultural pluralism" be included in our G.E. outcomes? In our institutional outcomes?

*We need to do a review of which classes are currently integrating cultural pluralism into their curriculum and maybe review which classes are demonstrating culturally responsive pedagogy (including contributions, ideas, stories, narratives from historically underrepresented voices in the field).*

5) Could we meet this outcome by creating "cultural pluralism" designations for other GE, major, and minor courses that meet agreed-upon criteria? We could consider requiring students to take x number of classes (major and/or G.E.) in order to fulfill the requirement.

*On this subject Senators raised a series of questions: Who exactly will define cultural pluralism as it pertains to our graduation requirements? How will this be determined? What expertise will the person/body have to be able to define this term?*

Table 5—Faculty & Setting the Curve for Student Retention/Graduation

(Moderator: Laura Talamante)

Chair Talamante provided her overview of the feedback from her table. She noted that in terms of scaling, it wasn’t to create larger classes, but scaling it up so more faculty could benefit from what’s already working on campus. The second was in line with what faculty need to support these practices.

1) What are faculty practices that are currently working? What would we need to do to take the practice to scale?

2) What do faculty need to support these practices (e.g. compensation for independent study, thesis supervision, etc.)?

**High Impact Practices:** Overall,senators believe we have a rich array of High Impact Practices in place and are achieving positive results, especially with HIPs that provide opportunities beyond class assignments.

**HIPS Consolidation:** *Faculty questioned how to reach more students w/HIPS and suggested having them coordinated under 1 umbrella.* *Faculty indicated the need to move away from separate budgets across the campus to support HIPs and have them coordinated in one place to ease faculty’s ability to access resources, find information on HIPs that are already working, and receive communication more uniformly.* *Senators argued that a lower TTF teaching load allows for more faculty to implement HIPS, including training, designing, and implementing. high touch practices take time for high excellence.*

**Graduate level HIPs**: Senators discussed the value of graduate level high impact practices, including the practice of scaffolding research process across five semesters, which was very successful. *It was suggested that these practices could be layered into the undergraduate experience, which some professors indicated they are already doing.*

**First Year Seminar:** A survey of students in class revealed a positive experience, especially summer bridge, peer mentors, and workshops on school/personal life. *Faculty questioned how better to share back w/others the success of First Year Seminar and ways to move the program out of its silo and increase faculty in FYS.*

**Design Your Life**: Senators discussed success using design principles in assignments in courses already in the curriculum. A student survey indicates students appreciated practices which made them think about their college experiences and future life, such as prototyping – talking to people in professions of interest – and internships as well as from creating career/life plans connected to educational goals/experiences inside/outside class.

**Writing Across the Curriculum**: *Senators recommend expanding the WAC training. Senators also voiced the need for support for issues of reading comprehension, which is connected to writing success. Senators emphasized more writing support is needed and preferably via faculty-based tutoring in a writing center.*

**Community Service Learning:** *Senators would like to see more internships and community service learning opportunities. There is a need for support for more connections in the community, for cultivating relationships so that community members initiate contact. Senators recommend increasing the number of college–level internship coordinators.*

**Undergraduate research:** In addition to more traditional research experiences, senators highlighted Community Service Learning and field practice w/professors as other forms of effective undergraduate research. *Senators wondered how the Office of Undergraduate Research can reach more students and faculty. They also expressed the need for more support for field practice with professors.*

*Faculty Librarians indicated interest in finding more ways to support student success through simplifying guides and tutorials (face-to-face/online) for research and recommended that classroom faculty work with faculty librarians and include library tutorials in syllabus grading.*

**Student Academic Journals:** Student publishing strengthens writing and editing skills, and prepares students to deliver presentations. The University Library has a Digital Initiatives Librarian (Dana Ospina) who is working with faculty to support undergraduate publishing. *Senators observed that an increase in library staff support would allow Ospina to work with more programs.*

**Short-term study abroad**: Senators observed that short-term study abroad provides valuable exposure to different cultures. *We need more student/faculty financial support for Study Abroad and to offer more short-term opportunities to increase the number of students who can participate. They recommend exploring funding opportunities through IRA funds.*

