**Academic Senate Minutes**

**April 9th, 2014**

**Voting Members Present**: Aguilar, Belu, Berezan, Bowles Eagle, Chai via (proxy – Welch), Dales, De Velasco, Erbe, Ferris, Gould, Heinze-Balcazar, Herbert, Holguin, Jacobs, Krochalk, Kulikov, Lopez-Morin, Magruder, Manalo, McGlynn, Monty, Park, Parker, Peyton, Pinto, Pitchon, Tang, Thomas, Wang, Wilkins, Victor via (proxy – Sneed), Zenhari

**Voting Members Not Present:** Ernst, Etcheto, Fitzsimmons, Furtado, Ganezer, Kaplan, Leonard, Navarrete, Niederman, Oesterheld

**Voting Ex-Officio Members Present:** Coward, Esposito, Fawver, Kalayjian, Hagan, Hirohama, Moore, Pitts

**Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present:** Jones

**Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present:** Bersi, Furusa, Joshi, Junn, Manriquez, Parham, Zitelli

**Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present:** Borrego, Bragg, Chlebicki, Hay, Lovitt, Maki, Poltorak, Wen

**Guests:** Jose Prado, Laura Robles, Clare Weber, Ben Zhou

**2013-2014 Academic Senate Executive Committee:**

Jerry Moore - Chair, Caroline Coward – Vice Chair, Matt Jones – Parliamentarian, Kate Esposito – EPC Chair, Caroline Coward – FPC Chair, Kate Fawver and Pat Kalayjian – Statewide Senators

Recorded and Edited by SEW and the Executive Committee

Meeting Called to Order 2:30 PM

Approval of Agenda MSP

Approval of Minutes MSP with 1 Abstention

**2:35 PM Chair Moore’s Report -** Chair Moore opted to forgo his report but wanted to highlight two important announcements:

* **Next Senate Meeting will be NOT be held in the Loker Student Union, instead will be held in the Extended Education Building Room 1213**
* **Next Senate Meeting will be chaired by Caroline Coward, Vice Chair of the Senate**

**2:40 PM President Hagan’s Report –** Hagan reported that they started Campus interviews for VP Admin/Finance, there is a 2nd candidate coming in next week. We will likely have 3-4 total candidates. The goal is to have the position filled before the end of the semester. There may be some search fatigue out there, please hang in, and if things go well, we’ll likely increase your search fatigue by hiring more faculty. It’s a lot of work, but in the end it’s good for the campus. So I appreciate you hanging in there.

**Efficiency:** Rolling out a procurement card “Pcard” on a much wider basis than this campus has previously done. It will make a big difference in terms of the speed of processing. On this campus 10,000 invoices were processed last year, of that number 28% were under $100.00. The Pcard is going to be rolled out to the people the Deans identify should have one. We’re going to allow commodities to be purchased up to $2,500.00. We believe we can increase efficiency, increase the speed by which people get things done. Allow the purchasing staff to take care of other things that need to be done in terms of processing things. More details to come. In another area in terms of efficiency, Dominguez Hills won two system wide awards for energy efficiency. The Energy Efficiency & Sustainability Best Practice Awards were for Lighting Design/Retrofit and Monitoring-Based Commissioning. This can help to reduce waste and monitor energy usage leakage and reduce cost where they find spikes.

Spoke with Senate Exec about a pilot interdisciplinary grant program. While we know we still need to invest in fixing the foundation, we also want to try some new things. Something we will work out with the University Committee on Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, basically fostering interdisciplinary grants, it may be $100K-$200K in one time funds for a series of grants for whatever is deemed appropriate. The main goal is to encourage faculty and perhaps grad students to submit grant proposals that will require that it be more than just in your area. If it works out well we’ll see if we can work something out on a permanent basis. This is not taking away from the current RSCA program, this is in addition to that.

**Inauguration** – the real importance of the Inauguration is an opportunity to showcase the campus. There is a lot of talk about the Investiture itself, but I wanted to remind everyone that there’s a whole week of Inaugural activities with service learning - community engagement; faculty lectures including one by our senate chair; a focus on our Student and Faculty Research – many good things happening that week, to the extent that if you can make it I would appreciate it. I’m grateful to say that over 100 faculty members have agreed to march in the procession. I tried to get the exact numbers on the Investiture dinner which we combined with the President’s Scholar’s dinner, I believe last year we raised $150,000 for the President’s Scholars, our goal was $200,000 this year and already we’re up to $250,000 and we’re expecting several more donations to be made, and a couple of them are quite significant, in the six figures. The Investiture has allowed us to go out and ask for additional donations to sponsor us and one of the goals is to have this event covered as much as possible by non-state funds. Hopefully we’ll have raised sufficient non state dollars to exceed the President’s Scholars goals from the past and also cover the bulk of this event.

