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Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2016

Voting Members Present: Abdourazakou, Avila, Bowles Eagle, Cauthen, Chavez, Durand, Ferris, Heinze-Balcazar, Jacobs, Jarrett, Jett, Kaplan, Keville, Krochalk, Kulikov, Ledesma, Ma, ~~Macias~~ proxy - Hutton, McGlynn, Merz, Monty, Mutchler, Needham, Nelson, Parker, Peyton, Price, Robles, Tang, Thomas, , Villanueva, Wang

Voting Members Not Present: Barab, Belu, Bender, Ernst, Fitzsimmons, Furtado, Grasse, Leonard, Monty, Navarrete, Park, Vanterpool

Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Esposito, Gamino, Haney, Hill, Hirohama, Moore, Norman, Pawar, Perez

Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Hagan

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Brasley, Davis, Fenning, Junn, Hay, Huizinga, Kalayjian, Kaul, Sayed, Weber, Wen

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Avila, Carrier, Driscoll, Franklin, Manriquez, McNutt, Stewart

Guests: Keith Boyum, Kirti Celly, Tim Caron

2015-2016 Academic Senate Executive Committee:

Jim Hill – Chair, Jerry Moore – Vice Chair, Annemarie Perez – Parliamentarian, Sheela Pawar – EPC Chair, Vacant – FPC Chair, Thomas Norman – Statewide Senator, Kate Esposito – Statewide Senator

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

Meeting Called to Order 2:30 PM

Approval of Agenda MSP

Approval of Amended Minutes (02/17/16) MSP

Chair Hill Report

* Current Constitution would need some clarification and at some point in the future, a committee could be formed to review it for better wording.
* Re. Dean Presentations, often times questions arise after a presentation has occurred, we will set aside time on the following agendas to address questions. In particular to what came up on the previous presentation by Dean Wen were a question about the numbers corresponding to the question around assigned time.
* President’s Review – please participate and respond to the request for feedback on the President’s Review.
* Displaced and Food Insecure Students Report that came out from the Chancellor’s office. The report showed what services are available by campus. Our campus did not have a lot of programs that were listed on the chart. Senate Exec felt there should be an ongoing real discussion in Senate and the Division of the University that’s closest to this issue which is Student Affairs. Hill said he reached out to VP Franklin who is not here this week but told Hill that there are a lot of services that Dominguez Hills is working on already that are not listed. We do want to talk about this in an ongoing way, and we want to hear from Student Affairs, however Dr. Franklin was not able to be here, so we will be coming back to this on our agenda.
* Email to “allfaculty” listserv regarding academic freedom speaking about the potential strike. Hill said two critical pieces are, 1. Faculty are in charge of the curriculum, not only in the broad generic sense, but specifically in the classroom and 2. The position of the Senate within the university. One analogy that Hill said people make all the time is the three legged stool. Representatives of the unions, in the case of faculty, the CFA; the administration and the Senate and they need to be separate. We are not the CFA, we are not the administrators; we are the Senate. It is appropriate for the Senate to address issues of the faculty being in charge of curriculum and academic freedom and intellectual property.

Comments from the floor:

**Senator Thomas** said as it relates to Hill’s email regarding the strike, he appreciated the analogies. As it relates to Appendix A on the Food Insecurity Table, but when I look at similarly situated campuses such as East Bay and Cal State Los Angeles, I find it particularly shameful that these are the campus’ that have higher representation of traditionally underserved communities but they also have the least in terms of resources in terms of food issues. We have at least two of the columns, Cal State Los Angeles and East Bay have one. We not only need to be addressing it here on this campus, but I would like to suggest we reach out to the statewide senate as it relates to this issue and bring the alarm to that level as well. Thomas added he does not know how it distributes, but he would venture to guess that if one is food insecure, it likely ties into other markers of disadvantage.