**Classroom practices:** Senators stated that clickers engage students and keep them accountable, especially in large classes. *Senators wanted more professional development/technical training on the topic of clicker pedagogy. Senators would like to see an increase in skills training opportunities for all faculty.*

**Supporting student success**: Senators mentioned that invasive advising keeps students on track for graduation, increases majors, and increases retention. *Senators believe the ratio of advisors to students in some programs needs addressed. They also recommended students might benefit from centralizing the advising space rather than having advisors spread throughout campus. Senators discussed engaging students in learning and growth beyond focusing on graduating students in 4-6 years, recognizing that one size does not fit all for student success and to make that message clearer in advising throughout the campus.*

*Senators emphasized the need to do more to address students’ basic needs, increase the number of psychological counselors to address student mental health needs and hire more career center counselors to support DYL practices in the classroom.*

*Senators indicated that more Supplemental Instructions Leaders (SILs) are needed for more disciplines and more faculty tutors are needed for more disciplines. Senators requested support for developmental learning across the curriculum*

**Senate Parliamentarian – election results**

Gammage reported the following election results:

Faculty Advocate – Donna Nicols elected

Nicols – 29 votes/Outland – 1 vote/Sanford – 3 votes

Gender Equity Task Force – Terry McGlynn elected

McGlynn – 29 votes/Sayed – 6 votes

University Scholarship Committee – Doris Namala – elected/Rui Sun – elected

Namala – 18 votes/Sun – 13 votes/Azizi – 11 votes/Eames – 9 votes/Outland – 8 votes

**Statewide Senate Report, Senator Thomas Norman**

Norman thanked the Chair and the Trustee for attending. Senator Tarjan and Trustee Sabalius were put forward to the Governor to become the next Faculty Trustee. Something that came up in the Faculty Affairs Committee, there was a recommendation to our Vice Chancellor of Research that we consider creating a Cal State Press to support us in our publication efforts. We’re a big enough system to support this, if there’s an interest, please let him know. Additionally, CSU put forth to the Chancellor for consideration is to protect our intellectual property. It’s a resolution going after Course Hero that will take our stuff and put it on there. We’re asking the Chancellor's Office to help us. It’s very onerous for us individually to ask them to take it down. They’ve been in conversations with the General Counsel about it. Legislative updates – AB 829: Occupational Therapy – we’re looking to get support for our doctoral program on our campus. We’re only one of two CSUs that have it. The other is the Bond initiative. We differ with California State Student Association. There are two Bond issues, AB 13 and SB 14. He noted that SB 14 is the better bill and that California State Student Association is supporting both. For further details, see [AS Statewide Senate page](https://www.csudh.edu/Assets/csudh-sites/academic-senate/docs/current-issues/Bond%20Initiatives%20spring%202019.pdf).

Chair Talamante congratulated Senator Norman who was elected as Secretary for the Statewide Senate.

**OPEN MIC**

**Talamante** requested that Chief Velez speak to some of the safety concerns that have come up.

**Chief Velez** spoke about an incident that occurred in the Library on Sunday, March 17. He noted that the University Police received a radio call at 3:00 pm of an indecent exposure in the library. A misdemeanor requires that they have a victim to identify the suspect in order for them to effect an arrest because it’s a crime that’s not committed in their presence. Officers located the suspect in one of the parking lots, another officer responded to the library. The alleged victim left word with library staff that she did not want to be contacted. Officers spoke with library staff and they were able to determine that there were not the elements of an indecent exposure. Nonetheless, they ran a background check and found that he is a transient, and they issued a trespass letter banning him from the campus for seven days.

**Talamante** asked where the transit stop ends the line and how that effects our campus.

**Chief Velez** noted that Dominguez Hills, just like other municipalities that surround our campus are experiencing issues with transients and homelessness. We have bus stop that is right in front of Small College Complex. It’s a stop where the individuals who are driving these busses use it as a pit stop to use our facilities. Transients sometimes spend the day riding around on the buses, end up getting off the bus too using our facilities. We cannot ban them from using public facilities. Velez said that we have met with the transit people and hopefully the construction and redesign of the frontage of the campus, we’re hoping to make it a little less convenient for the bus drivers to stop and take those 20-minute pit stops.

