Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
September 25, 2019/Loker Student Union, Ballroom A/2:30 – 5:00 PM

Voting Members Present: Allen, Asatoorian, Benavides Lopez, Brandt, Chaparro, Chhetri, Deng, Dixon, Eames, Fortner, Gasco, Gray-Shellberg, Griffey, Hill, Jarrett, Johnson, Kalayjian, Kulikov, Kuwabara, Ma, Macias, Mahmoud (proxy for Andrade), Malladi, McGlynn, Mendoza Diaz, Monty, Nguyen, Nicol, Park, Pederson, Price, Raianu, Roback, Sanford (proxy for Bono) Silvanto, Skiffer, Stang, Supernaw, Tang, Willis

Voting Members Not Present: Furtado, Heinze-Balcazar, Kitching Morris, Naynaha

Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Anderson, Celly, Norman, Ortega, Ospina, Pinto, Russo, Shuaib (proxy for Giron), Talamante, Thomas

Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Parham

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Brasley, T. Caron, Costino, Davis, Franklin, Koos, LaPolt, Manriquez, McNutt, O’Donnell, Peyton, Price, Roberson, Spagna, Stewart, Wen

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Avila, Figueroa, Poltorak


2019-2020 Academic Senate Executive Committee:
Charles Thomas – Academic Senate Chair, Laura Talamante – Vice Chair, Enrique Ortega – Parliamentarian, Dana Ospina – Secretary, Salvatore Russo – EPC Chair, Katy Pinto – FPC Chair, Rita Anderson – NTT Representative, Kirti Celly and Thomas Norman – Statewide Senators

Recorded and Edited by SEW and the Executive Committee
Meeting Called to Order: 2:30 PM

Approval of Revised Agenda M/S/P (Giron not present, Shuaib would give ASI report)
Approval of 9/11/19 Revised Minutes: M/S/P (revision reflected in posted minutes)

Academic Senate Chair Report:
- Chair Thomas pointed out that on the sign-in table, AVP Rios in Outreach placed some new marketing materials for presenting our campus to students. Thomas said we'll see if we can get some more discussion at a later Senate meeting.
- Dodger Stadium Takeover - Hopefully you had an opportunity to witness the total takeover at Dodger Stadium, we had 1200 alumni and/or Toro supporters in attendance for which we received baseball hats with both the Dodger and Dominguez Hills logo. Thomas noted it was a wonderful thing to be in the Dodger Stadium with a bunch of people asking where did you get that hat? And when you were standing in line you could look around and see fellow Toros popping up everywhere.
- Last week, we will come convocation as well as our Senate Reception two weeks ago. There is a new faculty reception set for October 9, which is two weeks from today.
- We will be having a guest from the Academic Senate Statewide, which is the chair of the Academic Center Statewide, which is Catherine Nelson. She will be attending our academic senate meeting in two weeks.
- On Friday, we have the Dymally Speaker series, and we have Cornell West who will be here from 4 pm - 6pm in the gym.
- We will be having a budget update. Chair Thomas said he met with VP Coley earlier today, and we're going to discuss in terms of what the output will look like before we actually present here.
- We will be asking AVP Koos to present a Faculty Affairs, shall we say, scorecard as it relates to how we have done in our searches. The presentation will be similar to then Interim AVP Hill presented last year, just to wrap up the presentation that the Provost makes in the spring semester each year. Thomas noted that there will also be updates not only with regard to enrollment, but also retention.
- RTP – Thomas said he’s aware that RTP files due next week. And he knows that there have been some debate within some of the colleges, as it relates to whether or not they’re cumulative files turned in, or the support will be cumulative or not or just based upon the previous year of review. In short, these items have been brought to our attention. Faculty Affairs along with the FPC will be engaging in conversations over the course of the semester as it relates to that.
- The Ross partnership – Thomas noted that at the last Senate meeting there was discussion about the Ross Partnership. Thereafter, there were questions that led to a follow up discussion about the development of this partnership. Ultimately, it is a faculty led partnership. Today, Dr. Landefeld who has an article that was recently published, which is The Lack of Diversity within Healthcare. Thomas said he’d asked him to discuss not only the partnership that we have here with Ross, but partnership generally, because we have a couple other partnerships, and more importantly, as it relates to the medical school admissions landscape, for our students. Thomas said then we’ll open it up for any questions that senators might have as relates to this faculty led initiative

Dr. T. Landefeld explained that he spent 40 years of his career working in medical school admissions. He noted that he and Christina Goode from Western published a paper that really shows how embarrassed we should be with the lack of the number of Black and Brown individuals in medical education, from medicine to dentistry, PT, PA, everything. There are two major issues with medical education right now. We’re in a shortage of physicians, particularly primary care physician, which are general practice, pediatrics, OB/GYN. It’s a shortage that’s there now and is going to get worse in the next 20 years, because of the numbers of those that are retiring. And what’s happening is more schools are opening up, classes are expanding, but that’s not going to fill the gap. There are about 50,000 students applying to medical school every year and the acceptance rate is less than 40%.

The second thing mentioned in the article that these classes are not diverse. Landefeld said when we look at Black and Hispanic, we’re talking about almost 33% of the population in the United States right now, the number of doctors in these two groups are less than 10%. So the medical profession is not represented of what the country is. The demographics are changing, by 2040 the majority now which is White is going to be the minority. Along with this is a number of diseases, which are health disparities. Black, Hispanic, Native Americans have much higher disease, certain diseases than Whites. When you put those two things together, our future is really dependent on us having a more diverse medical profession and none of the schools are doing that. Landefeld said it was his belief that one of the real problems is the standardized test. Many of you may know one of the criteria for getting into medical schools is the MCAT which is a standardized test. As many of you also know there’s no standardized student. Landefeld said these tests are socially economically and racially biased. If you look at the history, Black and Brown, and Native American students have not gotten in and have not scored as well. And therefore as a school starts looking at the 50,000 applications, they’re look at those metrics. A lot of students including a lot of our students are not getting in. One of the ways to get around this, is a number of us pre-health advisors have gone to visit the medical schools in the Caribbean over the past year. While there are over 50, there are only five that if you graduate from them, you can practice any place in the United States. This means that they’ve met all the requirements for California, which is the most severe, New York, Texas, Florida, etc. When students go the Caribbean, they’ll get a good education no matter which one of the 50 they go to, but they won’t be able to come back and practice. We’re looking at what they’re offering, what’s the curriculum, what kind of facilities, what the faculty are like, and who their students are. You cannot adequately assess this based on advertisements. Landefeld said one of those schools they visited was, now they’re located in Barbados. Ross partnered with HBCUs, and HIS, a partnership where they’re working specifically with minority schools. What they’re offering is first semester tuition free for those who get in that program. As one of the participants, we tell the students what they need to achieve, such as GPA and a reasonable MCAT. If they get that they’re accepted into the medical school. Their first semester tuition is free, the room and board is free and they’re also offered a free trip down and back. They go there two years, it is a four year program, and they come back to U.S. and practice. And there’s a number of schools like Ross and others that have been approved by states like California, where they come back to California hospitals to do their 3rd and 4th year. Landefeld said he’s been doing this for a long time, I do not accept any program that is not first class. I’ve had students who go to those top five schools and graduate and one is a chief resident over in Nevada, they’ve done very well. That’s the layout the medical schools. He noted that he’s seen students who have a 3.7 or 3.8 GPA, they don’t do well on the MCAT and they do not get into medical school. If a student really wants to become a doctor, then they have to decide you're going to do something else.
This is not a second class situation and the thing with Ross really makes it great for us, because it really identified underrepresented minority students for their classes.

