



Academic Senate • 1000 E. Victoria • Carson, CA 90747 • WH-A420 • (310) 243-3312

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
May 2, 2018/LSU 2:30 – 5:00 PM

Voting Members Present: Abdourazakou, Benavides Lopez, Cid, Dam, Deng, Evans, Ferris, Heinze Balcazar, Johnson, Kalayjian, Kaplan, Keville, Kitching, Krochalk, Lacanlale, Laurent, Ma, McGlynn, Monty, Naynaha, Nelson, Pawar, Phan, Pong, Radmacher, Sanford (proxy for ½ mtg. Mendoza Diaz), Skiffer, Tang, Taylor, Villanueva (proxy for Cutrone), Yi

Voting Members Not Present: Bono, Ernst, Furtado, Gaines, Grasse, Gray-Shellberg, Jarrett, Kulikov, Ledesma, Macias, Nicol, Still

Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Avila, Celly, Esposito, Gammage, Norman, Ortega, Talamante, Thomas, Hagan, Iheke

Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present:

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Avila, Driscoll, Franklin, Goodwin, Hill, LaPolt, Manriquez, O'Donnell, Peyton, Salhi, Spagna, Stewart

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Brasley, Davis, McNutt, Poltorak, Sayed, Wen

Guests: K. Boyum, T. Caron, R. Cuputo, L. Garcia, F. Garcia, R. Hay, J. Kimmitt, H. Oesterheld, G. Rhodes, E. Schrock

2017-2018 Academic Senate Executive Committee:

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

Recorded and Edited by SEW and the Executive Committee

Meeting Called to Order: 2:30 PM

Approval of revised agenda M/S/P

Minutes 04/18/18 M/S/P

Senate Chair Report

In-coming President, Dr. Parham met with Senate Exec as part of his first visit to campus on April 23, 2018. When asked about his vision for leadership at Dominguez Hills, he indicated his intentions is to trust our vision of ourselves and work to help us achieve the best realization of our vision. Dr. Parham emphasized his role as a servant leader and that shared governance is about our collective vision and making sure that all voices are valued. In terms of developing his relationship with the Academic Senate, he expects to be collegial, engaged, invested in building trust, and committed to transparency in shared governance. As part of our last Senate Exec meeting this semester, next week we will be looking ahead to a mid-July meeting. We have plans to meet with President Parham and Provost Spagna to begin building these new relationships. In addition, we will begin work on the August 29, 2018 Senate Retreat. To help us with our planning, we would appreciate feedback on areas of Senate interest. We will be breaking the room up into various table topics again and asking everyone to come to the meeting with their contributions on potential plans of action. The goal is to come away with drafts of plans/resolutions/responses to the Executive Orders and Chancellor's Office, etc. to help get

the work of the Academic Senate off to a productive start. The Senate Exec and Standing Committees will use these drafts to prepare for upcoming meetings and have some actions in motion from the beginning of the semester. Please email with suggestions for topics in the following areas (or areas not yet identified):

- Senate Exec
- Educational Policy Committee
- Faculty Policy Committee
- Statewide
- General Education Committee
- University Curriculum Committee
- University Writing Committee
- Council of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators
- Academic Technology Committee
- Other

Chair Talamante thanked everyone for all of their hard and collegial work this year. She said, “It has been an honor serving with our faculty, staff, student, and administrative leaders. I wish you all time to relax this summer with friends and family and engage in activities that fuel your passions.”

Early Start EO 1110 Faculty Advising Training Announcement, AVP Driscoll, AVP Oliverez, & L. Edwards, Senior Academic Advising Coordinator

Oliverez: Today’s update is to discuss transitions being made around developmental education for students where developmental courses are being eliminated

- Students coming in this summer will come in through credit-bearing courses,
- New process for how we assess students using multiple measures
- UPT and the LMN are out, no longer using these as a measure to assess our students’ preparation
- Math & English now being assessed using HS GPA’s, courses, and a variety of tests they take prior to coming to us.
- All of these piece combined have helped to determine their category placement, students can fall into one of four categories.
 - o Students who are in Category I are students who have fulfilled the requirement for GE prior to coming to us.
 - o Students in Category II are viewed as college ready but need some support coming in. They are not required to do Early Start. Categories I-III are not required to do Early Start.
 - o Category IV are ready and need support and are required to participate in Early Start.
 - o We intend to deliver Summer Bridge and First Year Experience in the same way we’ve been doing it for the last three years. That is to continue to push all of our incoming freshmen students to come to summer school. We know, based on data, those students who come to summer tend to have a better outcome in terms of first-year retention, long-term retention, and engagement on campus. There will be options for all students to come and take summer courses whether or not they take Early Start courses or other GE courses, all of our students will have a summer course option. All of these options will again be free.

Driscoll noted that faculty, staff, and students, and Records and Administration have been working together to make sure this is going to be very smooth for our students. Driscoll then had an information

sheet of internal working guidelines passed out that lists the names and contact information for the main lead in each area that can resolve an issue as opposed to sending a student from place to place.

Chair Talamante asked if there was anything that Driscoll might wish to communicate in terms of dissemination back to departments. **Driscoll** explained the following.

- University Advising Council meets every month. Faculty, staff, and advisors are all invited to come. Driscoll commented that Tim Chin and Matt Jones have been doing amazing work, including coming to every meeting they've hosted providing handouts and supplemental information so that the advisors understand and have been trained of the ongoing process on how to place students.
- Advising Summit is coming up where there will be additional training provided there.
- If anyone needs additional information within your college, Driscoll noted that everyone has a college specialist who works with Loren Edwards on a daily basis; she can come out and provide further information if possible.

Provost Spagna commented on the amazing job the team has done under the leadership of Bridget Driscoll and Paz Oliveres and all those involved from both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. He also mentioned the English and Math Department. He said in his meeting with all the Provosts in the system, where they were discussing the multiple measures and the conversations about better communicating to our students and community, some of the other Provosts weren't aware of what he was talking about. Spagna said the notion of us being a more coordinated collaborative group is impressive.

