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2016-2017 Academic Senate Executive Committee:

Jim Hill – Chair, Laura Talamante – Vice Chair, Annemarie Perez – Parliamentarian, Sheela Pawar – EPC Chair, Kara Dellacioppa – 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

**Senator Peyton** proposed the addition of an agenda item, reopening EPC 16-09 Revision of the University Writing Committee Charge which had been approved in May of 2016. Peyton stated that her reason is that the Grad Council has some concern about the scope of responsibility for graduate writing and how this resolution conflicts with that. Peyton suggested that the item be added after the 3:20 pm time and prior to the resolution on Constitutional Clarification that includes the University Writing Committee in the Constitution. **Senator Furtado** seconded the proposed amendment. **Senator Monty** said he believes it inappropriate to reopen discussion of that resolution because the Senate body does not have it before them and for those who are do not have it before them, they would be working from memory of what happened last year. It would be more appropriate to have it moved to the next meeting so that everyone would have it available to them. Monty said if that would require a deferral of the related item that would be acceptable to him. **Peyton** said she has copies of the resolution. **Hill** asked if Peyton would like to bring the whole resolution back. **Peyton** responded yes, as she would like to add a sentence. **Hill** explained that would need to become a resolution in and of itself. **Senator Oesterheld** stated in the spirit of consultation, she would like to endorse Senator Monty’s comments. **Senator Vanterpool** stated that there is an argument for what the Grad Council wishes to propose, however he supports that it would make better sense to bring it back to the next meeting. **Hill** welcomes some discussion so that we know what needs to be done. **EPC** **Chair Pawar** said she would like some clarification. The issue should come to EPC first given that it was an EPC proposal to begin with. **Hill** responded that the actual resolution would definitely need to go to EPC, but we could have discussion on the floor to determine what’s being brought to the floor some discussion of what the issues are so that it could move along. **Monty** requested that the discussion be limited to three speakers so that we do not get off track with the agenda unnecessarily. **Hill** noted that the amended agenda had not been voted on.

Amended agenda passed by a vote of 28/0/6.

Approval of 3/08/17 Minutes 32/0/5

Chair Hill’s Report:

* This meeting we will review three constitutionally related resolutions that will be brought forward by the Vice Chair. The procedure for amending the constitution is that it will be amended by a vote of the General Faculty. The way it gets brought before the General Faculty is that the Senate votes on the resolution to put it before the General Faculty. If either of these three or some subset of the resolutions pass, Hill said he proposes to have a General Faculty meeting as the first half hour of the next scheduled Senate meeting.