President Hagan’s Report

* Food Insecurity and displaced students – Hagan said he’s glad the Chancellor has put together this report. As was mentioned, there are a lot more things going on this campus, but as was also mentioned there are a lot more things we could be doing. Hagan said he’s spoken with other presidents to see what they’re doing, and has found that there are some really unique ideas out there. On one campus there’s an app that students can download. When a campus event is over, it notifies everyone when there is food left over and staff are paid to stay after the event is over to make sure everyone has access to the food. There are lots of different strategies out there. Hagan said there’s also ready been six requests for assistance in a 24 hour period. It’s good and bad. It’s good that we’re going to address it, however likely there are many people in the room who know of a story of students who are living out of their cars.
* President’s Reviews – Many people would have received a letter from the Hagan that is required by the Chancellor to let the faculty know that the President is being evaluated. Please feel free to submit feedback. Some may have received an additional letter from the Chancellor. Hagan said he is required by the Chancellor to provide a list of 75 names of students, alumni, corporate, faculty, individuals that they can contact directly. If they received a 2nd letter it would mean that Hagan put them on the list and he offered their name because he felt they’d interacted enough that that person would be in a position to offer a little more feedback.
* Re. MPP reviews based on a previous PM 1990-08 put forth by Senator Hirohama: the idea of evaluating managers on a regular basis is critical; getting feedback is an important aspect. He’s looking into that policy, and while regular reviews have been happening, he has not be following that policy. He believes PM 1990-08 may not follow best practices. They will look at that process and may propose a revised version and bring it back to the Senate for input. They will make sure that it goes forward.
* Forum on Campus Violence that took place that morning of 3/2/16 went very well. A lot of information was offered on what is being done on the campus, there were a lot of recommendations on additional communication and training that we should do on this campus. That forum was not the beginning and ending of the discussion. We will be looking at our policies, we will look at our programs and training and our communication around that. Thank you to those who planned and those who participated in it. There’s another forum on Diversity and Inclusion on April 5 at 9:00. Many times a lack of inclusion and a lack of diversity can land to campus violence. It may not be physical violence, but there are issues of micro aggression and unconscious bias, one of the biggest solutions of addressing campus violence is building and maintaining a sense community. On this campus we often talk about our diversity, our diversity in terms of the ethnic numbers often lull us into thinking that we have the diversity issue down pat and I don’t think we do, we have to have these conversations. I happened to hear a conversation whereby they spoke about feeling excluded, and in their explanation of it they excluded another group, once again, unconscious bias.

Questions from the floor

**Senator Hirohama** wanted to address the Perceived effectiveness of Review of Administrators. While you said you wish to make some revisions to it, Hirohama asked what is President Hagan’s timeline? Hirohama said that existing PM does have pretty specific timelines in that the committee that would oversee the review process was supposed to be formed by May 1st and has members that would be put forth by the Senate. There are only four more meetings until the last Senate meetings. Are you going to set a schedule for next year? Or are you going to put it off and then it wouldn’t be put into effect until 2018. There are administrators on the list that are approaching by four and five years. **Hagan** said he did not read the PM until yesterday and he reviewed the timelines and he does not see it happening in that timeframe. He said he will ask his team and HR to look at some of the best practices and make some recommendations to him. Hagan said it is important, but he does not see it as his highest priority right now. He is not dismissing it but it’s just not his highest priority as they’re really trying to get the Chancellor to change their funding model. We will have a process for evaluating managers in the next year. Whether it follows the timeline outlined in the PM, he’s not sure that the timeline laid out made much sense. He does not think he will have the timeline revised before the year is out, they will have it ready for the fall.

**Vice Chair** **Moore** said he wished to follow-up on the Food Insecurity Report – he said he was really pleased to see the report from Hagan’s office yesterday. He pointed out that within the Chancellor’s office report, it said that over the next two years they’re going to establish a committee to look at this problem. We need to come up with faster solutions to that problem. Also it seems that we have more things in place than anyone seems to know about. If that’s true of the statewide senate report than you can be sure its true of the average student. And all the other people that these students are likely to interact with that could provide them with guidance to those office and those opportunities. It’s a pervasive problem, yet it’s one that’s really difficult to make sure we’re intersecting with. Because there’s not one single door that they’re all coming through, it requires a careful consideration from all the components. It may well be that student affairs has a principle responsibility, but that responsibility has to be felt from the front desk at Loker Student Union everywhere to people who are selling parking permits, we have to drill this down to help this be effective. **Hagan** said you’re right, we need to have all the people from all of the different areas to be involved in this discussion. Even at the Forum on Campus Violence, there were services we provide on request basis that he didn’t even know about. It’s really communicating out more. There’s been the rationale that a lot of students don’t want to come forward, but they will confide in a person and sometimes it’s in the right place, but sometimes that person doesn’t know. Making sure that the entire campus knows what is available. What does our staff think when they come across someone sleeping in their car at 3:00 a.m.? Do they issue them a tickets for trespassing? We need to make sure that whatever services are available that we make sure everyone is aware of them.