Hybrid & Online Learning Task Force Update, Task Force Chair – Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies - H. Salhi. Additional Committee Members: Enrique Ortega, Antonia Issa Lahera, 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, Steve Williams

Issa Lahera introduced a video put together by the Task Force. **Salhi** introduced the Task Force. He said there are 15 members and when they met for the first time, they decided to split the tasks among the committee members, whereby six subcommittees were formed. Those committees included data collection, accessibility, technology, pedagogy, faculty development and policy. What has been done so far has been to host town hall meetings on site and via video conference; they also hosted a student-centered focus group and have been looking into best practices. **Issa Lahera** then talked about the cross-functional approach to looking at what is currently being done and what else is possible. She spoke about the high response rate from students on the surveys that were sent out. In terms of the online Town Hall meeting held via Zoom, about 65 faculty signed in for it. She said they tapped into library faculty who have a great deal of knowledge on online and hybrid learning. She said that at the community college level, as a standard practice, faculty must go through three classes before they're able to teach online. She noted that in her office they invested in online course designers who are experts in course delivery. She said while faculty are experts in content, she is not an expert in graphic design. She said she's excited because it looks like Cal State Dominguez Hills will be talking about best practices across campus because there are a lot of students to serve with online learning.

She said that all of the committees were looking at data first, understanding what we have now and what are the findings. Then they met with people to find out what are the challenges with what we have right now. Next was to look at what research says and what are the recommendations as a committee. The presentation lays out what the findings are, what the challenges are, and what the research says. **Salhi** said the Task Force's request is for an extension for the Task Force to finish their work by December 2018. They realize there is a lot of work still to be done to analyze data and to look at other comparative institutions to come up with best practices. **Senator Monty** said that one thing that has always troubled

him when it comes to online learning is trying to read books, book chapters, periodicals, and scholarly articles on a phone. He asked what kind of technology access our students have. Do they actually have a computer, and do they offer have a reliable high-speed internet connection? Monty said he asks this so that if he were to offer an online course, he could have a reasonable expectation that they would be doing the work in a proper workstation where they might actually learn. Instead of trying to do it on an I-Phone. He said it's something he needs to know, especially with the profile of the students at Dominguez Hills coming primarily from underrepresented minorities and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. He asked if this kind of data has been collected as part of the work of the Task Force. **Salhi** responded that they did survey students, and **Issa Lahera** said they would be sure to find out about accessibility and what technology methods students have going forward. **Salhi** added that they are also looking at data as to how students perform in online classes vs. face-to-face. One of the reasons we've asked for this extension is to look at the evidence we have and then make recommendations. **Senator Sanford** said that he was part of the Chancellor's course redesign in technology this past semester and one of the things they were trying to do is to reduce the DFW rates in the technology chronology classes, which tend to be populated not with just the students from our department [Communications] but also with students from Justice. It had a very high DFW rate, and despite the redesign, it did not change the DFW rate. The students need to have class time. We cannot be a completely asynchronous online model for the students we're talking about. The same class taught on campus, in person, those students did fine. **Salhi** responded the committee shares your concerns. But we also look at other classes and there is a serious issue, the way we teach, the way we introduce our courses. This is why this team, with the help of IT, is looking at how to offer these classes in ways that are beneficial to the students. At some point or another, we may have to decide which courses are a best fit for our campus. Courses that are already online, if a department has been offering it for quite some time, and we see the DFW rates constantly, it is something we're cautious about. It is one of the data points that we're looking at. This is one of the issues that we have and is why we have this Task Force. **Senator Heinze Balcazar** said she would like to echo Senator Monty's concern. She said she's had students who've had trouble opening documents on Blackboard. They struggle trying to find a local library trying to open those documents. Not all students have I-Phones. She said she's had students who pay their monthly minutes on their phones to be able to access a course. She said it is a concern for the Department of Modern Languages as well. **Statewide Senator Esposito** thanked the group for the report and asked where we are as a campus with QM. She noted that years ago there was a lot of training on it and wondered if we really institutionalized it, and is it still a best practice? **Salhi** responded we look at the data for the last three years, and we have over 170 faculty who taught at least one online course. Of those 170, only 109 completed Quality Assurance training. We also are fortunate that we've had a lot of faculty who have had training outside the campus. **Salhi** concluded that Quality Matters is still on the table, and we continue to work with it. Lastly, there is a serious recommendation being considered that anyone who teaches online should be certified. Currently what can happen is a last minute class is offered, we call IT up and the class is added in a matter of hours, and suddenly you're an expert in online training. This is where many problems can start. We are looking at this and training is a big part of it. **Talamante** said in response to concerns brought up by Senators Monty and Heinze Balcazar is for the committee to look into how we can better support students as well.

Sense of the Senate was requested by Chair Talamante to support the extension of the Task Force so that they can provide the campus with a more comprehensive report and recommendations by the last meeting of the Senate in December of 2018. **Sense of Senate passes by a vote 38 in favor, 0 against and 1 abstention.**

Chair Talamante asked the committee how to find out when the meetings are given the meetings are open. **Ortega** said they have been emailing out Zoom links for the meeting and will continue to do so in the fall. **Talamante** suggested sending announcements via Senate as well.

***W EPC 18-07 Changes to Area A to meet EO 1100 Requirements, EPC Chair, E. Ortega** Ortega said the recommendations presented in this resolution are being done so after concerted efforts to reach consensus by representatives from the College of Arts & Humanities, College of Natural and Behavioral Science, Health & Human Services, by the English Department, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the General Education Committee. Given the attention this resolution has received from potentially affected parties and the fact that this is the last Academic Senate meeting which changes can be made to meet Fall 2018 deadlines for catalog updates and advising for incoming students, Ortega asked that the Senate waive the 2nd Reading and allow it to be presented as a W* reading. **Talamante** asked for those who support waiving the 2nd reading and presenting it as a W* resolution to raise their hands. **2nd Reading waived by a vote of 33 in favor, 0 against, and 4 abstentions.** Ortega continued that changes recommended are to reduce the unit count of Area A to 9 units in order to comply with the overall General Education breadth requirements established in Executive Order 1100. The first resolve changes the name of the Area from Basic Skills to Communication and the English Language and Critical Skills in order to match the language of Executive Order 1100. The first resolve also recommends removing ENG 111 from sub Area A1. The changes recommended in this resolve were endorsed by the English Department to accommodate recently approved changes to the department roadmap and General Education requirements. The second resolve recommends removing sub Area A4, which is called Objectives for Basic Library Skills, optional, from the General Education plan. This is in response to the memorandum to CSU Presidents and Provosts which was dated April 17, 2018. It was a clarification on Executive Order 1100 revised, which states that the Chancellor's Office supports campus' planning GE area variations only in specific cases and you have the cases in which it recommends the sub Area changes in the rationale. Ortega said, "as far as our reading goes, none of these seem to apply to keeping the sub Area A4." He opened it up for questions. **Senator Monty** asked for Senator Kalayjian to elaborate based on her work with the GE Committee. **Kalayjian** said that her recollection was that Area A4 was added to GE as an attempt to speak to the complex skills necessary to do library research. That is now more commonly referred to as information literacy. From the standpoint of the General Education Committee, part of the reason to take it out is that it's confusing. It's another one of those that's not required, suggested or intimated. It's a purely campus-based requirement. The General Education Committee is working on embedding some information literacy tutorial components into other GE courses. The GE Committee is working directly with the library to build some sample information literacy tutorials that students could be required to take in specific General Education courses. We've had a couple of sample tutorials created. One is a key word search, which Carolyn Gardner suggested would vet very well into an oral communication course. The other was evaluating sources. We thought that could go into the philosophy/critical thinking course. It wouldn't add any units, nor take up space in courses that are already packed full by having these tutorials available, students could gradually get greater skills in the area of information literacy. The question was called. **Chair Talamante** put it to a vote. **Resolution passes: 34 in favor, 0 against and 3 abstentions.**