Our fiscal folks have worked out the **installment plan** that we said we would put in place for the student success fee, allowing students to pay over a set of five installments instead of the current three. That took quite a bit of work to synchronize with the financial aid disbursements. That program will stay in place whether or not the student success fee is approved. I just want to remind you that the Chancellor has not acted on that as he’s been out of town. We’re setting the scholarship grant program related to the success fee and that is going to go forward regardless of whether the student success fee is established. Provost Junn reminded me that as of right now, only 10% of the students use the installment plan, so we think that if students have a true need for more time, the extra two payment should take care of most of that.

The **University Planning Committee** is still doing their work. They’ve taken the feedback they’ve received from different venues and forums and they’re putting that together as they work on the goals and the objectives. They’ll put a plan together that the campus can react to and in the beginning of the fall semester we’ll have a stakeholders meeting. We’ll share a draft and get a final review of it with those on campus who are interested in the outcome. The plan is going forward and it is a plan which we can use to truly ignite our resource allocation decisions. **Questions?**

**Senator Monty** asked with regard to Interdisciplinary grant program are we talking about grant applications for projects with instructional applications or are we talking about research projects or both? **Hagan:** responded by saying “both”. It needs to be decided what the best way to handle it is. One of the suggestions from Senate Exec is that it could also be offered to grad students as well. I’m not opposed to that nor do I have a preconceived notion as to which way it should be run. Whatever way makes sense for the campus. **Chair Moore** wanted to know when did President Hagan envision a call for proposals. **Hagan** replied “in the fall.” He said, “We want to sit down with those who currently run the program and explore how we’re defining interdisciplinary.” **Hagan** said that it was not a definition for him to make, it’s a definition for people who are engaged in this. He believes it will take the rest of the semester to come up with this.

**Hagan** also mentioned that we received and approved the resolutions that came from the Senate on processes for moving and approving resolutions and classification and funding of part time faculty. We now have in place a process so that documents that come from this floor don’t die somewhere along the way. **Belu** wanted to know if there was any timeframe for classification being done and what would the worst case scenario be. **Hagan** responded he’s not fully sure because money was set aside for staff compensation and believed they would start off with the lowest paid staff, but then saw that different unions had different requirements. Then it was thought that they would go by seniority – and what was discovered was just because there is a good idea, implementation isn’t as simple. They needed to know what the scope of the problem was, which they have identified as a $900,000 problem. Then the question became, how to handle it. Questions like: Do you take the people who are newly misclassified and fix them. Do you take the people who have been misclassified the longest and fix them? Do you sit back and say we don’t have $900,000 to fix all of them at once so do you make a plan to take care of it over a 2-3 year period? Hagan said these are the kinds of the challenges the Provost and their folks will work out. He stated, the main commitment is we’re going to solve the problem.” **Junn** agreed, there has been some complications with the union rules and different seniority issues – we’re working very closely with Weber and the Chancellor’s office to figure out what will be the best and most equitable way to proceed. **Moore** replied even if the exact date wasn’t clear, was there a general goal of when they would try to bring this forward. **Hagan** – a new fiscal year begins July 1. We’ve been working with Bob Lovitt to try to understand all the dollars we have. I’d like to add that most of the presidents were under the impression that we were allowed to go over our enrollments by 5%, which impacts the amount of revenue that we bring in. There has been a big debate back and forth between the presidents and the Chancellor’s office because now they’re officially saying we’re only allowed to go 3.5% over, which is $1 million + impact on our budget. Things we had in mind that were easier are now $1 million short. We’re still having the debate. I would say for the fiscal year beginning July 1, and then having a good sense of the dollars that we have, we will figure out how much money we have to put towards the problem and begin to initiate it right away. It’s been a long standing problem and we need the issue solved as quickly as possible. We will be rolling into the summer and fall and move this issue along.