**Q&A/Comments:**

**Proxy Sanford** said in reviewing the minutes on page 11, Senator Griffey brought up last time that he had a concern about Ross being a private for profit University and that the average student debt load for Ross is over $300,000. Sanford said he has the same concern as Senator Griffey. **Landefeld** responded that all the school in the Caribbean are private. It's not unique to have for profit school. The thing about the debt, I just had a student graduate from USC dental school, his debt was almost $500,000. It’s a private School, it’s dental, which gets into equipment, but there’s going to be costs. I haven’t seen the most recent numbers, but most of the Caribbean schools are pretty similar to what we’re seeing to private schools in the U.S. Landefeld said the last number he saw from a student graduating medical schools, particularly private schools was a debt-load of over $200,000. That's one thing we tell the students, you're going to have a major debt when you graduate. Now the good thing about it is, if it's good, there is good financial aid. And one of the things that Ross is doing is they're taking the tuition out the first semester for sure. What they're going to do after that we don't know because this is a brand new program, But they have a number of schools that they've worked with, and we're one of those. Senator Russo said he looked up Ross University after the last senate meeting and found that the average attrition rate for a U.S. med school is something around to 2%-6%. And the average attrition rate at Ross hovers around 50%. So in other words, their model seems to be based on we have lower admission standards, but we're going to wash out half the class. Russo continued that for those students who can thrive in that sort of environment, the ones who maybe couldn't get through traditional med school, and they're going to Caribbean, and they can thrive in there. That's good, that option is there. But I think our students definitely need to come in with your eyes open realizing this place basically is designed to knock you out. and you're going to get saddles with student debt and it’s not dischargeable. I would not put myself in a position to tell students to go to med school, or that one, because I’m not a medical doctor, but I still think our students need to be advised and get very strong advisement about the model of these schools, as just because you're in a med school in the Caribbean, doesn't mean you're going to end up practicing medicine, particularly with a 50% attrition rate. Landefeld said he hears what Senator Russo said and he’s prepared for that. He offered that one of the things is that a for-profit University in the U.S. has a class of 120-150. The Caribbean schools take in three classes a year. And so when they take into class, they have a large number of students. I wouldn’t say their design is to knock students out because of the criteria they're looking at is not that much different. Landefeld said what he’s found is that while they have excellent student support, they're too many students. And because of this, he does exactly what Senator Russo suggests. He said he tells his students that go down there that they’re going to have to work very hard. He said out of the students that have gone to Ross, all of them have graduated and none of them have been knocked out. There's going to be students on either side who may not make it. As advisors, we address those things that you're talking about. Certainly making sure that they’re not going down there thinking that they’re going to be knocked out of medical school because they are going to have a debt. Landefeld offered that one of the other things he likes about the Ross program is that first semester, they're not going to have a debt, because they're tuition free. And sometimes students get there and they say I don't want to be a doctor. So I hear what you're saying. I just think that one of the problems that we might see because of being for profit is the more students they take in, the more money they’re going to have. And that's been something that's not unique to Ross, but if you look at the Caribbean schools, the attrition rates are very much different than U.S. rates. And again, I was involved with medical schools for over 20 years. I know what kind of debt they have. I know what kind of attrition rates they have, which is low.

**Chair Thomas** said that he would entertain one more question from Senator Gray Shellberg and then make Professor Landefeld’s email address available for additional questions. Thomas said he believed the larger issue of what we're talking about here is one of access. And so that to the extent that we are providing greater access to our students, and that they have choice, and that those choices do come with cost and we fully appreciate that there's a different landscape.

**Senator Gray Shellberg** said she wished to switch focus to the roadblock that standardize tests cause students and I think that we could do a lot at Dominguez Hills to take care of that problem. Gray Shellberg recalled some time ago when she was teaching history and the students did terribly on the test. So she split the test into knowledge items versus higher order items like comprehension and application. The students did great on knowledge, that's, that's not going to help them much.
They have to understand the material, they have to know how to apply it. They have to know how to deal with questions that ask them to do that. Gray Shellberg said it seems to her that if all of us who teach here that offer multiple choice questions, learned more about measurements, had workshops, and so forth, I think you probably see what I’m saying. She referenced Ebbinghaus’ forgetting curve, with nonsense syllables showed that they were going to forget it within a week, sometimes days. She said she’s most concerned about what we can do here that would better prepare our students for standardized tests.

Landefeld responded that he did not disagree. He believed that its our K to 12 system as the main problem. Students just don’t get the type of teaching about standardized tests as some of the other schools get. He noted that students in Palos Verdes get much better exposure to these types of practice tests. Part of it is going to be there the students come from. He said he’s been at universities where they offer sessions, again it costs money. That’s one of the reasons that these tests are still there. He said he hears what Senator Gray Shellberg is saying but he did not agree that we can prepare our students in our classes. Chair Thomas said this is this is a robust conversation, I just want to be clear that we are (1) interested in addressing the MCAT issue from both sides, (a) increasing standardized test scores to the extent that we can and (b) at the same time recognizing that MCAT scores are currently being seen as a limiting factor to the diversification of this particular profession. And (2) that these five medical schools provide an option. Professor Landefeld expressed that there’s been a lot of studies done and there’s no correlation between the MCAT scores and how the student does as a doctor, but that’s what admission uses because it’s a nice metric to use. Whatever we can do to address this we would be glad to. Whether we offer classes or in our own classrooms, but Landefeld said, he did not think that would make the difference because the average score of our students score versus what's in medical students is significantly different. Landefeld said please feel free to contact him with any questions at tlandefeld@csudh.edu. He said they’re committed and whatever he can do to help students get into medical/dental school is what he’s about.

Academic Senate Chair Thomas thanked Dr. Landefeld. He noted that while the President is not with us at the Academic Senate Meeting, he’s been working for us and he just came back from the Board of Trustees where yesterday, we got approval of our Master Plan.

Senate Parliamentarian Ortega attended to Parliamentarian business by informing the Senate Resolution EXEC 19-02 which was titled College Budget Committees is now considered off from the Academic Senate working agenda. He noted that there had been a First Reading of EXEC 19-02 during the Academic Senate meeting of March 6, 2019 and there were a number of concerns raised during that First Reading and there was no Second Reading for EXEC 19-02, however there was no formal motion to table the resolution by the end of last year's Academic Senate Meeting. Therefore the matter of the resolution to form College Budget Committees if it's to return it will return as new business.

First Reading: EXEC 19-14 Joint Statement on Shared Governance, Vice Chair Laura Talamante

Talamante said she wished to offer a brief background on this in that as we have been working on our Senate handbook and our own processes and practices in the senate office, one of the topics that came up was the question of shared governance. And it also relates to debates about the lack of significant shared governance with Executive Orders 1100 and 1110 and responses on this campus to those orders and our own resolution that we wrote and sent to the Chancellor's Office. And so we have used those discussions for the basis of bringing our own document which clarifies some of the issues that came up in those discussions in Senate and other places on campus. A motion was made and seconded to bring the resolution to the floor. Vice Chair Talamante summarized the resolution. She said the resolution is about getting our own Joint Statement of Shared Governance. This statement will inform all members of campus, faculty, staff and administration; it will be part of faculty and senate handbooks; and it will also be shared with candidates who are coming to our campus for positions that are administrative, as well as faculty positions. This statement will be read annually at the first scheduled General Faculty Meeting and the Senate Retreat to help us all be on board and a reminder of the values that we share around shared governance and its processes. It will be distributed to the President, the Provost, the Vice Presidents, Deans, and ASI President, all faculty including chairs and program coordinators, academic resource managers, and all staff. The rationale goes back through some of the items mentioned when introducing it earlier. Talamante read through the editor bodies that have informed the resolution. Talamante said in her discussion last year with the President and the Provost as Senate chair, we had brought this idea of forward and creating a joint statement in collaboration.
President and Provost are very interested in feedback in helping them understand this document and how we can move it forward

Q&A/Comments

Senator Monty pointed out that on Line 79 – the word should be consensus, not concurrence. Concurrence means that two events occurring at the same time. He said he believed what's intended is that the consultation should achieve consensus. Senator Riahib Shiaih (proxy for ASI VP Giron) wanted to know if the student voice has a say in this and if there’s been consultation with students regarding the resolution? Talamante said we can make that more explicit. Senator Celly said in response to Senator Shiaih. We have actually got some working notes on this. And you made a very valuable point. And it dates back to the American Association of University Professors several decades ago, talking about the importance of student voice in shared governance. Not just through ASI but more broadly. Chair Thomas wanted everyone to be aware that this is not the sole means by which to provide your input, you can send an email, if you have any the additional comments. We will certainly be bringing this to President and Provost in advance of our second reading.