Second Reading

EPC 18-06 Changes to Area D to meet Executive Order 1100 Requirements, EPC Chair E. Ortega. Ortega noted the changes to the resolution came about based on comments received on the Senate floor at the First Reading and additional comments were shared by representatives after that First Reading by

CAH, CNBS, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the General Education Committee. We know that this resolution is very important because of the suggested recommendations and the implication that it has on the functioning and logistics of departments and programs. After the changes that we are suggesting here, Senator Monty will discuss the merits of the version that we discussed during our First Reading during the last Academic Senate meeting. A motion was made to bring the resolution floor. Ortega reviewed the recommended changes which was to reduce Area D unit count from 12 units to 9 units. The first resolve recommends removing History 101 from the General Education program and recommends that it become a stand-alone university graduation requirement to complete Title V American Institution requirements. This would allow for the 3 unit reduction count while allowing for the current diversity of offerings in sub Areas D1 and D2. The second resolve states that three sub Areas from which students must select three 3-unit courses that gives us a total of 9 units. The third resolve includes a recommendation, which uses the same language that students currently use in Area C, indicating that students must select courses in sub Areas D1 and D2 from different departments. **Senator Kaplan** asked why POL 101 isn't also in the first resolve with HIS 101. From his understanding they were similar. **Chair Talamante** responded to the question stating that after the last Senate meeting they received further feedback on this resolution where Dean Avila and LaPolt offered a further suggestion. Whether it was Political Science that stayed in or History 101, the idea was that one of the American Institution requirements instead of two would remain so that there would be more flexibility of choices in D1 and D2 but that students would also gain the opportunity to have three units removed. To pull both out would mean that the units stays the same except six of them are outside of GE but the total unit count for meeting GE requirements and AI would remain the same as what we have right now. **Kaplan** asked, "So that course itself is required?" **Talamante** responded yes. **Dean Avila** thanked the Senate for the opportunity to provide feedback. He said his primary motivation, and he believes that Dean LaPolt would agree, was that there would be a more robust conversation around this topic. We think our GE package is very important. He said we believe that decisions about GE should be driven by conversations about student learning outcomes. The proposal to remove one of the graduation requirements rather than two was to open up the possibility for further discussion around this topic. Either proposal works fine for his college. **Senator Gammage** said his question was with regard to removing History 101, how does that impact our student learning outcomes in terms of aligning our student learning outcomes with the GE package in terms of the WSCUC report that will be coming here pretty soon? Will our GE still align with our student learning outcomes? **Dean Avila** responded, "That's exactly the question we should be asking. We've not had a conversation about the GE package necessarily in terms of our student learning outcomes. It's important that part of the conversation be about what are the student learning outcomes for this category." Avila said this is a longer conversation, one that would take town halls and conversations with the GE Committee, and presentations to the Senate. Unfortunately, it is May 2nd and we're under the gun to be in compliance. Avila concluded his remark with "Exactly right Senator Gammage and a very good point." **Talamante** asked if Senator Kalayjian could speak to the developing program learning outcomes for GE and were American Institutions built into the new program learning outcomes that the Adhoc Committee has been working on. **Kalayjian** said they're tentative. She said in developing the program learning outcomes they leaned on the LEAP learning outcomes from AAC&U and some models from other successful GE programs across the CSU. We were looking at program learning outcomes not specifically related to any area and that it was a conversation they anticipated. We haven't attached program learning outcomes to specific areas at this point. **Senator Monty:** The CAH Chair's Council voted unanimously again today to authorize me to speak in opposition to the revised resolution and in favor of the draft resolution that was distributed in email on April 18 after our last Senate meeting. At that point Senate Exec had penned a draft resolution that essentially adopted the recommendations made by