**Senator Vanterpool** said he also would like to speak to the issue of evaluating administrators. He said it was a practice that was routinely done in the recent past. While we’ve had massive turnover of administrators, other factors also have contributed to the bigger picture of why these reviews were not taking place. He recalled that in the past, the Executive Assistant to the President would help monitor this to make sure there was a regular stream of review. **Hagan** said that he does recall it does say that the President’s office is going to keep track of this and he added that they will come up with a process that will work. Hagan commented that there were some bad administrators here despite the process and that it was not about the process of evaluation, what’s important is holding them accountable to do their jobs. He said he believes in evaluation, we have a process and we’ll set goals, and he cannot comment on what it’s going to look like. There were people who went through the process many times and nobody was happy and nothing changed, and he said there should be a process by which you identify information and you’re in discussion with them about their performance and about their goals. We do take it seriously. **Senator Cauthen** spoke with regard to the importance of the Food Insecurity and Displaced Student Report and appreciated Hagan for saying that a large part of the problem had to do with poor communication within the to the university community. Part of that communication problem is sort of systemic problem of going to school in a community university, but getting the word out is more than important. He said from what he’s seen, if the campus community gets the word, the campus community will step up, faculty, students and staff. “As Moore said we need to get a much bigger jump upon the problem than the two year timeframe that seems to be coming down from the Chancellor’s problem. One of the things we established, was an emergency student fund, which was initially looked as a fund that would help with financial crisis around paying your bills, but we’ve had discussions that we need to broaden the charge of that fund, because someone might in fact need a place to stay for a couple of nights. We have to put our money, our efforts and our planning behind our words or we make things worse. We have to commit to that.” **Moore** said one of the reasons he finds it as frustrating since 1991 and has been involved at this institution at a variety of levels and he had no idea who to contact when students were in need. Moore said if he’s having these kinds of problems, what about new hires, adjunct professors who are having these kinds of conversations. It’s a really systemic problem that needs a systemic response. **Hagan** said that’s one of the reasons they included a phone number in the email that was sent out. We do need to make sure people know who to contact. **Thomas** said Hagan’s response to Senator Vanterpool seemed to say that the prior system failed to root out bad administrators. Thomas said he’s not sure on what the new system is going to look like, however that comment brings something important for Thomas, in that he wants to make sure that the new proposed system “has teeth in it” to not have the same type of critique. He appreciates that he’s going to address the issue, but he want to make sure that the new system has some teeth in it that actually leads to people not being able to say, many years later, “well we had some bad administrators during President Hagan’s time.” **Hagan** said it’s probably a fair characterization of what he said, but not exactly what he said. Hagan continue with “it gets to the point that moving out bad administrators implies that that is the solution. There are lots of solutions to work with less than effective administrators. And some of that is identifying what their job is and their goals and holding them accountable. And when they’re not being successful, sit down and have feedback discussions with them to give them an opportunity to improve. There are some cases where it’s just a bad fit, and when we terminate managers, we will often sit down and talk about, we put in a sentence that says you may not seek a job anywhere in the CSU, because we would to move them on to another. I don’t want a process that fails to address issues, but it is not the process alone, do we have clear goals, clear job descriptions, and are they accountable? Some people whose jobs look very little like their job descriptions to which they were hired. The goal is to have the most effective administrators on this campus. The goal is to reduce that and to work to make them better. **Thomas** said he’s not suggesting that he has the solution on “how to create teeth” and he recognizes that there’s a myriad of tools to motivate and/or create the appropriateness in terms of management. His point is that there were shots taken at the previous policy and he wants to make sure that the new policy addresses the shots that were taken. **Hagan** replied, “as best we can”.