President Hagan’s Report

* Board of Trustees (BOT) Meeting – today was the day that the BOT voted on the tuition increase. It was a met by impassioned speeches on both sides of the issue. The students and a number of faculty, including Dr. Price made strong cases for why students should not have to bear any more of the cost of supporting their education. It went back and forth and there were interesting comments between the Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker of the House about voting against it. It was a good discussion. It felt like there was a sense of what this university should be doing, not only to provide an education for everyone but also being particularly aware of the strong social justice mission that the CSU and that this campus in particular plays a major role in. It wasn’t about this $270.00 increase, it was about all those increases over time. It was about all those failures of getting the state’s resources. It passed by a vote of 11 – 8. A provision was put in there that stated if the legislature allocates the funding then the increase would immediately be rescinded. What it reminded him was that the arguments of the “state of the CSUs” still has to be taken to the steps of the state capitol. When you look at the data about the students who are housing and food insecure, we have to really take stronger action and address these issues. As someone said, this issue will be back next year or the year after and that the existing funding models aren’t working because everyone around the Senate room could identify some real needs in terms of faculty, staff and advisors which costs money. But again, those costs should be borne by the state.
* Hagan noted that later on the agenda will be a report from Dean Huizinga on the research pre and post awards service task force, but he wanted to discuss a couple of things related to that. Hagan said at the last meeting of the search committee for the new Provost where it was asked what the costs were for running the search. The response was that that was more money than is available in the URSCA funding program. Hagan said that struck him because he knew how much money they said they would put towards URSCA. After looking into it, Hagan found that the only dollars that were going into it were the dollars that were coming from the Chancellor’s office. Back 2012, we had agreed to put in $300,000 baseline and $300,000 onetime to support URSCA funding and that the goal was to try to phase out the onetime, so that you would have $600,000 in that program. One of our commitments was to increase our support for fund raising and to increase our support for faculty research. Hagan said he asked Interim VP Naomi Goodwin to look into it and she found that back in 2012 those dollars were not made available as was agreed to. Hagan said he sent a note to Provost Hay and Chair Hill that they will put the $300,000 into baseline URSCA and the $300,000 of one time to get that up to what that should have been going forward.
* Mervyn Dymally African American Political and Economic Institute received some funding from the General Assembly. Part of the agreement was that they would support research policy papers on political and economic issues related to the African American community and other underserved minority communities. Towards that end, we’re trying to put together a RSCA type grant which Hagan said he discussed with Senate Exec. There will be $100,000 in additional funding, and then up to $20,000, we’re expecting about five grants to be funded at that level. There will be another grant program coming up. It is not limited to this institution, but the first round or so will be in terms of getting the communication out. Look for that in the next five to ten days.
* Mellon Mays Undergraduate Foundation is one of the largest funders. They’re trying to get more underrepresented minorities into Humanities. CSUDH and CSUF and perhaps four other CSUs are being considered in being part of their communities PhD program where we will have an opportunity for our students to compete for 18 slots in the CSU. These are just for Humanities students, that’s their goal. If the students get in this program, they’ll support them through parts of the undergraduate degree and support them in their PhD pursuits including summer internships. It’s a great opportunity. They met with a lot of folks here on campus and they left very impressed with the Humanities faculty and students.
* Request to update the Senate on the Strategic Plan – We’ll be doing a presentation at an upcoming Senate meeting and we have a document where we summarized all the goals and where we are in relation to them. We’ll mail it out in advance of the Senate meeting presentation so that everyone has a chance to review it.

Q & A

**Senator Thomas Norman** thanked the President for his report and expressed he wished to put a concrete action item out there in response to the notion that we should be doing more lobbying of which he agrees. Norman noted that in addition to the wonderful Equity Interrupted paper that had come out, there is another paper called the $48.00 Fix which comes up with a specific solution costing out to fix higher education across the state. The taxpayer would pay about a tank of gas to be guaranteed a college education at the UC, CSU, or CC which is what the norm was. From 1960 – 1990, public education was important. The Statewide Senate will report later, Norman said, and his committee led the resolution through and it passed unanimously that the CSU should be looking at very progressive ideas like this to give the tax funding, whether its income tax or a blend of severance tax, etc. to restore us so that we’re not talking about tuition increases but instead, massive tuition decreases.

Provost Hay’s Report

* There will be three Trustees on campus on March 23rd. They’re coming for different reasons. As we continue to make our case that our facilities need to be improved, we’ll make sure they get tours of our temporary buildings while they’re here.
* Attended on behalf of President Hagan, Capital Advocacy Day on March 14th. VP Stewart and David Gamboa was there as well. We met with a number of our legislatures, staffers for Assemblyman Sebastian Ridley Thomas and Senator Van Allen. We also met with Assemblyman Mike Gipson from Carson, Senator Stephen Bradford as well as Speaker Anthony Rendon from Southgate. There were four Presidents along with Provost Hay in the meeting with the Speaker. Hay said what they were doing is making a case for the budget for the CSU. We were asked to do was to push the graduation initiative funding that was received and increase it. The $35 million that was received, our campus received $1.5 million of that. That allowed us to put on $500,000 in more classes, $400,000 in student access with supplemental instructors, student advisors and those kinds of things. A lot of our representatives asked us specifically what they could do for Dominguez, we weren’t there lobbying for Dominguez, we were there lobbying for the System. Though we certainly let them know where we stood as far as our facilities, we let them know where we were as far as tenure track density, which is one of the lowest in the system. We made our case. Hay said he expected that we would have a little bit more of a response, but what he was to learn was that this is not budget season for them. But gain support for us and to make sure that they hear us on a regular basis and they understand our concerns.
* WSCUC – you should have received in your email on Monday, 3/20, the WSCUC draft report. Please take a look at it. There are eight categories on it. I. Introduction II. Compliance III. Degree programs IV. Educational quality V. Student Success VI. Quality Assurance and Improvement VII. Sustainability and item #VIII. Conclusion. Hay encouraged everyone to read through it and offer any comments which can be done online. Additionally there will be a WSCUC Town Hall on April 11th where we will talk about the report and break up into subgroups to discuss areas of the report you feel most comfortable discussing. We’re in good shape and be in better shape after your involvement on April 11th.