the CAH Chairs and also accepted the friendly amendment requiring that students take courses from three academic programs. Monty said for those that weren't at that meeting, CAH recommended that both American Institutions requirements be removed from Area D of General Education; that Area D would consist of a 9 unit requirement which students would take one course from the current Area A1, a second course from the current E2, and a third course from either one of those. We felt that this was much better than the proposal that would reduce the social science offering to three units. This we felt would do justice to the significance and diversity of the social sciences and would also give students a better opportunity to attain the student learning outcomes from Area D. There are 14 of them at present. There are also 14 academic programs represented in Areas D1 and D2. The idea that students would only take one course from the social sciences and somehow that would provide them with a representative sampling of research and scholarship and learning in the social sciences seemed to us unpersuasive. CAH Council continues to speak in support of the proposal we put forward at the prior Senate meeting for a number of reasons. As Senator Kaplan indicated, programmatically it makes no sense to move one American Institutions requirement out of Area D and to leave the other one there. It gives the appearance that one is an integral part of General Education while the other is some sort of external thing, when in fact both of those are part of one integral requirement, the American Institutions, the University and the system-wide graduation requirement coded by Title V. Programmatically it makes a lot more sense if we want students to understand why we're doing this, to associate them with clear learning outcomes. It makes better sense to leave them together. There are also advantages in terms of the quality and exposure students will have to social sciences in the GE package. It would be good for students to take three courses from three different academic disciplines. We feel strongly that it would be much better to remove both of the American Institutions from Area D and to maintain a full and complete integral Area D social science requirement. Senator Monty recommended that Political Science be removed from Area D; that the language in the second resolve be changed to what was published in the first revised draft that was distributed on April 18th. **Talamante** asked if the following change would address Monty's concern. She suggested that adding POL101 to the first resolve to read that effective Fall 2018, HIS 101 and POL 101 be removed from the General Education Program and become a stand-alone University graduation requirement. Additionally, that in the 2nd resolve it read, "that fulfillment of Area D: Social Sciences may be achieved by students selecting: a 3-unit course from sub area 1 (Perspectives on Individuals, Groups and Society), a 3-unit course from sub area 2 (Global and Historical Perspectives), and one more course from either sub area 1 or sub area 2; and be it further," And then the third resolve read "that students select courses in sub area D1 and D2 from different departments." Talamante repeated there is a motion on the floor to amend the current Second Reading presented today as noted. This was seconded. It was then brought to the floor for discussion. **Dean LaPolt** said as was shared by Dean Avila said, our goal is to be in compliance with the Executive Order by fall of next year. He said that anything more far reaching than that we should consider very carefully because it has big impacts on our students primarily, and it also has big impacts on our departments, and it impacts budgets. He said that the proposal currently on the floor would basically take our current General Education Program moving three units from category A and put them into category D and that's it. The rationale for that is not clear. As a Dean of Social Sciences, and Category D is Social Science, he would certainly benefit from it but our students would not. LaPolt said that prior proposal that came to you initially today, where we only move one of those AI requirements out gives our students a net of three extra units that they can use outside of GE. They can use it for internships, they can use it for pre-electives, they can use it for writing across the curriculum. We have unit majors above 120 units, and those students will be able to graduate sooner. There are a lot of implications for what is being proposed. What we're asking is simply let's meet the requirements of the Executive Order, let's have town halls next year, let's discuss this, let's really consider what's in the best

interest of our students instead of simply taking units out of A and sticking them into D. **ASI Director of Student Services Carolyn Tinoco** asked how this would affect transfer students? **Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies Salhi** said there is no impact on transfer students. That applies for three units and six units as well, so it's safe from that perspective as well. **Senator Monty** said he does agree that this should have happened differently, there should have been a broader dialogue earlier involving all of the concerned stakeholders but here we are. He said he had two additional concerns. One it seems to have nothing to do with student learning outcomes, it has to do with saving three units. We're trying to shave units. He wasn't sure if we actually have academic programs that are in violation of the 120 unit cap. It was his understanding that we allowed multiple exceptions to those programs five or six years ago. It was after the last Senate meeting that the draft he is arguing in favor of today was circulated to him, and it appeared to suggest that it was accepted or adopted by the Executive Committee. But then further consultations occurred and who was involved? Deans. The curriculum is the purview of the faculty. While I understand Deans have interests, and Deans certainly should have a voice in this, but I have concerns after Deans meet behind closed doors with the Chairs of a certain number of committees, and out comes a revised resolution that really doesn't make a lot of sense to him and only has the purpose of shaving three units. **Vice Chair Celli** said that being really close to it, it seems to her that if we're trying to protect the two classes that are integral to American Institutions and that it is a graduation requirement, all we're really doing is moving it out of GE and moving them together seems to make sense. What protects students better in terms of securing those options in the longer run? Having those courses within GE regardless of this imperative to reduce the size of the GE program or having them move outside of GE. **Talamante** noted that there are some CSUs where they never embedded American Institutions requirements within their GE package. **Monty** said they are distinctive in the sense that in GE there are learning outcomes, and its supposed to be an integrated package. But at the same time there are unit requirements. With the American Institutions, they are a competency, much in the way that they are written into the educational code as competency requirements. So student may satisfy those requirements by completing a course or by testing out just like the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement. **Secretary Thomas** called the question. **Talamante** asked for a vote of those in favor of the amendments as discussed to raise their hands, those opposed to seeing the resolution stay in the form that it came to Senate as it is today, and any abstentions. **Proposed amendments to resolution passes with 18 in support of the amendments, 4 against and 15 abstentions.** **Thomas** called the question on the now amended resolution. **Talamante** asked those who support the amended resolution for adoption to our Area D of General Education to raise their hand. **19 were in favor, 4 against and 17 abstentions.** **Resolution passes. Question from the floor** was raised if it was necessary to have a majority to pass? **Chair Talamante** responded that there was a majority of those who voted and that those abstentions decided not to vote.

Chair Talamante turned the gavel over to Vice Chair Celly so that Talamante could present [*W EXEC 18-08 Resolution to Honor and Commend President Willie J. Hagan at Cal State Dominguez Hills](#). She asked the Senate to waive the 2nd reading. Talamante read aloud the resolution and presented Hagan with the framed resolution and a framed thank you card. Senate gave Hagan an ovation.

Reports:

President Hagan – Hagan thanked the body. He spoke about shared governance and how it can mean different things to different people and that he believed that Cal State Dominguez Hills got it right. He said he appreciated the Senate body for its frankness and its constant effort for putting the needs of the students first. He said he's been in Higher Education for over 40 years and he can feel that its time. He

looks forward to the future where he is a participant and not taking the lead. He said he does plan to be involved, but likely not right away. He said as he listened to the resolution being read, none of his achievements were achieved alone. He said everything he heard involved some aspect of the campus. He noted several examples of where faculty and staff have worked together for student success. He said he really enjoyed the collaboration.

Talamante noted that the ASI VP, Grace Iheke needed to leave to get to a call and that the CFA Representative Daniel Cutrone was unable to attend the meeting and that Cynthia Villanueva would be giving the report.