Provost Junn’s Report

* [Re-inventing the First Year Experience from the Inside Out](http://www4.csudh.edu/academic-affairs/events/index) – Junn, Kaul, Driscoll, and Franklin were in Houston to discuss the initiatives that we’re taking to improve student success for freshman. Our First Year return rate is the highest it’s ever been, at 93% of the students who came to us in the fall are enrolled in classes in the spring. It will be available on the Academic Affairs website. It’s a joint approach between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. In addition to the Freshman Dream Seminar, we want to make sure we pay attention to all of the students we have, not just the Freshman.
* The Designing Your Life course is for juniors and seniors. It’s currently being done at several different institutions, but the one we’re looking at is at Stanford. It’s a new way to approach complex problems and how you want to solve those problems, so that when you finish you’re degree, what do you want to do when you grow up and help students start to plan their career past baccalaureate. It is one of the most popular courses on their campus. Junn reached out to Bill Burnette and heard back with an invitation to come up and take a look at their approach. Currently it’s a ten week course at two hours a week. He’s taught it eleven times. We’re going to take a small team up there and determine how we could create something like that here for our students. The number one major on campus is Business Administration; over 2100 students are majoring in it right now. The second largest major on campus is Psychology, with 1252 majors. What can you do with a B.A. in Psychology? She said she contacted the Chair of Psychology to ask him, if there are over 1200 students majoring in psychology, what are we are we doing to help them think about their future. How you market your degree will be something all students will confront then they graduate. Many first generations do not have family members who can help them do this. As an institution, this is an area we can add value to our students. We will do this in April and report back and let you know what’s happening and see how we can move this forward.
* Since our campus has such a strong sentiment for part-time faculty, she would like to create an outstanding lecturer award which would only be for lecturers, part time or full-time. Junn said she’s asked Senate Exec to work with AVP Weber to draft the criteria and it would be folded into the regular process that the Honors and Leagues is already doing.

**Moore** commented he’s offered the same sort of course for about a decade, it’s called Anthro 490 and it’s required of students to take the spring semester of their junior year. We have found that it’s almost essential to cap it at 15. **Junn** responded that the class size for the Designing Your Life program at Stanford is about 70 or 80, but break into groups of eight or nine, and have it an all-day event, such as a Saturday. They’re writing a book on it which will be published in September.

ASI Report – given by Proxy Leslie Estrada

* We are preparing to attend the California Higher Education Student Summit that will happen in March in Sacramento. We’ve scheduled a few meetings with several assembly members in order to discuss the issues that we’re facing at Dominguez Hills. Our main focus is student success which would mean to really convince the assembly members to support us with more funding for more resources, especially with the report that came out about displaced student who are homeless and lacking in food, it is something that we’re really going to press. We’ll be speaking with Speaker Elect Anthony Brendon, we are also having a meeting with Shirley Weber who is a part of the Committee of Higher Education, and Roberta Laura who helped write the Dream Act. We really hope that they’ll come and listen to our concerns. If our students don’t have money to eat, they can’t focus and failing their classes; these are bare essentials we really need to focus on first if we want to talk about increasing graduation rates. We want to build relationships with these assembly members and other state officials.

[Academic Affairs Strategic Plan](http://www4.csudh.edu/academic-affairs/strategic-planning/index), Provost Junn - (*report name hyperlinked*)

Provost Junn reviewed the report that was handed out in the Senate package of the draft of the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan. Page 1 described the process they’ve been going through to get to the point they are now with regard to the University Strategic Plan. Academic Affairs is the largest division, and need to make sure that their plan is making progress and in alignment with the University Strategic Plan. Interim Vice Provost, Budget & Strategic Initiatives/ALO Kaul led the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning Committee which met seven times and produced the current draft. What are key fundamental values about that the faculty, staff and Academic Affairs feel about where we want to make progress as we look at the University Strategic Plan. There are eight overarching goals, many of the goals are consistent with the University Strategic Plan, but there are some that add a few other new pieces, like the section goal 7 talks about our sense of historical identity and diversity which maybe wasn’t as clearly delineated in the University Strategic Plan, and innovation. The Deans have received this plan, and some of the colleges the Deans already are engaging the department in trying to figure out what pieces of the AA Strategic Plan does the college want to pursue. What will happen now is that by May the colleges will be working on the college plans as they relate to the University’s in concert with these overarching principals. We plan to host a town hall maybe just before the spring break to see what the progress is, and so that all the faculty are aware of what’s going on in their college level, and to get sort of a pulse. This way we can get our final Academic Plan created in the end of May, after the Deans and other Academic Affairs units submit their plans. The plan is up on the Academic Affairs website, there is also a space to submit feedback, anonymously or otherwise. Now is the opportunity to provide your feedback.