**2:55 PM Provost Junn’s Report –** Junn reported that the **University Planning Committee** has been meeting very assiduously over the semester and we’re almost done. We have two more meetings, two 3 hour marathon meetings to complete the goals. I can tell you in general we have used all the feedback from the focus groups and the Town Hall meetings. It looks like we’re coming down to have six goals instead of how ever many we had in the original plan, with no more than four objectives per goal. The strategies are being worked on now and ready to give back to the campus and that should happen in the 1st week of May. We’ll get that out to you as soon as the UPC completes their initial draft.

Junn wanted to inform the faculty of a possibility to get involved in the **Stanford Gates Grant funding**. Junn was contacted by Candace Thille who used to be at Carnegie Melon where she helped to start the Open Learning Institute, OLI. Thille has now moved to the College of Education at Stanford. She has a long history of working with Gates and many other foundations. Junn met her one and a half years ago and Thille is very interested in developing a grant that includes the UC’s, the CSU’s and community colleges. Junn described Thille as a cognitive scientist very interested in learning environments particularly as they relate to 1st generation learners. Junn said that Thille came to her and also went to Monterrey Bay, where she knows Eduardo Ochua. Both of CSUDH and Monterrey Bay have large numbers of underserved students and she has also partnered with two community colleges, Foothill and Deanza, as part of this grant opportunity. Thille has not yet decided if she’s going to go with Berkeley or UCLA for the UC system. It’s a five year multi-million dollar grant and Thille said she is coming to us to see if we have faculty who might be interested in developing courses that are from Gates point of view, hard courses, math courses, statistics, GE kinds of courses, high enrollment and high failure rate kinds of courses. To develop highly interactive hybrid, online kinds of courses that insure success of first generation learners. Junn responded to Thille that she was sure we do have some and that she would talk about it with the campus. Junn asked Thille when the grant was due and Thille said that she doesn’t really have a proposal, as this is, “we invite your campus to write a grant”. Thille said she can turn it in whenever she’s ready. She is willing to come to CSUDH campus, and will be here on April 29th, the same day that Moore will be speaking. Junn thought maybe Thille could be tabbed in before Moore speaks. Thille will be available from 9 – 12. Junn offered that the first hour she can speak with interested faculty and 2nd hour she can meet with the Senate Executive committee and some other key leaders. Junn said there will be a schedule and she wanted to alert the Senate because if there are faculty members who have online or hybrid courses and really care about underserved students in these larger difficult courses, than they should talk to Thille. Right now she is limiting it to just our two campuses, and Junn let her know that she needed to check with the faculty to see if they want to do this or not. And if it didn’t seem like something CSUDH wanted to do, Thille will go to another campus, but she’s reaching out to us first. She’s writing a white paper to summarize what she thinks this grant can do and she said when she finishes it she’ll send it to Junn who will then distribute it campus wide.

**URSCA/RSCA**: Junn reported that she met with the co-directors of URSCA, April 9th to go over the budget. The budget for URSCA was for 1.5 years and the money that was allocated was for one time, and after the period of time was up there is no money in the baseline for it. Junn proposed for the co-directors to sharpen their pencils and go back to the drawing board on the budget and bring it down to a reasonable point so Junn can argue for it to become part of the baseline. The President has already allocated money for RSCA, and the decisions on those grants just came forward. Junn pointed out in the old days when RSCA was still there on this campus, faculty were given $5K if awarded the RSCA and there was one for FRG, untenured faculty and there was one for the IRG, tenured track or full time lecturers. And now when they brought it back for a while it was up to $15K for the IRG’s. Junn asked Laura Robles how many applications were there for IRG’s this year?” Robles responded that there were 38 and only 14 were funded. Over $400,000, but only had $200K to allocate. She further stated that your chance of getting the IRG’s this year was less than half. Junn reported that they’re going to be talking to the Executive Committee. She also commented that as the faculty grows that means fewer faculty will be able to get awards. Therefore they’re looking at what’s fair, what’s equitable and what can be some reasonable transition points there. It’s all on the table for discussion and Junn is hoping to work with Randy Cauthen and John Price to figure out a viable budget that we can sustain and ensure that this undergraduate search activity just doesn’t die after 1.5 years.