RESOLUTION

**\*W FAC 17-04 In Memoriam of Porfirio Sanchez** – Senator Heinze Balcazar read aloud resolution \*W FAC 17-04 in honor of Dr. Sanchez who passed away February 13th, 2017. It was suggested that the last whereas clause be changed from “this year”, to “2017”. **Resolution passes unanimously**

Amended agenda item: Limited discussion on issues with EPC 16-09: Senator Peyton

Peyton thanked the members of the Senate for giving the Graduate Council the opportunity to talk about their concerns. They would like to open EPC 16-09 because they feel that the policy that was voted on last May should reflect a jurisdiction over undergraduate writing. Peyton added that she believed that many who voted on it assumed that it had to do primarily with oversight over undergraduate writing. She said the ask is that the Senate reconsiders the policy and that there isn’t a lot to change other than to add a sentence in the beginning that suggests that the information in the policy is directed to the oversight of undergraduate writing only. What has happened during the last Senate the UWC brought forward some initiatives for changes in the university catalog that affect the admissions of graduate students as it relates to the GWAR and we would like to take issue with that. According to Peyton, the problem with the current situation and the way we approach the GWAR; it causes students not to be able move forward. It causes students who are coming from other campuses to actually wind up in the cue and have a delay in their progress. Peyton said, “We feel that the Graduate Council and the Graduate Faculty should actually have oversight of writing in the discipline and part of achieving the Master’s degree is having students able to write in the discipline that they are pursuing the degree in. Hill said there are several different issues there, one of writing within the discipline, as well as entrance requirements. Peyton said and third that the policy be changed to the undergraduate focus. **Dean Huizinga** said we currently have over 2,000 graduate students enrolled in our 22 programs; 12,000+ undergraduate students. Out of the 2000 students, 500 come from our sister campuses, they received their degrees at sister institutions. Long Beach being the number one feeder. 50% of the students come from UCLA. Huizinga said that at the last Senate meeting that there was proposed change for the catalog to align it with what currently is policy for GWAR. The GWAR policy is dated and does need to be revised. Whatever language was proposed last time, changes what has been in practice for quite some time. It would affect and create a barrier to graduation for those 500 students who come to us from other CSUs. In the past, we would have a practice of reciprocity. Before we include language like this in the catalog, we need to consult with graduate advisors. Graduate Council are people who mentor graduate students and advise them. **Hill** said that Senate does not have a direct role in approving catalog copy, it was actually brought here so that there could be some discussion. **Vanterpool** said he sees two principles here – one is the reciprocity principle and there is the presumption of academic expertise having to do with the Graduate Council advisors and faculty. It’s a favorable presumption that they know what they’re doing. Vanterpool said he does not see what makes the request to limit the jurisdiction of the University Writing Committee (UWC) so burdensome, he said he actually sees it as very wise. It’s not going to give the committee any further work. It seems we are wisely dividing up supervision, undergraduate and graduate. **Senator Oesterheld** said as a member of the UWC GWAR at both the undergraduate and grad level has always been at the purview of the WCC, now named UWC. When this new charge was updated for the UWC, there was no change made in terms of that committees customary and traditional oversight of GWAR as both a graduate and undergraduate policy. The UWC last semester did reach out to the Graduate Council to discuss this pressing matter of a discrepancy in requirements that native Dominguez Hills student were being held to that was inequitable relative to how students who were coming in from other CSUs were being treated with regard to GWAR. We reached out to Grad Council but did not receive any response. The catalog