Second Reading EXEC 19-12 Resolution to Establish a Non-Tenure Track Advisory Board, Non-Tenure Track Representative to the Executive Committee, R. Anderson - A motion was made to bring the resolution to the floor which was seconded. Anderson reviewed changes made since the September 11th First Reading based on feedback from the floor of the Senate and from the Senate Executive Committee meeting on September 18th. The first change was to increase terms to two years instead of one, a suggestion made by Senator Gray Shellberg. The second change was to add to the proposed body of the Advisory Board one Academic Affairs staff member who works with non-tenure track faculty elected by the staff. Senator Hill suggested that “elected by staff” needs to be fleshed out a little bit more. He noted there were issues with this for other staff positions related to Senate. He suggested that he read specifically elected by either all staff on campus or academic affairs staff or some subset thereof. Proxy Sanford asked if putting in the word “all” between “by” and “staff” satisfy that for you? Hill responded “that would clearly define it if that is the way you want it defined. You might want to put all academic staff, but he’s not sure if that’s what’s wanted. Sanford responded, “it sounds like we'll need to have a conversation about exactly how to change that whether we're putting all staff or all academic staff.” Chair Thomas pointed out that the actual sentence says, “that work with non-tenure track faculty. And so you may want to define staff is just the staff that work in that locus of control, as opposed to other staff. And so again, the open question will be whether or not we need to amend this, or whether it's something for later implementation. And that was the question Senator Hill raised as well.” Proxy Sanford asked if it then should he put it to the floor as to whether we should talk about this now, or should we implement this?” Academic Senate Chair responded that at this point, Representative Anderson, as the author of the resolution would make the determination as to whether or not the word “all” would be viewed as a friendly amendment or not. we're going to need. Vice Chair Talamante said that because we have that words “works with non-tenure track faculty, I'd like to actually suggest the opposite of all, and that it would be Academic Affairs, because these would be the staff that we intended in our discussions in Senate Exec so that folks like academic resource managers, for example, who work with the contracts, those would be the kind of people that will be very important for these kinds of discussions by the advisory board. Proxy Sanford asked if he could just respond to that. He asked for clarity, that on line 23 it would read “one academic affairs staff member who works with non-tenure track faculty, elected by the staff of Academic Affairs. Would that be the friendly amendment? Would that work, “staff within academic affairs?” The Academic Senate Chair said the proposal, and the friendly amendment as I see it, which we will vote on in line 23 would be changed to one academic affairs staff member who works with non-tenure track faculty elected within staff? The body did not concur. Senator Norman suggested that the amendment would read, “by staff within academic affairs.” Senator Gray Shellberg if it would be simpler to say elected by those staff members? Hill responded that would open the door for mistakes. Senator Asatoorian said that his concern was, the mission of this advisory board is around conditions for teaching or hiring development, a lot of staff on this campus that are outside of Academic Affairs that does contribute to that process for Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Teaching spaces for instance or IT staff. Asatoorian said to avoid all of this, why we can't just say, one staff member in general, why does it have to be specific to academic affairs. That excluded a whole chunk and if it’s one staff member than we ask all staff members to vote and it becomes an equitable process for staff. Chair Thomas replied in the event that this suggested amendment fails, we would certainly be open to the amendment offered by Senator Asatoorian. Currently, procedurally, we are dealing with this particular amendment. The Chair asked if there was any further discussion. Senator Monty called the question. The vote is on whether we include the amendment to add the words “within academic affairs after the word staff.
Motion failed by majority. A new amendment offered by Senator Asatoorian, eliminated the words Academic Affairs from line 23 and to add the word “all” before the word staff. Senator Skiffer suggested that we may have two groups that we’re talking about because the Academic Affairs component is very important for that expertise and the issues that non-tenure track faculty face that they will have to deal with academic affairs. So that’s a good resource for them on this Advisory Board. Then you may also want a separate staff member that you elect as well. Perhaps you’re looking at two different people rather than trying to make one sentence that is going to fit every side. Chair Thomas said your comments are (1) not just whether or not this amendment is there, but (2) sounds like you’re formulating yet another potential amendment to this, which is potentially adding two staff members. Procedurally that just like the last amendment, we got to deal with this amendment first, then it there’s yet another amendment you want to make, we can certainly address that one. Skiffer responded “it was just food for thought.” Chair Thomas said it may be a means for rejecting this one for yet another one that may be coming.” Proxy Sanford said that the current amendment to bullet point six on line 23 works to encompass all staff he moved that the senate body take a vote on that amendment, and then we move to address Senator Skiffer's request that a second staff member be considered. Senator Kuwabara asked what the reason was that a staff member was added to the body of the proposed committee. Senator Anderson responded the reason a staff member was added is because a staff person is usually the first point of contact for non-tenure track faculty that work part time. She explained, often that person helps us with keys, getting adjusted, classrooms and any questions we have. So that's why we added a staff member that works with now tenured faculty. Senator Eames said noted that the current amendment on the floor introduces an additional problem by the original point being made by Senator Hill was that was it the election process was not clear. But this amendment is attempting to clarify the election process but also eliminating the specificity of the kind of staff member who is serving on the committee. So sort of introducing a new problem, but that original issue still stands. Chair Thomas said that he believed the new language addresses both of those issues. Eames agreed. Gray Shellberg asked for clarification on what staff members would be eligible. It was explained that all staff would be eligible to vote for whomever the staff representative would be. However the representative would need to be a staff person who works with non-tenure track faculty. Chair Thomas clarified that the next vote on the floor would be, bullet point six, eliminating the words, academic affairs, and the addition of the word all between the words by and staff. The amendment passed by a hand vote of 11 in favor, 6 against and 23 abstentions. Chair Thomas asked if Senator Skiffer wants to address the fact that we have one staff member, or any other comments to this resolution? Senator Skiffer withdrew her comment. There was a question from the floor for some clarity to which Senator Pinto responded that she wished to address it. Pinto explained that in discussions at the Senate Executive Committee and to emphasize what Senator Anderson is saying is that we wanted a staff member who works with non-tenure track faculty. Yet, what Senator Asatoorian is saying is true, that it doesn't only happen in academic affairs. And so as long as the resolution reads that the staff member who works with non-tenure track faculty is written, it leaves open a staff member who is involved with non-tenure track faculty can come in and share their voice. And it is important to recognize that that might not just be someone in academic affairs. So I think we're still in the spirit of what the intention was. Chair Thomas added the spirit is also that all staff should have an opportunity to have their say and who that representative would be, and that was a huge part of the amendment of what that amendment was dealing with. Associate Dean Salhi asked that in the spirit of cooperation, on line 17, it reads one non-tenure track faculty from each of the stateside colleges. Salhi requested clarification on what does each stateside college mean? Does that imply that College of Extended & International Education (CEIE) is not included? If so, he would like to make an amendment so that it reads from each of the colleges rather than each of the stateside colleges. Former Academic Senate Chair Hill stated that Deans cannot offer an amendment. Chair Thomas said let’s see if one of the senators wishes to take on your proposed amendment. Senator Supernaw said she would like to suggestion that CEIE is needed and should be added to line 17, which was seconded. Chair Thomas restated the proposed amendment from Senator Supernaw as bullet point number one line 17 to be amended to include language that would read one non-tenure track faculty from each college, eliminating the words state side which would make sure to include CEIE. Senator Nicol offered that if CEIE is added, there would be 16 people on the committee, bringing it to an even number which could potentially lead to a deadlock in voting. Chair Thomas said that's a great point, if this is approved, we would end up with an even number of members. And there’s the potential for issues with an even number of members. Senator Russo asked what the initial rationale was for using the language “stateside”. Vice Chair Talamante stated that discussions that have previously been done on the floor on the Senate have noted those faculty are members of other colleges, and that programs that their teaching through in CEIE are housed in colleges but taught through CEIE, but that was the thinking. Senator Celly said “If I may supplement that with two
thoughts, one directly related to what is on the floor, which is the addition of a non-tenure track faculty member from CEIE.” She continued, “At this moment, I think in time, there is not a represented non-tenure track faculty member in that college. In that college in fact, has members of other colleges, departments teaching in that college, and then members of the community coming in to teach specialty courses. That said, that could change. And so including CEIE would be a good idea for future changes.” Proxy Sanford noted that on the Dominguez Hills webpage that lists the number of colleges we have, it states six. He asked if there's other colleges that aren't listed, I would really like to know what they are but CEIE is included in that six. And the chair votes to all right. So then that does create the balance because right now, apparently, we would not have that. Chair Thomas said that will be one of the consequences of the vote here. The amendment as we currently have is the removal of the word stateside. And currently there are six colleges, including CEIE. Thomas said he has confirmation that it would make 12 voting members + 1 that is non-voting. Salhi responded the point of the issue of the amendment is adding a college. The other issue regarding the number of committee members is a different issue. Can we stay with the spirit of inclusiveness and vote on whether or not CEIE has a right to be part of the colleges. Thomas replied he is not adding an additional element but merely pointing to the consequence which would just be 12 voting members as opposed to 11 voting members. But the point is removing the word would include CEIE. Salhi asked why it was determined that CEIE wouldn’t be included? Thomas said we previously addressed that. And that was that representatives are represented in their home departments and also teach in CEIE. Nonetheless, your amendment is on the table. Thomas stated the specific amendment and asked all in favor of eliminating the word stateside and having it read representatives from each college, please raise your hand. Amendment passes, and now it reads every college. The Senate body realized that there were now 13 voting members on the committee including the chair. The question was called to vote on the amended resolution.