**Updates on the Searches**: Excellent progress on the Dean of Extended Ed. The final candidate was here April 9th and Junn will be making reference calls this next week and then making a recommendation to the President for the Dean candidate mid-week next week (4/13-4/19) and hope to make an offer for a Dean to come to the campus permanently. Junn expressed that she hopes to wrap that one up in two weeks. Junn reported that the Dean of Health and Human Services and Nursing is moving along as well. And that three candidate have been invited to campus. She believes it should commence fairly quickly. Faculty Affairs Search Committee is meeting on Friday to conduct SKYPE interviews and the search for Graduate of Undergraduate Deans, are both moving along as well. Junn reported that the committee has been put together for the AVP for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessments, so that will be getting underway. Junn will be meeting with Dean Furusa and the Council of Chairs to talk about interim qualities, they’ll launch that search in the fall. Junn said she might ask the Senate to create a search committee this summer so that when people come back in the fall we don’t have to lose time and said she will address that further at the upcoming Exec meeting. Questions?

**Coward** inquired about the Library Dean search**. Junn** said that search is also happening. She believes the committee is getting ready to do the SKYPE interviews. **Coward** asked if there were librarians on the committee. Junn said she would double check. **Coward’s** second question had to do with the Stanford Gates grant – and wanted the name of the woman leading this project. **Junn**: Candace Thille. **Coward** commented she had heard research that showed 1st generation students seem to need more high touch, high interaction, hand holding, brick and mortar, more in person interaction. And so **Coward** said she was curious why Thille was going in this direction. **Junn** said that’s part of the reason she’s writing this grant. **Junn** offered that there was community college research that online community college students tend not to do well and many of them are first generation learners. The challenge is the community colleges have less resources for faculty development than the CSU’s. Junn further added that they have less training and support for faculty developing online courses, so they may create online courses, but maybe they’re not effective. And there are standards, there are quality matters, and that there are things you need to do if you want to create effective online course, very different than teaching face-to-face. But there are these new technologies which are making it possible to have very high touch. Some people thing that online means no touch or low touch but that is absolutely untrue with these new technologies. Thille is really interested as is Gates on how to reach students who are first generation and try new things. Gates is interested because they want more Americans to reach post-secondary education.

**Senator Park** – re. Research grant. When we had RSCAAP there was a possibility for tenured faculty to apply for the grant but I believe the current situation is that tenured faculty cannot really apply for the research part of the grant and then they can only apply for the grant that includes the preparation for proposals for bigger grants, so I’m just wondering if there’s any chance for any tenured faculty for research. I think the criteria is for non-tenured faculty only. **Laura Robles** explained, “There are two categories. One category is for non-tenured faculty and a category for all Unit III faculty.” **Park** responded by saying “the category that allows for tenured faculty to apply is the category that’s for preparation for bigger grants. **Park** felt that this was sheer research and doesn’t think that tenured faculty has any possibility of getting a grant. **Robles** said there is a wide range of people that apply. Many people from arts and humanities. And their thing is an NIH grant to write a book or to produce a play or something like that and it’s totally allowable and so it can support your research that will allow you then to disseminate your information or to do your performance or to write your book. **Moore** commented that he believed there is a lot of confusion about that. **Fawver** requested to make that more explicit on the application, because, she said, that’s not the message many of her faculty are struggling with. **Robles** said the guidelines were originally written by a former Chair of the Academic Senate in conjunction with the Senate Exec and the Provost at that time. **Robles** said she assumes that those things can be reworded with permission of the senate so that it can be more clear. **Furusa** shared that the Committee recommended the Senate revisit the criteria to clarify certain areas because certain problems were noted and they believe appropriate adjustments should be made. **McGlynn** felt if there was going to be a real reconstruction of what these guidelines are he believes it should take place in a greater conversation. **McGlynn’s** understanding, he shared, is if you’re a tenured faculty member and you apply for $15K, that you actually use that money to gain more funds to do this. That you are expected to submit a full NIH or NSF or something like that. So if it’s actually being changed – then it’s not a change in working but a change in guidelines.