copy under question is to correct an inequity that is currently penalizing our own students. Until the catalog copy accurately reflects the policy Dominguez Hills, the ones that come from undergrad to grad are the ones being penalized. **Huizinga** said this language was in the catalog for 12 years, why is it pressing now? She added, it is pressing now because two years ago Graduate Council requested a change, let’s make it better for all students, not worse for students coming in from other CSUs. **Oesterheld** responded that she heartily agrees with Huizinga on this matter. The inequity has been in place for that long. It came to the attention of then Provost Junn made it a priority for the UWC and Grad Council to resolve it. This does reflect a couple of years’ worth of attempts to address it. Inequity has stood for far too long, its seriously long overdue in being addressed. It’s an inequity that’s been reported to those who have ultimate oversight all throughout those years, but this is the first time there’s been a real concerted effort to changed it. In the previous Senate meeting, when Siskanna Naynaha was giving the report of catalog copy, there was an exchange about roles and propriety of who should be doing what. Oesterheld said on behalf of Naynaha and the UWC, the UWC welcomes the Graduate Council’s plans for revising the GWAR requirement, but also, we would like very much as a group with certain amount of expertise in the teaching of writing, and in the case of Dr. Naynaha, writing across the curriculum. We appointed her as campus leader in that regard, and we ask that we have inclusion of the UWC in whatever kinds of proposals or policies that are put forward. **Peyton** said she wished to clarify that at the time Grad Council was asked to give a response, we were not ready to respond. That was the email that was sent to Dr. Naynaha. Peyton said she believes that the changes to the catalog did go forward without an interaction between the two committees. That may have been because of this EPC policy which would allow you to assume that all of that is within your jurisdiction. We do have input to GWAR and with regard to inequity, our concerns are about students that come out of other CSUs that we do not recognize that they’ve met the GWAR requirement on their home campus, when they arrive here, they have to digress and pass some additional testing or take a 300-level course. On the issue of writing, Peyton said she believes that graduate faculty are usually the responsible parties for writing across the curriculum within their discipline. **Senator Tang** said he wished to discuss this issue from two perspectives, one if from his own department, Computer Science and the other is from faculty who advise graduate students on their graduate thesis projects. In any departments for students who have a thesis or Master’s project they need to be able to write. In his department, Tang said they all agree that the students lack the necessary writing skills. Not because the English grammar or vocabulary, it’s because of the technical writing. How to integrate the specific aspects of computer science into a thesis. In his first four years at Dominguez Hills, he was asking his students to write, but last year he gave up, he said he was wasting their time and his time. They do not have any training of technical writing. Tang felt that each department would have their perspective of how to get their students to graduation by having a presentable thesis. **Hill** said we seem to be looking at a strong case for the possibility of changing the policy, at least one. There are a couple of policies that are related here, which is a separate issue from the charge in itself. These are all separate but strongly related to the catalog copy question which is not necessarily that comes to Senate. Hill said that as a Chair he would like to ask all of the groups to come together and talk, which includes the Grad Council, UWC, Senate Exec (including EPC) and the Provost Office, it would seem that Vice Provost should be involved in these discussions. Hill said it was mentioned that there are statewide Senate resolutions that need to be brought into the discussions. With not much of the semester left, we need to figure out if we can get some resolution written that would accommodate a well thought view of what changes might be necessary.