Questions from the Floor

**Hill** asked with regard to the Campus Climate Survey, how was the information from that incorporated into the development of the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan? **AVP Weber** said we did a preliminary run and were planning to go out a second time this month to increase responses. We put together a committee of faculty that will look at the findings and give input into the final report, an executive report, etc. It will be at the end of the semester that we have it all together. **Senator Price** said she understands that there are several different programs that are moving or expanding in Extended Ed. Is that part of the Strategic Plan or an AdHoc kind of thing that’s going on? **Junn** said she spoke with Weber yesterday and perhaps there is a confusion. You cannot move a state funded program to Extended Ed, that would be constituted as supplanting, so we would never make that kind of a trade. Price said, moving maybe not wholesale, but hiring new faculty only in Extended Ed, for an existing program. **Junn** said she would like to speak with Price further because she would never authorize something that would be on the border of working into supplantation. **Price** said she had heard it was occurring with social work and nursing. Junn said that was inaccurate. **Hill** said it is good to bring to the floor of the Senate, but it is seeming to go off into contractual language and may first need to be clarified. **Junn** said she did ask Weber to set up a meeting because she believes there is a misunderstanding, **Weber** said that they’re gathering information with regard to what CFA brought up with the President in the Labor Management Meeting. A meeting will be coming up in a few days, there will be a response once all the information is reviewed. **Hill** asked if the Senate could be included in any outcomes with regard to answers to the questions that have raised on the floor of the meeting today. **Junn** said she will make sure that he is made aware of the outcome.

**\*W EXEC 16-02 – Resolution Regarding Affordable Learning Solutions and the College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015, K. Esposito**

A motion was put on the floor requesting that EXEC 16-02 first reading be waived so that it be a starred item. In order to qualify for the funding we need to have a resolution approved by the Senate. A motion and a second has been put on the floor of the Senate. **Senator Monty** asked what the position of the Statewide was with regard to this resolution. **Hill** said the Statewide Senate Chair is the one who brought this to the Senate Chairs before it was brought to the local Senates. Someone at the Chancellor’s also spoke to it and brought our attention to the website [cool4ed.org](http://cool4ed.org/). **Moore** said he is in support of this resolution, however it’s incumbent upon us if we really want to make a substantive impact on student access, we have to do more than this. There needs to be real significant money behind this. **Senator Vanterpool** said he is also in support of the resolution because it goes along with one of the major agenda items and that is student success. In that vein, he sees the urgency of the matter and will vote in favor. **M/S/P Passed Unanimously**

**Untabling of EPC 14-13: Establish a Review Procedure for Double Counting Major/Minor and Upper Division General Education Courses** M/S/P 36 in favor/1 against/0 abstentions

Second Reading:

**EPC 14-13: Establish a Review Procedure for Double Counting Major/Minor and Upper Division General Education Courses, S Pawar**