**Senator Celly** said she understands that there is an issue with needles showing up in some of the restrooms and wondered if there’s been an analysis as to where they may be coming from. Is it our own local student/faculty/staff populations or is it coming from our temporary visitors? **Chief Velez** said it is the first he’s heard of it and will certainly look into it. She said she knows that there are some very simple solutions for containing this such as installing Sharps Disposable Containers in the most used restrooms. **Senator Evans** said he was the one who reported it to the Health & Safety Committee and there have been numerous diabetic needles found in SAC 2 and SAC 3. He said his concern is that janitors may pick up trash bags and get poked with them. He said he is requesting that Sharps Containers be put into the restrooms.

**Senator Sanford** said the other night a raccoon came into his class and ate. He asked what to do in those situations. **Velez** said absolutely call the police. He said it has been an ongoing issue. Call them and they will respond.

**Talamante** addressed the Provost regarding faculty who are coming forward with issues that are now happening with scheduling because of issues related to space. She gave examples of not being able to get a lab space that’s supposed to go with a class, being told you’ll have to move to Friday, or we’re going to have to put this online. She asked, “How can we move forward in a productive way?” **Provost Spagna** said the simplest way to move forward is to contact either of the two co-chairs of the Facilities & Space Committee. Those are the Vice Provost, Ken O’Donnell and Yvette Nava in Academic Affairs. Spagna noted that they likely get three calls a day. They’re having a fairly good success rate in terms of trying to address the needs. He said they’re both set up with course schedulers in the colleges as well as other members. He said go to them directly. The Provost said he sits with them fairly regularly to see how we need to negotiate in terms of shared lab space or moving classrooms. He added that this is not going to go away as we move into the next year. The best approach is to bring them up immediately and we’re constantly looking for solutions and strike that balance between addressing students’ needs and supporting our faculty. **Talamante** asked would the Provost recommend that faculty also cc the schedulers in their colleges so that people are in the loop on how this is moving forward? The **Provost** replied that he would assumed that they did already, but he would encourage that as well.

**ASI VP Joseph** said there were a few things she neglected to mention in her report. One was about basic needs – what she found out when she traveled to Sacramento was that a couple of CSUs have charged their professors with adding a basic needs support services section to their syllabi, which would include information about homeless shelters, food pantries on campus, places that give out clothes for free. This way students can have those resources without having to disclose any challenges they may be having, and we can serve a lot of low-income students with any challenges they may be having. She said she doesn’t mind sharing a list of the resources so that professors can copy and paste it right into their syllabi. **Talamante** wondered if we could explore putting it on all the Blackboard pages so that students in need would have an easy way to get it. The **Provost** said he agreed it was a great idea and wondered if there wasn’t a way to consolidate a list of all of those resources on a page and then provide a link to faculty that they could include in their syllabus. This way the link would be able to be updated regularly.

**Senator Phan** with regard to the MPP reviews and those who would prefer to submit their comments physically and still remain anonymous. Each survey would have a unique number and that when you go to pick up a hard copy. Copies could be kept at the library and the person would randomly pick one. The Provost said it would be a good idea to get to AVP Roberson Simms and implement. It could address the anonymity factor and for those who would prefer working with a hard copy.

**Senator Bono** said he would like to improve the way we support faculty in doing research with graduates and undergrads. He said he would like to get involved in supporting research in a sustainable way. **Spagna** said we are about to enter into the sun setting of our existing university strategic plan. He said this would be a great item to codify as one of the points within the next strategic plan. It ties into HIPS, it ties into faculty support. The Provost noted that it is a perfect time to bring it forward. As it gets codified, it then becomes a priority and becomes earmarked for resources. **Senator Norman** responded that another area to watch at this time is the faculty in residence program and we’re transforming the percentage of students who will be living on campus. One of the things that the committee is really looking at, is to make sure it’s not just for the two or three faculty who are living there, but spaces as faculty that all of us will be able to go and get involved.

**Meeting Adjourned**