**\*W EXEC 17-05 Resolution for Constitutional Clarification – Vice Chair**

**Vice Chair Talamante** asked Senator Peyton is today’s discussion about the first of the three resolutions cause her not to want to bring up the first resolution as it relates to the UWC. **Peyton** responded yes, that was why she wanted the discussion to precede the resolutions related the Constitution. Until we have clarity on the role of the UWC, we probably should not include them in the Constitutional change. **Talamante** said if given that this is only about the inclusion of the UWC as a standing committee, does Peyton still feel that way. **Peyton** responded yes. Talamante moved to have the second reading be waived on EXEC 17-05 as a \*W resolution. Motion was seconded. **Vanterpool** suggested “de-starring” the resolution because it is premature now to move forward with it. It depends what will come forward with the reintroduction of EPC 16-09. **Senator Monty** asked how exactly does the issue raised by Senator Peyton implicated in the changes that are being considered to the constitution. Its status will be defined as a standing committee, but the nature of that committee and its jurisdiction is an unrelated matter. **Peyton** said she felt its premature given the prior discussion and that first we should clarify the role. Peyton said she does not see any harm in bringing it back around at a point and time in which we have clarity. **Oesterheld** said not too many years ago the changes of the General Education committee and the Curriculum Committee were changes and yet their status as standing committees was not altered. If there are going to be changes to the UWC’s charge that its overarching status should be in anyway affected. **EPC Chair Pawar** said that she agreed with what Senator Oesterheld just said but that if there were to be any change that Senate would have greater control over the committee if it were a standing committee of the Senate, so I would think you would want to make it a standing committee of the Senate. **Statewide Senator Thomas Norman** said he wanted to speak fully supporting what Senator Monty said. These are high level constitutional issues. We’re looking to clarify issues on lecturer representation, looking to include electronic voting. Norman urged the Senate to close discussion soon and move forward discussing the resolutions. **Hill** said the other two resolutions are technically decoupled from this discussion so far. **Peyton** wondered if it would work out if we were to take the UWC out and left the other changes until such time we have clarity on the role. Peyton said she was not entirely supportive of the UWC as a standing committee. As the chair of Grad Council why isn’t Grad Council a standing committee. Why is there such urgency to address this at this moment? **Hill** said as of last year, the UWC was a standing committee, it’s just being included in the list within the Constitution. **Peyton** responded that’s why she wanted to bring EPC 16-09 up today. **Hill** said we need to get something to the floor before we can discuss altering language. **Vanterpool** said he now is inclined towards the argument of what Senator Monty said, it does see the relevance and since this will have no relevant bearing on what will result from reintroducing the original resolution in question that we go forth. **Hill** said he is calling for a vote for the waiver of a 2nd reading so we can have a full discussion. **2nd Reading Waiver Passed – 28/0/2**

**Talamante** presented the resolution stating that this came about as a result of an Ad hoc committee that was approved in the fall to see if there were areas in the Constitution that needed clarification. The clarifications that are being proposed deal only with the changes that were approved in EXEC 16-07 Definition of General Faculty; to reflect current Senate Committee Charges along with current policies and to correct punctuation, typos or grammar. Talamante then reviewed the proposed changes/clarifications aloud. **AVP Weber** said that organization of the Academic Senate if you’re changing and correcting the definition of faculty, when you’re looking at how Senators are assigned, if we’re including all lecturers as faculty and you’re still using this assignment of Senators as per number of faculty in a department, you’re perhaps unintentionally going to end up expanding the number of Senators. Equally sized departments may have unequal numbers of faculty just by virtue of the number of lecturers within a department. Weber said she suggests that this be looked at and reconsidered. **Vanterpool** said for this purpose are we talking about any classification of a lecturer or a full-time lecturer? **Hill** responded any, except for the grad students. **Vanterpool** said it goes to the issue of departments that neither allow part-time lecturers to be voting members in their department meetings. What does this mean for being a department that conducts its meetings with tenure, tenure track, full-time faculty who have the right to vote. The problem when you go into departments with large numbers of part-timers and you’re talking about Senate representation, what does that do? **Hill** said as a point of clarity, the Senate resolution before actually said that all part-time faculty ought to be able to vote in the departmental elections and it was with a full vote. That was what was already passed by Senate last year. **Pawar** said she agrees with what Senator Vanterpool just said with the knowledge that we’ll come back to that point as it will need more discussion then we’re able to give it today. **FPC Chair Dellacioppa** said she struggles to get one faculty member in a large department to come here and she can’t imagine getting three. **Senator Thomas** asked with regard to the resolution that had been passed last year where all part-time faculty have a vote in Chair elections, [**Hill** interjected departmental elections]; that was what was included. **Thomas** said it becomes important in terms of representation for this body right now. Thomas said his question, but not his position, is who qualifies. If someone teaches in the fall, but not the spring or in the summer but not the fall and spring. If they taught two years ago, but not this semester. I understand that we’ve taken the approach that all of them have a full vote, but how do we define “all of them”. That is critical and would like a definitive answer. We have chair elections moving forward; and we’re unclear. If it’s just in the semester that the election occurs, you could easily see that where something could be crafted. It is important to get clarity. It felt good to say everyone has a vote, but if you’re not here every semester – I’m not sure you know you have a vote and I’m not sure if we intended for you to be included if you taught a class here eight years ago. **Hill** said he agrees, we will need to revisit that resolution and make sure there’s clarity. **Senator Villaneuva** said in speaking to CSU colleagues and lecturers across the CSU system and comparing the Academic Senate to other CSUs, other CSUs are oriented to including lecturers as General Faculty, they’re not given special positions in the Academic Senate. They’re faculty within their department, they can represent their department. There are other senates that allow not just two but many lecturers s part of the Academic Senate. The issue here is bigger than this. The issue here is that any way you see it, the hiring of tenure track faculty and the participation of tenure track faculty has to increase. Across the CSU, these changes are happening. **Hill** said that the change that is suggested in this resolution was supposed to align what we already have in the current language. **Peyton** asked what the faculty density is across departments? **Hill** said separate from this, that data is available and actually will be presented later on in this meeting.