California Faculty Association Co President Cynthia Villanueva

Villanueva thanked President Hagan for all the work he did on behalf of the faculty. Villanueva reviewed what had been worked on and accomplished during the academic year by CFA. She noted that the Lecturers Nuts & Bolts Workshop was held the prior week to help educate lecturers on their rights and entitlements. She noted that there were many one-on-one meetings throughout the semester with lecturers. She offered if anyone present had a colleague that had a question, to send them their way. Villanueva mentioned an unemployment workshop for lecturers happening on Thursday, May 3 from 11:30 – 1 pm in WH C303. California Faculty Association Dominguez Hills surpassed its membership goals a month ahead of time. CFA continued to work closely with administration with monthly labor management meetings with the Provost. They worked to improve the working conditions for faculty during those meetings. She thanked administration for being accessible. Faculty rights team has put in a lot of work in representing many members of the union and many of the faculty rights issues. She thanked Jackie, Donis and Claudia as the core of the Faculty Rights Team for all their hard work. Lobby Day was May 1st and many CSU faculty across the system joined their union at Lobby Day. They talked to many Assembly Members and Senators about increasing the budget for CSU. She said that they're talking about a bill that would increase transparency in auditing once the money gets to the Chancellor's office and what they do with it. She noted there has been a 300% increase in fees in the last 10 years. They want to make sure the money is getting to the right places for our students. She said they're also looking to introduce a bill that would address the need for an increase in counselors across the system. Currently there is 1 counselor per 1500 students and in some cases across 3000 students. They also lobbied for a Black Lives Matters bill. They're looking for more transparency in police investigation data. This is to clear up any system-wide policies that may be hurting our communities, our relationship with our police officers, and the relationship that students have with the police community. This comes from good spirit and is aimed at improving relations with police officers, students, and surrounding communities. This is part of our social justice and anti-racism transformation work through the California Faculty Association. Villanueva thanked Vice Chair Celly for driving all the way to Sacramento to represent the work. Lastly the California Faculty Association end of semester breakfast is Tuesday, May 8th from 8:30 – 10:30 am in the Faculty Development Center.

Non Tenure Track Task Force Plan for Recommendations, President Hagan and Chair Talamante

Hagan and Talamante presented a plan for going forward with the recommendations made by the Non Tenure Track Task Force through their final report. **Hagan** stated that some of the recommendations are low hanging fruit and some of the recommendations represent different opinions on how they should be done. He noted that the Provost will be the point person implementing a lot of the recommendations. And they wanted an outside body to not do the work of the Provost or the campus but to make sure the process will move forward and that the discussions that need to happen take place in an orderly fashion. Hagan

also said that the Provost will report back to this body on where we are. In putting together an implementation committee, Hagan said it is a balancing act between it's not their job but it's their role to make sure the process moves forward. That is what the charge is all about. There are a lot of good recommendations, and we want the campus to implement as many as they can. Obviously some of them cost money, and so there will need to be discussions in the budget process. Some of the recommendations cost money but you know they need to be done. We can't have so much of our instruction done by non-tenure track faculty and then not provide some aspect of development for them. Hagan said we also recognize that some of our non-tenure track faculty work at the other CSUs, and so one of the recommendations is to partner with them and say that the faculty that works with 2-3 institutions why don't we work together to support them without having one institution bear the burden of resources. The implementation committee consists of Kirti Celly who was part of the Non Tenure track Task Force; there is also the AVP of Faculty Affairs and Development because we think that faculty development opportunities for lecturers are very important. We also have a non-tenure track faculty member on the implementation committee and were discussing whether or not to have Dean representation. The President commented that it's not a large committee, as their job is not to do the work but just to see that the work is being done.

Talamante then reviewed the recommendations.

- Recommendation 1.2 VP Work with H.R. and the CFA toward a Digital Platform for Hiring
- Recommendation 1.3 Eliminate CSUDH Practice of "Part-Time Full-Time" Lecturers
- Recommendations 2.1 – 2.4 (Academic Depts: Provide a Package of Academic Materials; Educate & Support Dept. Chairs on their Role in Providing Support for NTTF; College or University: Formal Orientation; College or University: Maintain an Online Handbook for NTTF)
- Recommendation 3.1 Increasing the Number of Full-Time Lecturers among NTTF
- Recommendation 3.2 Instructional and Community Resources and Support
- Recommendation 3.3 Community-building support (Co-locate NTTF and TTF in contiguous office spaces within departments)
- Recommendation 4 Recommended Practices for Performance Evaluation and Feedback
- Recommendation 5 Recommended Practices for Mentoring and Career/Professional Development
- Recommendation 6 Recommended Practices for according Professional Status and Recognition

Talamante said that these are the preliminary ways that she and the President have discussed and that he has reached out to members of his Cabinet to work together on moving forward on implementation of the recommendations. Talamante said they will finalize the charge and send that out to the campus. She invited the Senate to provide any feedback or comments to send them forward.

Acknowledging ASI VP Iheke

Talamante noted that the ASI VP of Faculty Affairs was not able to stay for the entire meeting. However, Talamante said, she did want to take a moment to acknowledge the work of VP Iheke. She said Senator Iheke served alongside us for two year and wanted to thank her for her leadership not just in ASI and not just in Senate but also the ways that ASI leaders go alongside the President off campus, such as the Capitol and Washington D.C.. Talamante recalled President Hagan talking about how members of Congress really wanted to hear from our students. ASI leaders do this alongside their course work, they do this alongside preparing for graduate school. Senator Iheke has been accepted to a graduate program in the fall. Talamante said that Senator Iheke shared she was also applying for fellowships as she's completing her degree and attending committee meetings with faculty, staff and administration. The Senate gave a round of applause for her leadership as well as the work of the other ASI leaders.