Amended resolution passes. 46 in favor, 0 against and 1 abstention.

Provost’s Report, Michael E. Spagna
- Master Plan Revision Approved – Spagna reported that there was unanimous support at the Board of Trustees meeting for the Master Plan. There were a whole bunch of Trustees that were singing the praises of Dominguez Hills and where we’re going, including the Lieutenant Governor.
- Spagna noted that the President asked that the Provost share with the Academic Senate that there remains considerable opposition to modifying the admissions requirement to add a fourth year of quantitative reasoning. Senator Macias and several other of our colleagues have reached out to the Provost regarding this issues. The Provost suggested that we have more of a planning meeting for how we as a campus want to take on this issue in a proactive way to support our community. If you get a chance to tune in to the Board of Trustees meeting recording, Spagna noted that one of our alumni, who was extremely articulate during the open session talking about why this is why this is going to be a problem going forward.
- The President also asked it be shared that in case you didn’t know, we had another big day yesterday also at the Board of Trustees meeting, in that Juan Venegas was honored with the 2019 CSU Trustees Award for Outstanding Achievement. One of our students at Dominguez Hills received this top award. Spagna read “all this hard work paid off, Venegas graduated at the top 25 of his class, and became the first member of his family to attend a four year university, when he was accepted in the CSUDH Venegas is currently pursuing a degree in journalism while exploring his educational options. After graduating, he plans to continue his education with the ultimate goal of teaching future generations to embrace who they are and where they come from. Spagna quoted Venegas “I want to leave a legacy of community involvement and show the importance of helping those in need. I will show the next generation what it takes to succeed and college and in life.” A round of applause was given.
- On the faculty side, one of our colleagues, Karin Kram, was featured recently in the annual report for the California State University Program for Education, Research and Biotechnology, otherwise known as SUPERB, which has raised over $14 million in terms of supporting people with grants. Spagna spoke to a photograph of Dr. Kram displayed on the screen with a caption that reads KRAM Lab 2018 19. She said that Dr. Kram wrote about the photo that we're were in our nerdiest t-shirts. And the one she was wearing read Mainly Microbe on it. And she talks about her work with NSF. And she talked about now receiving an NSF grant was RUI Grant changed everything about how her lab works. She noted she has more time to work with students and write papers, She said she's been able to hire more students and support master students as well. She said she’s been able to bring
students to more conferences, six students when she attended the 2019 American Society of Microbiology Micro Conference.

- Quarterly Reports from the meeting of Joint CSU Deans, Provosts and Vice Presidents of Student Affairs. Spagna noted that he and VP of Student Affairs Franklin attended.
  o Conversation about the quantitative reasoning initiative and what that means and how we navigate that more to come later on that.
  o A report put out by California State Student Association, student leadership about concerns that they have expressed. Spagna noted that they presented this to the Cabinet, and we should all embrace this. There were four concerns brought forward by student leadership that we as a community have to pay attention to.
    • Concern about enrollment policies and how that affects getting classes resting at a reasonable rate.
    • The importance of quality advising. So the idea of advising and what do we need to do to think about quality advising for students.
    • Improved connections with campus administrators, and especially with Executives. Some of you know that we have a Team Toro Lunch that involves the Cabinet and ASI leadership. But more work can be done on our campus in terms of those connections with student leaders, and all of us in leadership roles all of us around this table.
    • The need for enhancing campus climate and safety.
    So these are things for us to embrace and think about going forward.

- And then finally, there were a series of reports that were shared last week of starting to tie some of our addressing Basic Needs on our campuses to actual retention rates. And we need to do more of that in terms of our GI 2025 efforts. We do have a report due November 15, on our efforts on this campus with GI 2025. So in an upcoming meeting, Spagna noted he would present a draft of all the things we've been doing on campus to meet our goals.

Questions/Comments
Senator Monty asked related to the concerns the student representatives presented. Monty asked if the Provost stated admissions policies or enrollment policies. The Provost responded, the specific concerns were the actual impact of enrollment related challenges on students’ progress towards degree. So it had to deal with enrollment challenges in terms of getting the classes they need bottleneck classes, a whole bunch of things as we have an influx of students. The Provost said that’s on this side, the other side of it also is reflective of impaction and the role that that plays in terms of students progressing. Monty asked if the Provost would explain a little bit more fully what they mean by the link between the Basic Needs like the food pantry and retention rates? The Provost said the presentation was made by students from San Marcus and Channel Islands. They were studying impact in terms of how many students were using the food pantries and then tracking them in aggregate in terms of how are they progressing through their programs, and finding that actually, the retention rates were higher than a control group that had not used the pantry. They were using that as a comparison. This was emerging research, there was interest among the vice presidents of doing more in that area. The Provost added that he thinks it gets to our larger conversation about attribution, about what can we want to point to in terms of increasing retention from year to year, this was the first significant report I'd seen getting the Basic Needs area other than saying kind of inputs, we're going to put food pantries on campuses and trying to tie it to progress. It was a good emerging study, but I think there were questions about that, how would we replicate this? How would we scale it up?

ASI Report, Proxy Shuaib
Senator Shuaib noted that VP Giron apologized for not being able to attend. Shuaib noted that there was an ASI Board meeting on September 20 where there was a presentation regarding the Master Plan. She noted that they voted to postpone their endorsements or opposition to the Master Plan until they felt that the presentation reflected the student needs on campus such as parking and different things like that.