**Resolution passes 27/0/4**

**\*W EXEC 17-06 Resolution for Clarification of Lecturer Representation, Vice Chair Talamante**

Talamante moved to present the resolution to waiver of the 2nd reading. M/S/P 28/0/1

Talamante presented resolution, proposing to amend the constitution to include all non-tenure track faculty so that lecturers on campus whether they have a part-time lecturer contract or a full-time lecturer contract could serve as senators in the two at-large positions. The language change is from two at-large representatives of the non-full-time faculty to two at-large representations of the non-tenured-track faculty. Discussion ensued requesting clarity around the intention of the change. **Villanueva** said you’re guaranteeing two seats for lecturers in the Academic Senate, that doesn’t mean that above a third lecturer cannot serve. **Talamante** said this refers to the at-large positions. **Villanueva** said faculty is faculty. **Thomas** said that his sentiments last year is that they did not want to create two tiers of faculty as it related to voting rights. Thomas said he wants to make sure that we’re remaining consistent with that spirit in terms of not saying that our part-time faculty, which represents 60% of our faculty, have diminished rights as faculty in terms of participation in the Senate. This might be a wonderful opportunity to increase the pool of faculty who would be interested in serving. If we’re merely talking about there being two at large positions and the fact that faculty should be able to serve regardless of their full-time/part-time status is then that is in spirit with what we’ve been discussing. But to the extent that we’re putting a ceiling at two and saying you do have your two spaces, Thomas says he finds that highly problematic and inconsistent. The **Parliamentarian Perez** explained that part of the reason for this change is that a number of faculty who are part-time don’t see themselves as part-time because they’re actually teaching full-time. There’s some confusion that they have about whether or not they can apply for these positions and whether they should be voting in the part-time faculty election that is held each spring. **Vanterpool** said the elephant in the room remains the number of lecturers that we’re dealing with. Let’s not be premature in voting on something. The union contract has specific language on this. There are consequences for going in whatever direction we go with on this piece. **Talamante** said for this particular change the pool we’re talking about are 28 additional lecturers who have a status of full-time. The current language does not make it clear that they can also be at large representatives. **Vanterpool** said he sees the relevance of the full-time lecturer, but we have this kind of vagueness that leaves us without specificity. Vanterpool said he wants to see all lecturers be involved and be engaged and do service, because this is also service. **Senator Price** said it seems if we inserted a parenthesis and clarified what we meant by non-full-time faculty. Price said that perhaps a clarification could be inserted there. Senate discussed possible clarifying language. **Statewide Senator Esposito** said she would like to make sure we’re addressing how do we better enable everyone to be included. Dean LaPolt said if we specify part-time and full-time lecturers, we’re leaving out counselors and coaches which are also part of the General Faculty. **Dellacioppa** said that she’s heard the suggestion from lectures and other people in CFA about possibly lecturers for attending meetings if it’s not in their workload. **AVP Weber** said that there are part-time librarians, tenure track librarians, etc. **Talamante** presented the new suggested language: “(part-time and full-time lecturers, counselors, librarians and coaches)”. **Hill** said the words non-tenured track faculty is in front of the parenthesis already. **Thomas** said he supports the change but he also wants to take the opportunity to address the “elephant in the room”, how many are going to have rights and do they have rights in one semester and not another. Thomas said he would like this properly put on the calendar, maybe not this semester but the next. **Talamante** assured Thomas that it would be a priority if not for this semester then for next.