Provost Report, Michael J. Spagna

- **Spagna** spoke about a meeting he had with the Academic Council which is comprised of all of the Provosts in the system. He noted that it took place the week prior. There was a presentation by someone by the name of David Attis, Managing Director of Strategic Research at EAB. His presentation highlighted the concern about the numbers of folks dropping Humanities as a Major across the system. Those numbers and trends and why it is happening spurred a larger conversation. Spagna said he will be working with Dean Avila and others to understand what do we know about this. Are we steering our people more towards workforce development without telling our story of how a Humanities degree does really prepare you to be in the workforce and have productive careers? If the Academic Senate Executive Committee thinks it's appropriate, we might even take part of that and have a conversation in Academic Senate. A second presentation came from Jerry Hanley of the Chancellor's office presented about success on Affordable Learning Solutions and made very public his pride of Cal State Dominguez Hills and the most faculty involved and the most money involved in terms of Affordable Learning Solutions. He circulated one of our brochures from the awards event and several people came up wanting to know how we do this. There was a research update by Ganesh Raman from the Chancellor's office about where the CSU wants to go in terms of supporting faculty research. It was an interesting conversation in terms of what do we need to do in the system, and what do we need to do locally? There are two campuses that are experimenting quite extensively in looking at everything from reducing overall loads to 3/3 teaching loads, looking at support for creative and research activity; San Jose State and Cal State East Bay. Provost Spagna said he would be working with those Provosts.
- Spagna reminded everyone that we're now coming into the time of cultural celebrations. Friday, May 2nd will be the Asian Pacific Islander at 6:30 PM. He invited everyone to attend to show support to all of our students.
- Spagna talked about the ongoing commitment we have in Academic Affairs to resolution 16-15 about hiring updates. Spagna pulled a slide up onto the screen and said these are episodic looks about where we are in the hiring process. We have 53 lines we've been pursuing this year. Of those 53 lines you'll see data about tenure track workload, total workload tenure density and tenure track headcount. You'll also see the replacement rates. There are 13.5 positions that we don't think are going to be filled out of the 53 for this academic year. Those 13.5 will roll over. It will probably be larger than that, perhaps 17 or 18 tenure track slots that will be rolled over. Consistent with the policies we've had we keep those within colleges. We keep those in a place where we don't sweep them and then redistribute. Spagna said you'll also see an extrapolation, R + 5, R + 10. We've completed the commitment to the President's five year plan of hiring 20 faculty per year going forward, new tenure lines. We have these 53 lines open now. We're having conversations in University Budget Committee and in other places that once we get a clearer picture in the next month about what do we have in retirements or others, we'll be able to start extrapolating out. In the spirit of transparency and accountability, I'm asking that all of the Deans to be prepared with data and have conversations at the college and department level, talking about requests, talking about the data that's behind it, what is the rationale about how we're going forward with this. He said that is his commitment as Provost and that the Senate will be seeing charts like this periodically and even in the next week to ten days as they get updated, he'll be sharing it with the respective chairs and then sharing it across. With these faculty lines that we have hiring, he does have a slight concern about making sure that we spend all this time recruiting and trying to support faculty, but are we retaining them.? The good news is we're doing a fairly good job in retention but we have 1 tenured and 3 tenure track faculty who have resigned and are moving to other

opportunities. While people have many reasons why they move on, we do want to pay attention to what are we doing with staffing within individual departments and within individual colleges. Spagna said he does not think we have kept pace with the staff that is necessary to support faculty. We have not done yet an optimal job of how do we support creative and scholarly activity. That's one of the reasons he's connecting with colleagues at East Bay and San Jose State is what do we really need to do to make sure that not only do we get people here but they're thriving?

- Spagna said he had just returned (May 1st) from Washington D.C. where they took a contingent of faculty out to D.C. to meet with NIH and NSF. Spagna said that Senator McGlynn did a fabulous job of working with NSF colleagues. He said he is very proud of our faculty in appearing with these federal agencies and building relationships. Spagna noted that the larger question is how do we build a culture internally to support each other, hiring a pool of grant writers. How do we do something where we're providing more incentives with reassigned time, RSCA money, seed grants?
- Spagna said he is excited to celebrate his 10th month at Cal State Dominguez Hills and he couldn't be more excited to be with everyone. He said he thought that faculty were engaged but they have surpassed any wild expectations he might have had. He concluded that he is very excited to see what we can build together here, literally and figuratively, on this campus.

Q&A: **Senator Monty** said we heard updated about most of the AVP searches that have been ongoing but one that he hasn't seen any activity on is AVP for Faculty Affairs. Additionally, with regard to support for research for creative and scholarly activity one thing he would recommend with RSCA is that it happens too late. The deadline should be in the fall semester and the award should come out by early February because we need to know in advance whether we should be planning for a summer research trip. That would make a big difference for a lot of faculty and should be a relatively easy fix. **Spagna** replied, "In response to the Faculty Affairs search, that has been the one that is most challenging. There's a highly competitive environment in the LA Basin. Of the 7 institutions in the LA Basin, there are 3 that are searching for an AVP of Faculty Affairs. We haven't yet decided what we're going to do with the search. It is quite likely that that one will have to be postponed. Related to RSCA in terms of moving the timelines forward, we're finding in a lot of faculty support, that we're not in a place to do it in a timely manner for faculty to take advantage of. The other element is that we need to have a more dedicated effort to look at undergraduate research and what we do to support faculty in undergraduate research." Spagna said there are models that we're exploring to up our game on that. **Talamante** stated that in terms of moving forward or not moving forward for the search for the AVP of Faculty Affairs and Development, we are at the end of the semester and faculty are involved with finals and it would be an imposition to request that faculty participate in Open Forums. **Spagna** said as he's shared before full faculty participation is critical to hiring the right person, and he realizes that the window has closed. **Celly** suggested that it might make sense to add counseling faculty to the spreadsheet. Celly asked how is it going to be shared so that faculty can be involved from the ground up at the individual colleges. She wondered about decisions being made over the summer, who is going to recruit, jobs that are posted yesterday or last month, etc. **Spagna** said that his commitment continues to be one of transparency and accountability. It's a commitment to the placemat, the table. What goes on the table is something we will all craft together. We want to make it so that we as a larger community can see how the decisions are made, how we're using data to inform our decisions will get us to a much better place. **Heinze Balcazar** said with regard to the issue of faculty hiring for the next cycle, you mentioned that the Deans will be meeting with Department Chairs to discuss their requests and that they would discuss data. Can you remind us what data is needed? **Spagna** responded if you look back at the criteria that I shared at the previous presentation at the Academic Senate, there were some that were by college but there was some that was common. Tenure track density, FTES, existing lines, retirements. He said he points back to that

criteria because he's requesting that every Dean with every one of those criteria have data to back it up. That's the information that as faculty we'll be looking at to make decisions and have conversations about requests for the lines. **Heinze Balcazar** asked, "Majors?" **Spagna** replied, "Yes, that too". He said the commitment is to the larger picture. The placemat, the investigation and it has to be jointly crafted in terms of making sure that decision is made together.