**Fawver** wanted to know from Provost Junn what happened to the budget committee for academic affairs that Fawver recalled the Provost had promised at the first meeting of the academic senate she attended. Fawver felt that it’s the kind of discussion where the concern of the reallocation of funds and things, would not be under purview of the executive committee of the academic senate, but under this budget committee that has yet to be constructed. **Junn:** Academic Affairs never had been given sufficient money to cover its baseline. It’s a very broken budget model and it didn’t make sense to have a committee come and not be able to do anything. The good news, Junn shared, is that Bob Lovitt has been outstanding in working with John Price and Junn to figure out how they can create from the get go a base line budget that covers the needs to teach all the courses and have faculty, etc. At that point, Junn said, she is going to be looking at budget models that permit greater control. That takes some time. Junn said that is why she has been waiting to call that budget committee. Junn said she will definitely have it in place by the fall and come to the Senate for guidance on how to create it. **President Hagan** shared thatthe issue of Academic Affairs not having a baseline budget to cover everything that one would think would be covered is university wide. He added that one of the things that they asked Lovitt to do is really read the budget. Hagan said, “in part we are going on current budget numbers to make some of these decisions. For example, every year about $222k police budget which should be baseline has never been baseline at this university. It exists somewhere in a baseline like fashion, but it doesn’t. We’re trying to take to UBC a sense of here it all is because we’re still finding things. We’ve got people in this room who think they’re on permanent dollars – and they haven’t been for years, but that’s not their problem it’s our problem as we look to make decisions on permanent dollar things and then feel good. We’re faced with either just keep this buried until money gets better or budget correctly and bring it all to the table and see the problem. Which means we’re not going to have the things that Ellen has requested, $7 million. Hagan said Junn’s requests are all based on legitimate things that have been committed but that they’re wrestling with trying to get a handle on all of it. Hagan said that the University’s budget was described as not being transparent. In many ways, he shared, it couldn’t be transparent because there were so many pieces that had never been pulled together. Hagan said that the problem Junn mentioned is real and probably exists in other areas. He shared that his perspective on all of this is he can get very frustrated or take a deep breath and say okay, let’s see where we are and keep going. Hagan affirmed that fixing the Academic Affairs budget is obviously one of our highest priorities.

**Heinze-Balcazar**: asked with regard to the recent opening for the position of Dean of Undergraduate Studies, which she believes was frozen back in 2008 and 2009, the reason behind the reopening of the position and what the person in this position will be doing. **Junn** responded the position description used was the one that existed on the campus before and they augmented it a bit. Junn explained that what used to be Dean of Undergraduate Studies is sort of shared among a number of AVP’s in the Provost’s office. She said they wanted to sharpen the focus and bring back the importance of undergraduate and graduate education. She added, they’re repackaging and refocusing what used to be and that because it carries the title of Dean, they’re getting lots of interested candidates, even though it’s not an Academic Dean.

**3:10 PM Second Reading Item: FPC 14-04 Resolution to Amend the By-Laws of the General Faculty and Academic Senate of CSUDH** Coward presented – I would like to move FPC 14-04 as a second reading item, can I can get a 2nd. This being brought back to modify the senate by-laws so that either the President of the campus or the Chair of the Academic Senate can call a meeting of the General Faculty.

It was requested that the current proposed written resolution be changed to Chair, not chairperson as was currently written in two places. With the amendment in place – it was brought to a vote.

**Vote by a show of hands  
33 approve/0 oppose/2 abstentions  
Resolution passes**

**3:25 PM Second Reading Item: Exec 14-01 Amendment of Constitution of Law of the General Faculty and Academic Senate of CSUDH to include 2 staff representatives** (Chair Moore presented)

**Vote by a show of hands  
35 approve/0 oppose/1 abstention  
Resolution passes**

**3:35 PM Second Reading Item: FPC 14-03 Affirmation of Rights of Temporary Faculty to Participate in Department Chair Nominations** (Coward presented) – Before bringing this to a vote, she expressed her desire to enumerate the changes. Coward thanked everyone for participating in the process and said the changes are as follows:

* Changed title to Nominations, not Elections
* Under 2nd Resolve that the ASCSUDH “recommend”
* The addition to the PM, “in department chair nomination process, departments must allow participation by all temporary faculty who meet the criteria outlined in items 1-3 below”
* In #1, we’re eliminating the 3 year appointment requirement and inserting a residency requirement for 2 consecutive semesters
* It #2, eliminating the need for university service obligations for full-time lecturers, inserting the requirement for two consecutive semesters.
* #4 was reworded – to make it clear that departments had the option to broaden or expand lecturer participation in the nomination process beyond what is enumerated
* #5 – eliminated the word “elections”