ASI will be participating in Community Impact Day on October 5th. Chair Thomas asked for more information about Community Impact Day. Senator Shuaib said it's a volunteer effort. I think there's volunteers at the YMCA, and also on campus. The initial email was sent out in September, and the ASI Board was able to sign up. They'll be doing gardening on campus. Senator V. Price brought up an issue she’s been hearing a lot of feedback regarding space and privacy on the
3rd floor of the Library. When student come to speak, there’s nowhere to go, they’ve got to book conference rooms 24 hours in advance. There are some office and some walled rooms, but we need to talk about contingency plans and we need to talk about rig and mortar student hub that actually has some closed walls for students to be able to speak, confidentially. Shuaib thanked Price for bringing that up. She said as a student worker, she works on the third floor and it is very challenging to talk to students. She said she works in the Women’s Resource Center and a lot of things they deal with have to do with sensitive topics. She said she can hinder them from being able to provide everything they were able to in the Small College Complex. The Provost responded that not only is the University aware of this issue and that Vice President Franklin has been very, very strong on this. The Provost asked that Interim Vice President Coley speak for a moment on some of the plans going forward, so you know what we're doing to try and address these issues. Interim VP of Administration & Finance Coley said this is a very, very serious problem. He said what is being stated is absolutely correct. He said in his opinion, it’s dysfunctional space. He noted that they took a tour two weeks ago and it has also been presented to the Cabinet. Coley noted that the Cabinet is beside itself and committed to correcting this. He said the position that they have taken is to essentially hit the reset button, which is say that space that is there now on both the third and the fourth floor, that they are taking the posture that there's nothing in that space now. And they will be looking at a clean sheet of paper to be able to see where the things should be allocated, realigned, some things in, some things out. He noted he's already had some reports from the consultants that we've invited to assist us with this. And he said, he’s encouraged by some of the things he’s hearing. He noted he also had a chance to meet briefly the Vice Provost about this, this afternoon, and he gave a positive report on the interviews that are taking place. All of the individuals that operate in those spaces are being interviewed to identify what their needs are, what their preferences are, what would be the things that make them much more effective. Coley said they are focusing directly on those folks who do need to operate in that space to try to find ways to make it much more effective for all of the missions that need to be in here. There's a possibility that there are functions that are there that might need to be placed elsewhere. There is the possibility that there are functions elsewhere that might be better suited to be co located in that space. At this point, Coley said, he’s happy to try to address any questions that the Senate might have. Thomas said as he currently understands it, we are re-envisioning the Student Success hub. Senator Griffey complemented ASI for doing its due diligence on the Master Plan and for seeking to use its position to advocate on behalf of students. Griffey said he hopes that this body will consider listening to those students and reconsidering its vote in support of the Master Plan at the last meeting.

**CFA Report, Dr. La Tanya Skiffer**

- We will be releasing the bargaining survey this weekend. Keep an eye out on your email, so that you can respond and hopefully share your insights and ideas about strong points that we want to raise at the bargaining table. You will also be getting an email from Jackie Teepen on a regular basis to remind you to complete the survey.
- Regarding the bargaining timeline: We'll be doing the survey fall 2019. We then go into what we call sunshine proposals in the spring 2020, where both sides share briefly what they are bringing to the table. The contract expires June 30 2020. And then we're going to have bargaining,
- In addition to that, if you aren't a member, you have to join before you can take the survey. So you will receive access to a link if you're not a member, or you can just log on to Calfac.org. We value your voice, it's your contract too, you're going to have to live under it.
- There's some concern from faculty about the RTP process and it's shifting requirements. We want to let you know administration is here to support you, the Senate is here to support you, and CFA is here to counsel you and if need be to file a grievance on your behalf. It's also important that you recognize that you as faculty are required to put in the RTP guidelines that you are working under into your file that you are working under, so there's no question about it. If you don't have your current requirements, please let us know. We can support you and getting them you can contact your chair. If you choose to adopt new guidelines that is what you do formally, in writing. You do not have to do that if you are working under the guidelines that you were hired under. We have heard some confusion about that where it's been appearing that people have to adopt the old guidelines. And that is not the case. If you're feeling pressure about adopting new guidelines, some dated August 25, please reach out to us.
- We had a question from our FERPed faculty and our retired faculty about communicating with the university and getting questions answered about that very important transition. We have a wonderful invitation from the AVP of Faculty Affairs & Development, Cheryl Koos, please reach out to her if you have any questions at
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E-mail is the best way to communicate with her and she will help connect you to the right point of contact. If there are challenges, feel free to contact CFA.

- Lecture Range Elevation - this process will be coming formerly at the end of October, we should have a list of those names that are eligible and hopefully help and encourage everyone to apply and submit a very strong portfolio.
- There's an issue at Marymount College with students and transportation. That issue is that students have been housed there for their dorms, and they are complaining that the transportation is not getting them to campus on time for their classes. Skiffer asked that someone can take a point and help us get them here on time.
- Skiffer noted CFA had a great conversation with the Provost yesterday. They will be looking to have new hiring lines. She said she is calling all faculty to the carpet, let's make sure that we can create as many tenure track higher positions as possible. And then also support conversion of lecture positions to full time tenure track position and we want to see more tenure track faculty not working more non-tenure track faculty, because that's the job security that people deserve. Skidder added she believes it also supports what we need to do for our students, bringing it back to our advising question, that's about having people who have full time status and the time to advise, and also those faculty committed to it.
- Lectures Nuts & Bolts Workshop is Wednesday, October 9th from 11:30 to 2pm in LSU Rm. 325. They’ll be another one on October 16, from 2pm to 4pm in the Faculty Development Center
- Bargaining Listening Group on October 15 from 1 pm to 3 pm in the Faculty Development Center. This is an opportunity to ask questions to a member of our bargaining team. That person is going to be there to listen to concerns and share any insights that he might have.
- Rebuttal workshop will occur after the narratives go in for RTP, on Wednesday, October 16 from 11:30 to 1pm in the LSU 322.
- Interrupting Racism Workshop, Friday, November 8, 11:30, to 5pm.
- Unemployment Workshop will be Tuesday, December 3rd 11 to 1pm in the Faculty Development Center. That's for lectures who are able to apply for unemployment during semester breaks. It's a very important resource that we have, and we want to encourage you to use it.

VP Franklin responded that we do have about 60 students who are staying at Marymount College University because our dorms were overwrought here. They gave us about 100 spaces. The university is on the hill, but the students are living in San Pedro. It's called The Villas which are very nice residence halls and they had unused beds. The transportation issue is we have shuttles that go back and forth, but did not factor in traffic. And they're getting better with our transportation.

Franklin asked for patience as they try to ease our housing crisis by providing those satellite residence halls.

Chair Thomas said he would turn it over to the Statewide Senators and asked that they quickly summarize what they learned at the Statewide Senate meeting the week prior.

Statewide Senate Report, Senators’ Celly and Norman
Statewide Senator Celly said she would especially like to thank each person present and well as the General Faculty for their vote of confidence that's allowed her the responsibility and the privilege of serving statewide. She noted that this is her second year, so she’s really just learning. Celly said in case you're wondering what is the ASCSU, it's just like us, except that it's 23 universities with about 53 senators, and we are doing the same thing. We are a policymaking body, shared governance, academic freedom, body, making resolutions to guide policy formulation by our President and Provost. That's essentially what ASCSU does. Currently we’re working on:

- Ethnic Studies Bill - AB (Assembly Bill) 1460. The ASCSU along with the CSU are opposed to the bill. We're not opposed the content of the bill, or the principles underlying what is being asked for in the bill. But we are opposed to legislative intrusion into curriculum. And so there were three resolutions that came out of Academic Affairs which passed as a First Reading waiver. The details and those minutes and the resolutions themselves, are in a link which went out earlier today. Celly continued said that bill has been converted into a two year bill. But we do need to inform Senator Pan who is asking what are the universities doing with ethnic studies? What data do we have? Celly said the Ethnic Studies Task Force completed its work in 2016. We as a collective, which is Statewide Senate, as well as the Chancellor's Office has no data. The good news is our work in Academic Affairs
got the Chancellor's Office to send out two requests to the presidents, one for ethnic studies, and one for something called cultural diversity. At Statewide, there were three resolutions, the cultural competence one did not pass and it was not waived for First Reading. The focus is on ethnic studies. What are we doing to give every student an opportunity to get an ethnic studies exposure is basically the ask. If there's anything we can do to help you put that together, we will basically be able to say to the Legislature, we've got it, we are handling it, in fact, you just didn't know about this. Celly this is urgent.