Senate Parliamentarian, Justin Gammage **Confirmation of 2018-2019 Senate Executive Committee**

- Kate Esposito, Vice Chair
- Charles Thomas, Secretary
- Katy Pinto, FPC Chair
- Enrique Ortega, EPC Chair
- Justin Gammage, Senate Parliamentarian

Kirti Celly and Thomas Norman are the Statewide Senators

Laura Talamante as the Academic Senate Chair

President's Council on Diversity and Inclusion Update, William Franklin, Council Chair

Franklin shared a [PowerPoint presentation](#) and said that this Council was part of President Hagan's vision. He said they'll be onboarding President elect Parham with the work of the Diversity and Inclusion Task Force. President Hagan had a vision of opening up this conversation back in April 5, 2016. Beginning with a Town Hall of which 320 people showed up. Dr. Suman Pendakur was the keynote speaker. Franklin reported that those gathered went through an activity of the oppressed, which was phenomenal. After four hours, faculty, staff and administrators were still engaged. He noted that one of the takeaways was that while we may be structurally diverse, it doesn't mean we're inclusive. We may be privileging voices and perhaps stagnating others. We need to do a better job. This was when the President asked how they could put together a Council on Diversity and Inclusion. Franklin named the members of the Council ([see page 3 of slide presentation](#)). On November 21, 2016, President Hagan came to the first meeting and not only welcomed everyone but provided us with a six point charge in terms of what he wanted us to do. Franklin noted that the team is still in its infancy but took the charge very seriously that they wanted to serve as an advisory body to the President. They wanted to understand how to promote good relationships by having people talk about very uncomfortable subjects that sometimes people do not wish to talk about – race, gender, sexuality orientation, gender identity that are uncomfortable but are necessary to build relationships. They also wished to collaborate around data. How do they know the composition of students who get here, are retained here, and who graduate from here, disaggregated by race, gender, our veteran students, and international students. How are all of our students doing, and is this an environment that's welcoming and safe? How does diversity and inclusion intentionally fold into the strategic plan? How are faculty, staff and administrators talking to and working with one another and then how do we try to be more transparent around issues of diversity and inclusion, and equity and oppression and macroaggression and all those things that are necessary to talk about? The Council came up with core areas we felt it necessary to look at: Access, Retention and Graduation. What is our campus climate, and how do we improve it? Are there a lot of training and development programs for diversity and inclusion happening on campus, and if so, how come we don't know about them in the aggregate? How does curriculum development play a role? How diverse are we among faculty and staff? There are a series of new hires going on. We also realized that we have a lot of silos that we just don't know about because no one is championing this and no one is making this a priority. Franklin said that this was probably five or six and then we got tired. This is a heavy lift. If someone is going to champion this and

ensure that we have leadership around all these areas this is going to be a heavy lift and as a team we may not be able to do. We began to look at good research and good findings. We're not the only university in town or in the CSU who are wrestling with these sort of issues. There's still some populations and some segments that are not being heard and are not being served. We started looking at diversity leadership literature as well as what does it mean to have a Chief Diversity Officer. We explored that to its fullest and one of the recommendations to the President, which he is weighing, and that Dr. Parham will have to weigh is, is it time to look at a Chief Diversity Officer? And what will that role serve under the current context here on campus to be able to bring all of those pillars that the Diversity Council wanted to look at. How can we begin to magnify all of those pillars? That's a heavy lift and in front of us. As a Council what can we do while we're here to help ourselves understand better what is needed? We decided to first consider what's going on with our campus climate. The Council decided that will be our lift and do a comprehensive look at our climate. How do we look at faculty, staff, students and administrators and assess what is going on in our campus? We partnered with Insight Viewfinder, a vendor that we began to go down the road with. One of the questions they ask is not what is wrong, but why is improvement needed. Franklin mentioned that they looked at the work of Sylvia Hurtado and Walter Allen who had done some pioneering work around campus climate who recommended taking a pulse of attitudes and perceptions and how people are behaving and asking if there is leadership around diversity and inclusion issues. Viewfinder looks at several pillars in terms of where is your diversity leadership, what's the behavioral dimension in your climate, psychological dimension and an institution's history and legacy in terms of inclusion or exclusion. Surveys were vetted with the Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Policy Committee, Associated Students Inc., clubs and organizations, staff, and we were going to launch the survey after having over 100 people weigh in on the survey. However, then we were derailed by another fully comprehensive survey that was being run. We did not wish to compete with this, and we can do this in the fall. We want it to be good data that could onboard our new President. Franklin said what they'll in the fall survey is:

Core campus infrastructures assessed in Viewfinder™ surveys

- Diversity (Race and Ethnicity)
 - Retention
 - Diversity Training
 - Diversity Planning
 - Representation
- LGBTQIA+ support
- Veteran support
- Disability support and accommodations
- Faith accommodations
- Personal impact
- System response to incidences
- Diversity values distribution
 - Overall
 - Personal
 - Community
 - Priorities
 - Recognitions
 - Inclusion
- Safety
 - Self
 - Family concerns
 - Policing
 - Physical settings

Franklin said last but not least will be the combined effort of marketing the campus climate survey. He highlighted keys to success as follows:

- Critical to demonstrate overarching & enduring commitments to diversity, inclusive excellence and institutional impact
- Leadership by President, Provost, VPSA, Cabinet, Senate Exec, Academic Senate, and Associated Students, Inc.
- Mass preparation for the launch in mid-Fall
 - **Build on Spring Student Focus Groups**
 - Create a robust campaign
 - Use social media and web to help announce the study and its launch
 - Talk to and empower students in/out of class to participate
 - Talk to and empower faculty, staff and administrators to participate
 - Make it a topic of engagement in all meetings and in daily activity
 - Set survey completion goals for your unit, departments, divisions, etc.
 - Build an expectation for action
 - Make results public
 - Set goals and objectives around the findings

They had some student focus groups in the spring that generated some great feedback. The students were very clear about who they wanted to serve on their focus groups. He said they'll come back to the Senate body to talk about the kind of focus groups that faculty will want. He said while he's not sure if he'll be chairing this in the fall, he does anticipate onboarding President Parham around and let him know that these issues are important to us. Having some diversity and inclusion leadership rather than resting on our laurels that we're diverse.