**Senator McGlynn** asking why Vice Chair Moore voted against. **Moore** responded that the debate that led to the tabling of the resolution, make a set of points about the possible unknown consequences of the policy change. At the time it was on the floor, several departments were up against the 120 unit wall. We were trying to help those departments out. The concerns that seemed legitimate that the possible consequences we hadn’t had time to work them through. There currently is in place an AdHoc Committee looking at changes to General Education. One of the charges of that committee is to look at the matter of double counting, which was also done at Senate Exec. It’s not a radical departure from practice, but it’s not a uniform policy either. If those concerns are legitimate, Moore said he does not believe they’ve been addressed and there’s a Senate AdHoc Committee and we would profit by waiting to hear their counsel. **Hill** said that it does overlap with the work of that committee. Someone had suggested that the double counting the committee is looking at only pertains to lower division, but Hill said he checked the charge again, and it does just say in the charge that the AdHoc Committee should address double counting of GE. **Vanterpool** said the resolution does seem very timely. He says that because there are students that come to them about this issue, saying they’re so confused, that “this course counts for upper division GE and we have it as counting as a course towards to major, now I have missing courses.” Vanterpool said is what were some of the reservations in the past, rather than putting it off for another time? **Moore** responded that one of the most common concern raised, was how is breadth of the Upper Division GE ensured? **Monty** said he is the person responsible for the return of the resolution. He said he was opposed to the tabling of it last year. The objection about breadth does not make sense to him because it is understood that any course that is approved for double counting would have to meet both program and general education learning outcomes, if the course meets the general education learning outcomes he said he does not care what prefix it has. Monty said other reasons to vote for it is we don’t have a policy right now. What we have stated in the catalog is the summary of the outcome of many individual AdHoc decisions that were made improperly but the General Education Committee which beyond its jurisdiction in approving exceptions to General Education for specific programs that claimed special circumstances. As such we do not have a policy, we need a policy, if it turns out it’s a bad policy and we have to revisit and make revisions, then so be it. Monty said that any policy is an improvement on no policy at all. Many programs in all the colleges across campus can and probably have on the books or could design upper division courses that could meet both program and upper division general education learning objectives. If they were free to do so, we could achieve one of the goals we’ve spoken about in this body for many years without having to overhaul our general education from top to bottom. If students could double count up to six units in a major or a minor in upper division general education that would effectively reduce the number of general education units. If we can do this without undermining the integrity of the major or the general education program, I see no reason why we shouldn’t. **Thomas** said two questions he had is what currently happens right now, other than the exceptions, how is it done at all? The second question is once these decisions are made in accordance with this resolution, are these set in stone and set precedence as it relates to the majors that do apply. **Monty** said currently since there is no policy and since we finally persuaded the General Education Committee that they shouldn’t making decisions like this, when History submitted a proposal for double counting for the major in Upper Division GE, it was kicked back to us saying they cannot do anything until they have a policy from the Senate. At this point when the GE Committees receives a proposal, they’re simply returning them. Each course would need to be approved, any existing or new course would have to go through an individual approval process. Students are only allowed to double count a maximum of six units. **Senator Jacobs** said she would like to speak in favor of the resolution. She said she appreciates that it is laid out clearly what the process is, because at this point it’s done AdHoc. **Senator Heinze Balcazar** said she agrees with Senator Monty and Jacobs. She believes the policy would be fair, if departments wish to, they could apply to have six units to double count. What we have now is exceptions. On behalf of the Department of Women’s Studies it would benefit from double counting. The Women’s Studies minor has been surviving despite the 120 unit limit and this would be very good for Women’s Studies. **EPC Chair Pawar** said her concern is with the rationale is that there were programs that were over 120 units and they were trying to get to 120 units or under. There may be programs currently on campus that may be at 120 units but would like to expand by adding additional courses, say they want to add an additional 6 units, but have been prevented from doing so, but double counting in GE would allow them to. Pawar said she would like the resolution to be very clear on that and if they’re going to double count, they’re going to double count and it doesn’t have to be for programs that are over 120 units. **Monty** suggested two friendly amendments. Under 2nd bullet “a department or program wishing to double count an existing “or new course”. The new course would have to show its alignment with the major requirements or major learning outcomes in GE. **Pawar** recommended instead striking “an existing upper division General Education” so that it reads, “A department or program wishing to double-count a course in its major or minor should submit……..” **Monty** requested eliminating the SMT, SBS, OR HUM acronyms, and instead “the appropriate Area F subcommittee,……”Suggested changes were viewed as friendly. **Senator Haney** said the exceptions are major specific, if a student should change majors, than the GE Double Count falls out and the student is then required to take an additional upper division. The question should be, as Senator Monty said, if it meets the GE objective, it meets the GE objective regardless of what the students major is. Can this be clarified within this resolution? For example recently it has come up in Computer Science where a student changed from Computer Science to another major and had previously satisfied the upper division GE course. **Moore** asked if that was because the Computer Science class did not go through this process? **Haney** responded that they did. **Monty** said it’s a consequence of the AdHoc improper way in which these decisions were made, we’re actually replacing that here with a policy that says they can double count six units, so that any one of those courses would be grandfathered in. A student takes a course that counts towards general education, if the student changes the major, that doesn’t change the fact that they’ve taken a general education course in that area. **Senator Hutton** said that Liberal Studies currently double counts nine units, all in upper division GE, there may be exceptions, as its gone back 30 years. We’re actually taking two of them off our major worksheet. Our program classes, students have to get a “C” or better. But you do not need to get a “C” in order to pass the upper division GE. She said she’s run into students who are given credit for the upper division GE and we make them retake the course because they have less than a C which slows the path to graduation. At this point, we’re only going to double count one. I wasn’t sure if this had been thought through. **Hill** asked if Hutton wished to propose a change stating an exception with regard to Liberal Studies? **Hutton** said she did not. **Pawar** suggested that we include language for what Senator Haney was speaking about. She proposed that another bullet point be added that reads: “Students who complete double counted GE requirements under one academic plan will be considered to have met those requirements if they change out of it.” **Hutton** wasn’t sure if this would work whereby if a student moved from child development for example to liberal studies and they hadn’t taken a course that they had designated as a double counter. **Pawar, Moore and Hill** said that’s your major requirement, they’re still required to take it for their major.” **Heinze Balcazar** added a friendly amendment to bullet #2, last sentence, “This request will be reviewed by the departmental or program curriculum committee. This should also be added under bullet #3, “This request……..”. **Senator Ferris** said he wanted to clarify a point that Senator Monty made about existing procedures that are in place. Would the programs that are already double counting be grandfathered in? **Hill** said he would also assume so in that the resolution is more about the approval process. **Ferris** said he is putting the question out to everyone that the existing set of rules that are already in place. **Hill** asked the Senate body, does everyone believe they understand it to be that way? **Interim Associate Dean Kalayjian** said there are a number of departments, including Interdisciplinary Studies and Liberal Studies that have long had all of the upper division GEs as part of their majors that would not change. **Hill** repeated we all agree that all existing agreements appear to not be affected by this.