- From our Academic Senate committee work, what has emerged, counseling faculty colleagues who serve as student mental health professionals, are concerned with the lack of understanding across other segments of the University, about their role. It's quite difficult for them since they sit in Student Affairs to advocate for their share in the $35 million for tenure track lines, the question is how do we advocate for those lines, if at all?
- Quantitative Reasoning: Celly noted that we're not all on the same page. While it seems like an excellent idea, we don't have the K through 12 infrastructure to make sure that every student that we serve in the communities we serve, will have that opportunity. But given the start time is 2026 we have time to play a role in influencing decisions.

Statewide Senator Norman said he's received a few emails about Course Hero to which he will respond directly. Norman noted he did meet with the Course Hero CEO. He said that there is concern about property infringement but he will report on this at a later time.

Q&A/Comments:
Senator Monty said he just wanted confirmation that there wasn’t any discussion at the plenary about reviving the General Education Task Force report from last year. (Statewide Senators Celly and Norman indicated that there had not been.) Monty said he would like to recommend that in general, that we build in an additional ten minutes for reports into the agenda so that we have more realistic agendas and find ourselves able to complete agendas without having to rush the items at the end. Monty commented it's clear Statewide, the ASI Report, the Provost Report rushed through their reports and that won't always be the case. We need to plan more time on the agenda for all of these reports.

Academic Senate Chair Thomas replied, “Duly noted.”

Senator Nicol said with regard to the Ethnic Studies bill and she wanted to make sure that ASCSU and everyone here knows as well as everyone at ASCSUDH and disabused people of the assumption that the Legislature has not intruded on curriculum before. We have a cultural diversity requirement in the CSU, because of Teresa Yus in 1985 and she helped write a bill that was passed and that's why we had a cultural diversity requirement. The reason why Senator Weber put together AB 1460 is because of the lack of action taken on the Ethnic Studies Task Force. We have been waiting for the Chancellor's Office and by extension the campuses to do something with regards to Ethnic Studies. Nicol noted she is in a department now that is a department with only three tenure track faculty, and didn't have a full time chair for four plus years. And that speaks to a lack of commitment from the Administration with regards to Ethnic Studies. So pressure had to be put onto the campuses through this Bill. She said she understands the legislature imposing and so forth, but if you don't deal with the Chancellor's Office, then it's just going to be a cyclical thing where Ethnic Studies and by extension, Women's Studies and other interdisciplinary programs are going to get kicked around. And so I just want to make sure that everyone knows when Ethnic Studies faculty hear, that there isn't support for this, it signals to us that we are not supported and we have to fight tooth and nail to prove not only that we are an Academic Department and a Scholar Department, but we're not a service department and hope for the best.

Academic Senate Chair Thomas said that AB 1460 is going to be discussed by Dean of Undergraduate Studies Kim Costino at a later date.

Senator Griffey thanked Senator Nicol for her comments. He said that he found it an interesting situation in which faculty find that their Statewide Academic Senate oppose the Bill, but their Statewide Union supports it and even co-authored it and people like him, who have been actively lobbying for it. The Bill grew out of the race and social justice initiative with the California Faculty Association as part of our work to do on structural racism in the CSUs. Griffey
continued that he believed the fact that there is a statewide diversity requirement, and that was not seen as too political, but Ethnic Studies is seen as too political, political is something that we need to consider and reflect upon. He said he did not believe that was true of our current campus, CFA had to take a stand on this issue. He said he was not not representing their stand in this regard but thought he would bring it to the attention that the CFA has been active on this issue. He suggested if you wanted to hear more about it, it might be worth inviting some of our colleagues from CSU LA to discuss it.

_Celly_ thanked both Senator Nicol and Senator Griffey, and noted that she was not representing her personal view, but what went forward to the hearings this summer. And she said they had two Ethnic Studies faculty come from Cal State Long Beach to the Academic Affairs working committee meeting, and they were very clear about respect for the disciplines, respect for the sort of disciplinary integrity was the term they were using, but that they were also more open, as long as they had voice at the table, to ensuring that it did not have to be restricted to four disciplines or four races and ethnicities. State Senator Norman said he would like to go on the record that as a past chair of Faculty Affairs committee, who at every meeting invited and gave 20 minutes to the president of CFA Je_d_ski_c, and extended a standing invitation. Norman expressed that he and other senators felt it was very disrespectful for CFA who had that time at every Senate meeting to blindside the faculty and co-author a bill without any discussion or engagement. Norman directed his comments to the CFA folks in the room, saying he did not believe it was a good strategy and that it led to a split. Norman said expressed that he felt just as abused there, as he has by the Chancellor. He noted that he doesn’t like being in a situation where union leadership is disrespectful to the people on the Senate that are charged with the curriculum, on something as important as sponsoring a bill. Norman said, “It’s okay for us to have an opinion for us to disagree, but not to consult?” He said this is something that he is going to work on, to rebuild bridges. He noted he will be the representative from EXEC to the CFA Assembly. He said he will try to reach out to the new CFA President, to make sure that the Senate and the Union are working together. We're stronger together.

_Chair Thomas_ said that moving forward, as it relates to Statewide Reports, we're going to do those in two rounds. Once immediately after the Statewide meeting, and then we're also going to have them do a Statewide Report immediately before their next Statewide meeting, so that there are issues that we want them to speak on and we want to provide a perspective as to future actions, you will certainly have the opportunity to do so.

**PRESENTATIONS:**

_Reimagining the Curriculum Process, University Curriculum Committee Chair Sheela Pawar_

- The curriculum process is going to be going online. And that's going to make things much easier for us. It's going to make the process a lot more transparent. It's going to be easy to track where proposals are, it is going to be easier to edit proposals. If you've done curriculum, you sometimes find out, oh, I edited the wrong version. I've got several versions of this proposal. right one, that's not going to be an issue anymore. And also it's going to be a much greener process. In going online, Pawar noted that we need to make sure that the process is concise and very clear and that we know who all the stakeholders are and we know who has permission to say yes, to push a button and have it go to the next day.

- In order to do that, we have been holding meetings last spring through the summer, continuing into this semester of what we're calling the curriculum review revision committee, or CRRC. These have been chaired by Dean Costino and populated by people from various curriculum committees, and other interested parties such as department chairs who are undergoing curriculum process, Dean's, staff from the Provost’s office. This group is continuing to meet, defining the processes, identifying what's wrong with the current process, how we can improve it, and reduce redundancies, etc. It’s been decided to pilot the new processes this semester, and next.

- The revised processes have wider and earlier consultation. Consultation happens with USLOAC, IT, etc. There is an extra stage of campus wide sharing, so that the entire campus can be consulted earlier on. We are going to be sharing those programs that go on to the Academic Master Plan proposal, so that people have an early view of what new programs are being proposed and people can weigh in from across the campus.

- USLOAC is involved in the process and they are consulted on learning outcomes and assessment plans. What that means is that the curriculum committees, college level and university curriculum committee are looking at the
alignment of the learning outcomes at the course level, the program level on an institutional level and we’re looking at the disciplinary perspective, etc.