Q&A

Senator Ma said she believed it important to be cognizant of the many first generation faculty on campus. She hoped that we address the gap in communication styles and help these faculty adjust to American culture. She expressed that the unintended consequences of not addressing this can sometimes lead to an unfriendly work environment. Having some sort of structure and instruction around American communication style to create a more harmonious environment. **Franklin** acknowledged the importance of this and noted the international students who had expressed appreciation in the focus groups for addressing this challenge. Within the survey there could be open-ended questions on how we become a learning organization, and once we know better there's a correlation that we're doing better, and we hope that that correlation is high. **Talamante** said we could do a table at the Senate retreat to think about different focus groups. **Interim AVP of Faculty Affairs Hill** said the Faculty Development Center could help address that too. **Franklin** said he welcomed this. **Senator Bono** said in addition to International faculty and students, he would like students with children to be considered, in particular single parents. He asked if that was part of diversity. **Franklin** responded it is and that it had not been part of the survey instrument or the vendor's idea. However, when they began vetting students they asked if "parents" could be added which would include students, staff and faculty who are also parents. We also had single fathers who also said, don't leave us out. Franklin said he would love to add the survey instrument with the Senate in the fall so they could see that parents had been added. **Senator Thomas** said we have a lot of data already that he was hoping could be shared. Data as it relates to retention and graduation. We might see a tale where we see certain outcomes for certain groups. Additionally data available about faculty and staff. It would helpful to see where we are today which could better inform as to where we might want to go. Thomas provided the example that in 2015 he became the first African American tenured in the College of Business. He was surprised by that. That kind of data becomes very important for us to understand where we are. That kind of data is already available informing us where we are and why we might need to make some action to move forward. **Senator McGlynn** asked if there were plans to include gender and women's leadership on this. **Franklin** responded yes. It will not only be a part of the focus group but part of the quantitative engine that will go online.

End of Year Reports – Top Three Accomplishments (expanded reports available on committee webpages)

Talamante first introduced FPC Chair Maria Avila and led a round of applause for her and all the work she did in the previous year as committee chair.

Faculty Policy Committee, Chair Maria Avila thanked everyone and said she learned a lot and appreciated the opportunity. She has many competing priorities and would be stepping down.

- Seven topics were discussed over the course of ten meetings
- Three resolutions were brought to the floor
- Two were approved, one was tabled until the fall.

Educational Policy Committee, Chair Enrique Ortega

- Met twelve times throughout the year
- Drafted policies on two issues that have garnered a lot of comments from constituents across campus; Course Modalities and Graduation Writing Assessment Requirements
- Drafted policies addressing charges that needed updates, General Education Committee and the Educational Policy Committee
- We presented resolutions to address the changes required from the Chancellor's Office Executive Orders 1100

University Curriculum Committee, Chair John Wilkins

Wilkins said that he would be presenting a preliminary report for two reasons. One he did not have all the data for the entire year, and two, the University Curriculum Committee still has another meeting which might include another 50 proposals. Preliminary data shows that we had:

- 136 proposals
- 4 modified programs
- Four new programs
- Modified courses were 27
- New courses were 61
- 22 courses convert to online
- 71 were still face-to-face
- 50% of the proposals were from the College of Arts & Humanities

Goals for next year are

- Review the University Curriculum Committee charge
- Possibility of adding the position of Vice Chair to the committee
- Review the curriculum handbook
- Integrate it to a website
- Implement an electronic document tracking system

Council of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators, Chair Jim Keville

- Getting new committee up and running
- Identified that there were many differences from one chair or coordinator position to another and there is not a one size fits all formula
- Need for more transparency on how reassigned time gets assigned across the colleges

University Writing Committee, Chair Siskanna Naynaha

- Development of a Student Writing Survey based on models they looked at that faculty developed to survey their own students. We also looked at national models. This was worked on throughout the fall and then brought it to the Graduate Council for their input on questions specific to graduate student writing. This spring work was done to incorporate that feedback. The goal is to administer this for the first time in the spring of 2019. We intend to ask students to take it each year of their educational career at Dominguez Hills.
- Development of a survey for faculty regarding a writing intensive course policy at Dominguez Hills. We currently have a policy on the books that requires students to take two writing intensive courses in their major and closely related field in order to graduate which cannot be done because not every department and program actually offers writing intensive courses. We're looking for feedback from faculty across campus as far as their ideas on an implementable, ethical and smart policy that could be implemented at Dominguez Hills. The survey has been completed and exists in Campus Labs at this point. Due to the timing in the semester, it looks like we'll administer this in the fall of 2018.
- Looked at the 2016 Writing Across the Curriculum student survey that we administered here at Dominguez Hills as part of the WSCUC Written Communication Taskforce. We did use that report in the development of the WSCUC Accreditation Report for our institution. We never did a systematic analysis of it as we did with the writing survey for faculty members. We began that process and will hopefully be finalizing that at our final meeting. This will be used as some baseline data for interpreting the student survey that we hope to administer from here on out.

Academic Technology Committee, report given by VP Manriquez (Chair Reza Boroon)

- There's been an elements evaluation going on over the course of 18 months. We're getting to the part where we'll be doing a hands on evaluation from May up to November. There will be a recommendation at that point as to the Provost as well as to Manriquez as to what system they want to move forward with.
- The group is currently looking at the Student Evaluation Systems. Recommendations are potentially going to come out in May. They're looking at Scantron, Campus Labs and EvaluationKit. This would be to replace the current PTE system.
- New Computer Laptop Rollout is slated for Fall 2018. Manriquez said he is currently working with VP Goodwin for the budget timing for this because it is still part of our one-time allocation for rollout funds. We're working on getting this to be a sustained base, but at this point and time it is not built in to the sustained base.
- In an effort to address gaps for students that are taking online and the hybrid classes, we have two programs. One is a laptop and tablet checkout program, which is a first-time freshman program where laptops are made available to them. This is only one part of the equation. The other solution is getting digital service to their home. Manriquez said he is working with SPRINT through a program we have called EPS that allows educational access to see what can be done to close that loop for students.
- Update on search for AVP for University Effectiveness Planning and Analytics –the group met today for final discussions on next steps. There were three amazingly qualified candidates come to campus. We hope to have this wrapped up over the next two weeks.

OPEN MIC:

Vice Chair Kirti Celly said on behalf of Senate Exec, they would like to thank Dr. Talamante for Chairing the Senate and for her leadership and inclusion. It's been wonderful working with her watching her as she worked very hard taking risks and establishing connections. We thank you.

Meeting adjourned.