**Resolution to bring this to a vote of the General Faculty passes 30/0/4**

**\*W Exec 17-07 Resolution for the Amendment of the ASCSUDH Constitution to Allow Electronic Voting, Vice Chair Talamante** Talamante brought it to the floor to waive a 2nd reading which passed unanimously. Talamante presented the changes. **Senator Haney** suggested that the word “**should**” be taken out of the sentence “The General Faculty vote ~~should~~ be conducted electronically for the best representation of the General Faculty.”

**Resolution passes unanimously.**

Chair Hill announced that the GE Ad Hoc update would be postponed to another meeting.

**Response on Tenure Density, AVP Weber**

**Weber** described that the handout that she was sending around was a follow-up from a previous Senate meeting where she presented to the Senate per the Senate request the tenure density of the campus and other CSUs. She said we’re at about 41% tenure density and Channel Islands is a little lower than CSUDH. Tenure density is the full-time equivalent faculty of tenure, tenure track faculty divided by the full-time equivalent of all faculty. She noted that in this case, it’s the full-time equivalent of faculty within a department divided into the full-time equivalent of the tenure/tenure track faculty. Its specifically instructional faculty, so it doesn’t include coaches or librarians, and it would include the time base that department chairs have as department chairs. It would be a fraction of time base as department chairs. **Hill** said that next time the Provost will be giving an explicit separate agenda item about policies and procedures regarding distribution of tenure track lines. **Senator Nelson** said it did not seem to make sense for the College of Education. **Weber** said these data were pulled from PeopleSoft so if departments aren’t categorically within what is going on in your college, you are correct. There are some things off with CBAPP and COE. It’s a conversation to have with your ARM on how these classifications are set up. **Monty** thanked Weber and its very telling data and integrated into our academic planning going forward and asked if she could provide a key and the formula on how these figures are determined? **Senator Radmacher** said yes, a key would be very helpful. **Weber** suggested to email her as department chairs. She said she has it broken down with a list of faculty within departments. It’s census data from Fall of 2016.

**Research, Enterprise Pre & Post Award Service Task Force Report Update, Dean Huizinga**

**Huizinga** shared a presentation, giving a brief history and formation of the Task Force. She explained the various recommendations that were made by the Task Force and where they are in relation to implementing and addressing those recommendations. Huizinga gave an overview of her department and introduced two members of her office, Judith Aguirre, Research Compliance Officer and Gillian Fischer, Director of Sponsored Research and Programs. Both Aguirre and Fischer introduced themselves. Aguirre had been with CSUDH for a while and has expanded her areas of concentration and expertise including compliance for any research having to do with animal. Fischer is relatively new to CSUDH but has 17 years of experience at the UC’s and 4 years within CSU. Also introduced was Russell Statham who is the liaison between Foundation and the Research and Pre & Post Award Department. Statham pointed out that they’ve had and will continue to offer various training on how to do business with the Foundation and how to view your account online, etc. **Price** said she’s impressed by the work that Huizinga has done and the help that they’ve given faculty. Price recommended something that might be useful would be to have faculty discussions on topics such as “What is it like to get this grant”, and have panels. “What is it like to meet program officers, what is it like to do the proposals. Demystifying the process would be helpful. Once you get the grant, what does that mean? What does it mean to get a Fulbright? **Huizinga** said we do have a Grant Writing Academy. **Price** said sometimes people do not have three days to designate to something like this and doing a panel or a brownbag lunch would allow more to participate. **Talamante** thanked Huizinga and said she did participate in the first Grant Writing Academy and found it very helpful. She too would like to see more workshops offered. The more we can do to help create a culture visible and the process we go through to do that would be very helpful.