- We are not policing your assessment plans or not policing your learning outcomes. We are not going to be looking at your action verbs and saying whether they are part of Bloom's Taxonomy or not.
- We're not looking at syllabi anymore. [round of applause]. We are looking at things that have to do with curriculum such as course descriptions, number of units, prerequisites, and learning outcomes.
- We have clarified the procedures for objections. If there are intra-college disputes, those disputes are to be addressed by the college curriculum committees, UCC will look at inter college disputes and anything that may remain unresolved. Objections have to occur within the time of campus wide sharing. There's an explicit timeframe.
- Course proposals no longer go to UCC. If you have new courses, your proposals will stop at the level of your college unless there's some kind of dispute, that's the only time UCC will be looking at them in depth. We just look at them to say, yes, they've been approved.
- More transparency in the process: Ideally, when it goes online, they'll be a lot more transparency. But, Pawar noted, we are trying to make it more transparent even now. We defined responsibilities and roles in each stage, clarified what the procedures for objections are. And during this pilot program, we're going to be tracking the proposals in an online spreadsheet that will be updated regularly. Theoretically you will be able to go a little and see where your proposal is in the process.
- We are piloting starting now. If you have you have already put proposals in the pipeline, and you're using the old forms, you do not have to fill out new forms, we have new forms coming. But if you're using the old forms, we're only looking at what we propose to look at going forward in the future. If you gave us syllabi, that's great, we're not going to be looking for your policy on makeup, and late work, etc. We are just going to be looking at things like learning outcomes, course descriptions, and how it fits in the program.
- Feedback Needed: We need feedback from a wide constituency of people across campus. We want to make sure that we have process that makes sense and that is doable in place before we go into the electronic format, because it will be a lot more difficult to make changes once that happens. We will also be holding a campus wide Town Hall on November 1 from 10 – 12 in the Faculty Development Center.

**Q&A/Comments**

**Senator Kulikov** said we’re at a stage where we went through college curriculum process for MBA program, so what are we doing now? We have to fill in the forms, are we waiting until November 1, when can we proceed with our MBA revisions? Pawar said you can do that right now. We don't have the forms available yet, you can just start filling out the forms. We hope to have only the new forms in the Spring. But as of now, we're still accepting both and we haven't quite gotten the new forms out yet. So we're still working on them. **Senator Monty** said what was presented here, is similar in some ways, but it doesn't contain all the elements that were in the that email outlining the policy and procedures that went out some time last week. Monty said some of the issues he has are: (1) If he’s not mistaken, its still required that programs submit an assessment plan with the program modification. Checking the alignment of course outcomes and program outcomes and program outcomes and institutional outcomes, that's all fine and good. But I still think it's excessive to require that programs submit an assessment plan for every program modification. In that case, we would want to distinguish between a significant overhaul and a minor program modification. Some are minor and in that instance, if they want some evidence of how this modification will improve the attainment of some learning outcome, let them address that only. Whatever assessment issue or outcome that are relevant for modification. The other thing that wasn’t addressed during this presentation was the process. Monty expressed that there were too many steps and it was counterintuitive. Monty described what he believed the process to be. He noted by the fourth or fifth step in the process, then the faculty person took the proposal to the Department for approval. He said he didn’t know why any faculty person would embark on any kind of new course proposal without first securing the support of the chair in the department? He thought the process could be simplified and streamlined by starting with the department. If it's approved, then it makes sense for the chair to look at it to prepare the impact report and to send it to the Dean and to go forward. Monty said it seems to him that steps like that department approval, can actually be the first step and then everything else would fall into line. **Pawar** responded said to the first point, we are still talking about how to distinguish between modifications, whether it's the courses or the programs that are minor and go through a shortened process, versus the ones
that are significant. We're still talking about those issues, these meetings are ongoing. Pawar addressed Monty’s second point and said while she’s not recalling exactly, she believed he did not have the order there correctly. Pawar said, “But you are right, we conceive of it as an individual creating a proposal, and then conferring with the chair, and then whatever is next. We're not saying how departments must structure their curriculum committees, because there's too much variation in departments. So part of that is to allow for there to be that difference. But in reality, we don't conceive of those is really been different steps. But there are places where somebody is going to have to enter information into an electronic system. And so in some cases, we break things out into what seems like minutia steps, but that's because somebody has to actually be responsible for entering that information. But again, discussions are ongoing, and they’ll be more information at the Town Hall. Dean Costino added the email that she sent out, was intended to describe new programs and new courses, not modifications. And, she said, the first step is actually for new programs to get on the Academic Master Plan that is the first step. The questions that are there are required by the Chancellor's Office. If a department wants to get departmental approval before they follow those steps, they're welcome to do that. But in the system for a new program the first step has to be to get on the Academic Master Plan. All those details, departments can figure out how to do that. Senator Anderson asked how many non-tenure folks are participating in the pilot? Pawar said she does not know. Pawar asked if you mean from the ground up, anybody that proposes a course, to sits on a committee, she has no idea.

**CBABB Accreditation Update and Timeline, Dean Wen**

Wen thanked the Senate for giving him the opportunity to update the body on the progress of the AACSB accreditation. Wen said he would also like to hear from the body so that an informed recommendation can be made. Wen noted that last year, was the toughest year in his professional life. The College of Business and Public Policy’s MBA, suffered a setback from AACSB accreditation. He said, as a Dean, he takes full responsibility for the outcome. Wen described what’s been done over the last six months

- Spoke to all the stake holders, held open forums monthly, had conversations with MBA students, as well as conversations with faculty, and the Advisory Board. He added there were conversations with the ASI President and with the student representative. With that input, Wen said it is his recommendation to the Senate that we go with the AACSB accreditation for the undergraduate program and terminate the current MBA, redirecting the resource to develop a more relevant MBA or high demand specialized brand new program for the business school.

Wen said he believes that our faculty, students, and staff, deserve a recognition for their hard work and dedication over the past five years.

Wen then said he would be providing a background about how they came to that recommendation.

Earlier this year they received the AACSB letter and report. [The full report will be posted on the Academic Senate website.](#) Wen noted that the report tells us that we do have a strong quality undergraduate program and our faculty are current, doing research, playing a leadership role in their professional organizations. They are published in top journals, and also on the advisory board they actively involved in all level of the colleges and in our institution. In the survey they told the President and Provost that they can give us and undergraduate accreditation on the spot. However, they do have some concerns about MBA. The assurance learning data is insufficient. They thought our MBA enrollments is very low, we have 90 students. They give us 12 months to fix the problem, if we can fix the problem, they would get AACSB accreditation. To do that, we have two options. The first option is suspend the MBA, redesign and collect more assessment information for MBA and relaunch MBA. The second option is terminate MBA and redirect the resources to either develop a more relevant MBA or a new MBA, or we can develop a more specialized MBA program.

Based on that we started a whole decision making process six months ago. Wen then referred to the slide presentation:

**MBA Decision Making Processes**

- Had monthly college open forums
- Had weekly chairs councils
- Had an MBA students open forum in April
- Informed CBAPP advisory board AACSB's decision letter
- Interviewed with Bulletin, editor in chief, Kelsey Reichmann
- ASI President and officers
- Met with Laura Talamante, past senate chair
- Met with Charles Thomas, current senate chair
- Met with Thomas Norman, state senator
- Met with Kirti Celly, state senator
- Met with UCC chair Sheila Pawar
- Conducted three summer chairs councils
He noted that they invited the President and the Provost to one of the Open Forums. He said that by Past Senate Chair Laura Talamante, also the current chair both participated in the open forum. And we also conducted weekly chairs council. In every chairs council we would always update on progress and requested more input. There were ongoing conversation was the President, Provost and the Peer Review Team as well as ASCSB. President Parham is going to make a decision this semester and after that faculty are going to write and submit a report based on this decision. Then we need to finish that report before the end of the semester so we can meet the deadline for submitting the final report. The actual visit will be March 3 - March 5.

Wen said the most important information he would want to share regarding this is a curriculum change is that faculty input is very important. So we did two faculty surveys. The first one was on May 2. The key findings in that survey. The response rate was 76%, which is very good for any survey. The first key finding was more than 90% of faculty say they want CBAPP to be accredited by ASCSB. Findings number two, 80% of faculty and staff prefer to terminate and redirect resource to develop a new MBA or specialized Master’s program. Wen referred to two articles, referenced in slide presentation one is from The Wall Street Journal about more universities shutting down traditional MBA programs. Wen noted that a similar report was in Forbes magazine. Wen said they ran another survey just prior to the September 25th Academic Senate Meeting. He noted that they shared the survey questions with Senate Executive Committee and modified it accordingly. They did a second survey and again, had the same response rate. The one key finding he thought most important to share was the response to the question “Do you support terminating the MBA program and redirecting the resources to develop more relevant MBA?” Wen reported they received 88% response in support of that option. He said it's clear to him that faculty are basically saying lets come out with a new, more relevant MBA instead of keeping the old.