**Amended Resolution Passes 34 in favor/0 against/1 abstention**

AVP Weber – Departmental Elections, regarding the interpretation of the current policy. Weber said in our Collective Bargaining Agreement there is a clause, 20.3 that says faculty shall nominate their department chairs. Our policy that was voted on in the Academic Senate in 2014 says that departments may choose to include lecturers in the nomination process for department chair. The resolution came about as a result of a grievance that the CFA filed, that claiming that faculty are faculty, lecturers are faculty, in Article 10 of the contract, that’s how it is used. Therefore if the contract says faculty nominate their department chair, then lecturers should be allowed to participate in the nomination of the department chair. The original proposal that came to the Senate which was agreed upon as a settlement agreement for that grievance, was that it would include lecturers with a 3 year appointment and minimum of .4 time base which is the equivalent of 6 wtu’s and all full-time lectures. It got changed in the discussion in the Senate to simply state departments may include lectures in the nominating process. That’s where it stands. **Moore** said the other part is that it is also a Presidential Memo. The reason the language that was adopted that was adopted was that folks had various issues at the department levels in that should we make it proportional to teaching load? Or are we just going to exclude all those who do not meet that minimum level? What are we going to do? The intention was that the department probably had a better nuanced set of solutions that they could bring to the resolution of how to best include adjunct faculty into this nomination process, which was required by originally by arbitration and now through the Collective Bargaining Agreement. We just had a department who’s used this language to make a decision how to include adjuncts to read as if they were authorized to adopt a policy to exclude all adjuncts. That’s not at all what the idea that was intended. **Weber** said she had not been in support of this resolution when it came through the Senate for some of the ambiguity and it is up to the Senate to fix it. **Price** said in view of the fact that our resolution has been used in a way that seems to be in violation of the contract, does it behoove the Senate to do something about it now and/or amend it, what do we do? **Chair Hill** said there is a procedure on how to amend a past resolution which can be addressed at the next Senate meeting. Vanterpool said yes, time is of the essence, and can be brought back to the floor at the next Senate meeting. **Thomas** said he understands that we’re speaking about whether part-timers can participate in the nomination process, does that also refer to them participating in the actual voting process? **Hill** said the word nomination can sound a little unclear because when the department elects a chair, that election is to nominate a chair candidate to the dean, and that’s the sense in which nomination is used, so the word nomination in that clause is actually usually referring to the thing we usually call the election. **Thomas** said therefore you could be nominated to be Chair? **Hill** said that’s a separate question, but that might be a contractual issue. **Senator Nelson** said she’s also concerned that part-time faculty haven’t been required to come to faculty meetings, so if they have an exclusion, not that they can’t come, but they don’t attend, they’re going to be given the power to elect. And there are far more part-time faculty then full-time faculty. **Monty** recommends that this discussion be deferred until it is on the agenda and have a more full discussion. **Thomas** said his concern is that he’s aware of a few chair elections that are imminent and are strictly limited to tenured/tenure-track faculty. So the notion of “may” is being taken as “may exclude you” is currently going on and he would like to know what we do about those elections or do we need to have grievances over the efficacy of those. **Hill** said we might. **Senator Villanova** said she would hope that when it comes back to the table that you have consulted with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

College of Natural and Behavior Sciences Update, Dean Rod Hay (live link to presentation)

Dean Hay began with the College’s “by-line” providing transformative education in order to transform our students’ lives and the world through Science. We look at that every time we have a Chairs’ meeting. Hay said he cannot do his job without the support of his staff.