Reports

Parliamentarian Annemarie Perez – the nomination forms have been sent out for both Senate Chair and Statewide Senator. The forms need 51 signatures and we’re having people both print their name and sign it. Forms are due back to the Senate office by April 7th. Thomas asked how did we come up with that calculation as there was obviously an interpretation on who is considered faculty. Perez said each time we need to run an election, we have Faculty Affairs generate a list, which only include those who are currently teaching. Tenure track faculty who are on sabbatical are included, those who are FERPING are not.

FPC Chair, Kara Dellacioppa – no report

EPC Chair, Sheela Pawar - 4/12 Senate meeting we will have the resolution on Course Modality Instruction ready. EPC is also working on undergraduate planned leave and the definition of super senior. We should have something by the 26th of April if not before. We were working on a proposal having to do with advisement holds, however Susan Black retired suddenly and we really need the input of someone from advising.

Statewide Senate Report – Thomas Norman thanked the campus for taking the lead on the DACA resolution. The statewide Faculty Affairs Committee was able to draft a resolution based on that passed unanimously. The Saving California Master Plan Through Tax Reform was approved. One that’s been tabled but Norman said he will continue to give feedback on is Employment Security for Contingent Faculty, Librarians, Coaches and Counselors. We were asked to refer that back and make sure changes. We’re working with CFA on that and it would ultimately have to be bargained to create some of the new categories that are under consideration. One that Norman said he had not mentioned before is Opposition to President Trump’s Executive Orders that restrict travel from several Muslim countries. That was approved without dissent.

CFA Report, CFA Co-President Vivian Price

A survey had been sent out to lecturers to try to understand what the experience from lecturers are in terms of pay is on this campus as opposed to other campuses. We’re creating a report for that so that we can share it with administration. We’re asking for equity for lecturers because we’re seeing that we’re losing very good lectures to nearby campuses because they pay more. We’re going to be reporting on that as well as the other research we’ve done in terms of the funding formula and how it affects Dominguez Hills. Tentatively April 13th for a luncheon. We’re trying to find a space on campus. We’re also conducting a membership campaign. The Supreme Court may be making decisions about public sector unions and it’s going to be very important for our members to be signed up and active. Otherwise we may find ourselves stripped of a lot of dues and unable to provide the services that we once have. In light of these attacks there is a conversation about dues increase for CFA. Right now, we pay less than the community colleges do. Every penny counts. We pay 1.05%, the conversation is about paying 1.35%. It may happen this summer. Stay tuned. **Norman** asked if there will be a vote on the increase by the general membership? **Price** said she believed that it was just a vote by the delegates.

Open Mic

**Charles Thomas** asked at what meeting we would be having a presentation on the Campus Climate Survey that was done a year ago? **Hill** said on April 26th. **Thomas** asked if we would be getting a copy of the documentation beforehand? **Weber** said Senator Avila is one of the faculty members who is on the committee. We’ve met with the Academic Senate last week and worked out a schedule. It will go back to Senate Exec before it comes to the floor. Weber said the data distribution will be up to Senate Exec.

**Senator Ledesma** reported that the Department of Nursing was fortunate enough to obtain a grant to provide Basic Life Support (BLS) courses in our lab at a reduced cost. Most of the BLS courses are about $50.00 and up. We’re just charging $10.00. It will be open to faculty as well as students. We’re advertising that on our website. If you could let your students know. Ledesma said that they would be bringing the information to the ASI board as well.

**Meeting adjourned.**