Wen then reviewed the timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadlines</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/2/19</td>
<td>Dean's Open Forum # 1. If possible share with the faculty the nature of the Draft report Committee. Committee work underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/19</td>
<td>Given President's decision has been announced, Version 1 of the draft Deferral Report (DR) is due. Internal deadline for presentation for an upcoming Dean's Open Forum # 2 scheduled for 10/21/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/19</td>
<td>Present in Dean's Open Forum # 1. Deadline for having collected current student feedback. Deadline to gather alumni feedback via Alumni Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/19</td>
<td>Version 1, REV (post-Open Forum) goes to Dan/Malin for Review/feedback (DM iteration # 1/2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/19</td>
<td>Version 2 post DM feedback received and sent to Dan/Malin for Review # 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td>Internal deadline for completing departmental and the College curriculum review (CCRC) processes to have the curriculum review proposals ready for campus wide sharing and provide to Graduate Council for agenda deadline of November 8, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/19</td>
<td>Graduate Council Meeting &amp; Publication of Curriculum Register (Moratorium End date: 12/2/19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/19</td>
<td>Present a status report as well as seek input in Dean's Open Forum # 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/25/19</td>
<td>Incorporate all feedback from Open Forum of 11/21/19, DM Review Iteration # 2 and Graduate Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/19</td>
<td>Agenda deadline for UCC (It is the LAST meeting for fall 2019 and is on 11/27/19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/19</td>
<td>UCC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td>Penultimate DR draft ready. Feedback from UCC, Provost approval, and President approval. Confirm timeframe with Provost Office on Chancellor's Office review. Share this version with DM. Present a status report as well as share the future plan of action with the Open Forum # 4, on 12/12/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26/19</td>
<td>Deadline for Approval from the Chancellor Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2/20</td>
<td>Finalized Report ready to be dispatched to AACSBS – meeting the 60 days lead time deadline of March 3, 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He noted that those being highlighted in red are critical. The first one is a graduate council deadline. The 2nd deadline is for UCC. Then the third one is the deadline in which they need to get approval from Chancellor's Office. The last one is the deadline to submit the AACSBS report before 60 days of their visit. We suggest we get a AACSBS accreditation for our undergraduates and then terminate current MBA. Then redirect the resource to develop more relevant MBA, or a more specialized one.

**Q&A/Comments**

**Senator Nicol** asked if you terminate the traditional MBA and went to the specialized, how much longer will it be before you get that online? **Wen** responded we have our plan to teach our the current MBA is 18 months. During that time, we estimate the whole curriculum process of this campus to get a new program approval will be 12 months. After we get approval from University Curriculum Committee we need to get approval from AACSBS, which will take around six months. Wen said he would then estimate that we can get the new graduate program launched in about two years. **Nicol** asked, it’s two years but have you researched how long it would be once you add in the approval needed from the Chancellor's Office, which could add another year? **Wen** said we did study this. Cal State Long Beach recently launched their specialized MBA in the marketing area. So MS in marketing. In our case, right now we are work with Institutional
Research to do market research. We are looking at the market demand and the resources we have. Wen said he does not know exactly the answer, but we will find out. He noted that at this point, we have 12 concentrations in our undergraduate programs. At this point, most likely, accountancy could be one possible specialized area, another based on the market could be business analytics. Senator McGlynn said he believed that a cost benefit analysis to consider here. He wondered since this program requires campus wide resources, if a survey of faculty outside of the College of Business would be relevant, considering that resources allocated to this program affects us all. He said the benefit clearly is it's great to have an AACSB accredited program. He noted that he does not know how many undergraduate programs without an MBA have AACSB accreditation. McGlynn noted there's a benefit to having that, but there's also a cost. He said he wasn’t sure if the benefits of spending all of that money on the AACSB accreditation for all the reassigned time for the faculty to maintain that accreditation is worth it to our campus. He said he hopes that the entire campus engages in this issue and investigates the matter. Wen said that's a very valid question. Wen noted that in United States, the number right now is less than 30% of the business school, are accredited by AACSB and internationally, it’s less than 5%. It is a very prestigious accreditation. Whether there is a value to the accreditation or not, when you have a prestigious accreditation, you certainly attract quality faculty and most importantly, quality students. Senator Shuail asked how the termination in the MBA program affects the alumni of that program? Wen responded we did have conversation was current MBA alumni in April. No impact. If we get accreditation it will be for all of CBAPP. However, if a company looks into the very details they will see on our website, before we redesign and get approval from AACSB, will not allow for MBA or graduate program on our website, until we get approval. So when you have that, either we get our new MBA back, or get our specialized MBA back, they credit back based on the level of study. In the long term, maybe in two years, once we get into specialized back or new MBA back, all the alumni will be retrospect to the previous graduate. So they may say we graduate from an accredited Master Program.

Chair Thomas said what we're really trying to do here with this presentation, is to thread the needle between making sure that campus is informed and apprised of the curricular change that's occurring within CBAPP. While at the same time, giving CBAPP the opportunity to engage in a little bit of autonomy as it relates to how they proceed curricularly. The importance here is that we at least lay out what that framework is, when there's going to be conversation, in particular at the UCC level as outlined in this timeline and that this is the beginning of a conversation and not the end. If there any other further questions, you can certainly send those via email but know that you will continue to be having these conversations as you saw, in particular at the UCC as it relates to the curricular issues.

Senate Parliamentarian, Enrique Ortega - The following faculty representative were confirmed:
Academic Affairs Facilities and Space Committee - Library representative Joanna Kimmitt
Student Fee Advisory Committee – Hugo Asensio
Senator V. Price asked if there was anyone else who was running. Chair Thomas nominated Dr. Vivian Price who accepted the nomination. She was enthusiastically confirmed.
Student Grade Appeals Board – Deandrea Nelson
Educational Policy Committee - Rui Sun from CBAPP
Faculty Policy Committee – Fynnwin Prager
Staff election for Gender Equity Task Force - Chauncei-Elan Ares

OPEN MIC:
Provost Spagna thanked Dean Wen for making the presentation. He noted that we're seeing a phenomenon and it goes to Senator McGlynn’s question. We're seeing a lot more faculty and departments coming forward and saying we want to meet a standard in terms of accreditation. He said he sees this in journalism, in communications, I see it in CBAPP and he thinks it’s wonderful. From a maturity standpoint Spagna said it's wonderful to see faculty saying there’s a national standard and we want to reach that. Spagna said to the student question, all this can do is increase the value of our degrees going forward.

Senator Griffey said with regard to the Non-Tenure Track Task Force what happens next? The Academic Senate Chair explained as far as the senate resolution, that’s completed and we have a resolution. To go from resolution to policy, we will be transmitting this to the Provost and President. The Provost and the President will then look to determine whether it is be more appropriate to be a Presidential Memorandum or an Academic Affairs policy. They will then provide us their
input. In this particular case we probably would be doing MOUs for those parties and we would then send out a call for who's going elected to be on the Non Tenure Track Advisory Board. The Provost said that former Academic Senate Chair Talamante really worked hard with him to clear a backlog of these. The Provost said it is his intention to fast track this one because this is really necessary for the campus. Talmante asked if that means it would be possible to see this advisory board taking up its work in the Spring semester? To which the Provost responded, that would be his hope.

Meeting adjourned.

*[Dr. J. Price emailed the AS office on 10/9 to notify us that the spelling of Dr. Kram’s name (in the Provost’s report) was incorrect and that he was present at the 9/25 Academic Senate Meeting.]*