* NBS Departments and Programs – Anthropology, Biology, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Behavioral Science, Computer Science and Computer Technology, Earth Science and Geography, Environmental Science, Mathematics, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Social and Behavioral Science, Science Math and Technology, of which there are three administrators, 18 Staff members, 79 (75) TT Faculty, 177 PT Faculty (equivalent of 77FT).
* NBS had 3910 enroll in the fall of 2015, 3430 for the spring of 2016, NBS percent of total FTES is 2670/10876 (University) = 33.8%.
* The NBS Goals for 2015-2016 are Short Term (Year 1), Hire Faculty and Staff (with support, FDC, etc.), Fundraise with Alumni (Development), Mid Term (5 Years), Add Curriculum, Establish Community, University Relationships, Fund Research Mentoring, 60% of students in research, Implemented a Working Budget Planning Process, Move into the New Science Building
* Long Term (> 5 Years), Premiere Research Unit with Established Donor Pool
* From the Board of Trustees: Council of Presidents, their Student Success Initiatives and Metrics are the following: Initiative #1 –Tenure Track Faculty Hiring; Initiative #2 –Enhanced Advising; Initiative #3 –Augment Bottleneck Solutions; Initiative #4 –Student Preparation (Bridge/Early Start); Initiative #5 –HIPs for Student Retention; Initiative #6 –Data Driven Decision Making (Retention)
* Hay spoke about the many gifted faculty members that they’ve hired. 14 positions; 3 staff positions. He said in the last year, they hired an Organic Chemist, Patrick Still, who as a first year faculty member, put on an event for African Americans in Science which was a well-attended dinner that had a speaker from Howard that came out and talked about bio-mass, it was an amazing event. Ximena Cid, Physicist is part of the Society of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science and she’s already contacted that organization and is talking to the local CSUs to put together a working group because their annual meeting is going to be here in Long Beach this year. Not something you would imagine a first year hire to do. This year six more hires, one in Anthropology, two Chemistry lecturers, one in Psychology, two in Sociology. The two sociologist and psychology searches have begun, the last anthropology candidate Hay said he spoke with yesterday (3/1/16).
* With regard to budget – about $5.8 million in faculty salaries, $1.3 million in staff and administration salaries, $3.6 million in part-time faculty. Almost all of the cost of the college is in salaries.
* Science Building, construction will start in 2017 – 2019. When he came 20 years ago we needed a new science building. After the Science Building is complete and we move into it, the NSM building will be renovated. Mostly the push will be the wet labs, the chemistry labs, the bio labs, the hood don’t work, and the ventilation isn’t any good. That construction will be 2019-2020. The architects for the building are C.W. Driver which was decided upon after careful consideration of four different firms.
* Improved facilities – we’ve had some classrooms renovated.
* We want to fix the STEM pipeline, a lot of students come here and don’t want to be Scientist because they don’t know what it is. A combined project between the College of Education and NBS is a Center for Innovation STEM education where students come. We’re trying to get teachers come and get all kinds of support and they have to sign up for five years to teach Science and Math in the surrounding schools.
* One of the Initiatives is improve Women’s STEM. The campus is 65% women on campus. We’ve found if you don’t give support than the numbers start to drop off. We’re not sustainable yet and to continue interest we started a speaker series and have brought in several amazing female scientists. Almost all of the speaker fees we have given to these women were given back to donate to the women’s STEM club.

**Chair Hill** said that at the next Senate meeting there will be an agenda item whereby anyone who has questions about this presentation can bring it up then.

Pre & Post Award Task Force Report Request for Feedback – **Hill** said we would like some substantive discussion at the next Senate meeting with regard to this as we’re supposed to provide feedback to the President’s office by then. We will be breaking down the report, as it has a couple of dozen recommendations. We’ll break it into pieces and those items that have a shorter timescale or higher priority we would need to look at first.

CFA Report – Vivian Price

Thank you signing the pledge card, but we really need people to sign up for picketing as well. It is not a do it yourself strike. We’re going to have a strike school for students, Monday, March 7th from 10 – 2; there is a Lecturers Coffee Hour on March 9th from 10-11 am. It’s also the day that Sonya Sanchez is visiting us and speaking from 1 – 2 at the CSU. March 17th is a Happy Hour from 5 – 7 pm in the pub. And March 21st, there will be another strike school from 3 – 5 pm. There’s an equity conference coming up on March 18th and 19th. If you’re interested, let me know. Lobby Days are March 29th. Price also handed out “Envisioning Transformation” which was a Watt’s Commemoration Symposium on 3/22 and 23rd.

“Which Side Are You On?”

Parliamentarian – Annemarie Perez

The Enrollment Management positions are filled. And we will be asking for people to send in their nominations for Senate Chair.

Meeting adjourned.