**Senator Thomas** – can we clarify that we’re allowing lecturers to participate in the nominations but not the election process? In some places it says elections and some it says nomination process. I want to be clear on what we’re actually voting on. **Coward**: will remove in #4, “and election”. It will remain in the rationale because that’s in the title of the joint recommendation between CFA and Campus. **Senator Thomas** – I’m trying to understand how qualification 2, doesn’t apply to someone who is qualifies in #1. My argument is that 2 is superfluous, because everyone who fits into 2 is going to fit into 1, definition only. If I have at least 6 units and I’m in residence and there’s a residency requirement on paragraph 2, if I have 6 unites, 15 units what difference does it make? **Weber**: this was more relevant in the original resolution, when #1 had 3 year appointments, so Thomas is correct. **Coward**: if there’s no objection from the body and it’s considered a friendly amendment, I’d be willing to strike #2. **Senator Gould**: you will have to renumber the items, “the criteria outlined in items 1-3 below:” When we had items 1, 2 and 3. I would like to change this from, “who meet the criteria in items 1 through 3 below” to “who meet “any” of the criteria below”, so there wouldn’t be any confusion that they have to meet all three of these. You need some wording on the word “in”, which is repeated. **Coward** will strike the word “in”. **Gould** said if we are keeping item #2, then we must strike “[Note: this provision would not require a three (3) year contract]. **Senator Welch** (sitting in for Senator Chai) wanted to know if a lecturer is working in two different department, are they going to be required to have a minimum of 6 wtu’s per department, or 3 in one department and 3 in another. **Coward:** If your department wants to open it up to folks with 3 wtu’s, but what number one is saying is they need a time base of at least .4 in the department when the chair nomination is scheduled. The other part of your question is that if they had .4 time base in two different departments that they be eligible to participate. Yes. **McGlynn** shared that there is not a classification for teaching assistants. Giving the example of when graduation students are teaching, theoretically, he said, we can have some grad students who are teaching 6 wtu’s where they teach 3 lab sections each semester. Some people in my department, myself included, he expressed, are a little uncomfortable with the notion that masters students will be voting for the chair. The ideal fix to this is to not appoint students as lecturers. But, McGlynn wondered if that is bureaucratically possible and wanted to know if there was anyone who has more information about this situation? **Weber** said she would be happy to look into this but I do not have an answer. **Coward:** asked In the absence of an elegant fix, do you have language to recommend as a friendly agreement? **McGlynn** said he did not know how to include everyone that needs to be included but not include the individuals who are inappropriate. **Senator Belu** offered, what if we include in the language Lecturers or not Teachers assistants. **McGlynn’s** response was that we don’t have Teachers Assistants, that’s the problem. They’re hired as Lecturers, just like any other adjunct Lecturer. **Magruder** said if we’re striking clause 2 then we do have to make a change to clause 1, we’d have to take out “with a part time appointment”. To address the question of graduate students – let’s remember if they’re hired as lecturers in range L or A or above, they’re members of the unit 3 bargaining unit. So we should be aware of that before we make exclusions. **Wilkens** said as a point of clarification – if we do strike 2, then 1 really is the only item that is a criteria. The rest is guidance or regulations if you will in applying the criteria. The numbering is misleading. Sneed felt that it seemed that it was beyond friendly amendment at that point. He said he would like to see it rewritten before it’s voted on. He doesn’t believe that there’s an urgency to do it at this meeting. 2nd issue he brought up is that the amendment was written where different departments will be treating different faculty differently and he wondered if that brings up the possibility for some sort of grievance in the future. **Moore** said he believes it’s to the contrary, that this is to some extent following some guidelines that were put into the grievance settlement and the fact finders report on the grievance that was filed at Fresno state. In reading that finding, one of the things that the arbitrator stated was that they found that the situation that the department was engaged in was unfair, but they did not go on to say that all departments should do “X”. And so the intention is to establish this as being a base line but that departments on their own could make those decisions that would affect all faculty within that department equally, just the way RTP guidelines affect all faculty within a department and they’re different from department “Z”. This created a common minimal standard. **Weber** agreed that this was correct. **Moore** further added that Sneed’s first point that we may be beyond friendly amendment is well taken and perhaps we need to send this back to committee. **Fawver:** McGlynn’s point is valid, is it just Biology – how many departments and programs have this kind of situation where you have graduate students classified as lecturers? Nursing, Environmental Science, Chemistry. **Moore** said even if there’s one department, then we have an issue here. **McGlynn** offered it could say “excluding students pursuing a degree within the department in which they are teaching”. **Moore** reminded the Senate on the point that Magruder brought up that those individuals being protected as being members of that bargaining unit. **Monty** felt that the problem was lack of clarity in the Bargaining Agreement, he said it seems to him that union should be told to clarify the language in the collective bargaining agreement. He said he believes it’s absurd that students pursuing a degree in a program would be participating in the selection of a chair. Moreover, he added, if you read the rationale, it contradicts the substance of the resolution. If we take the resolution at face value, we can’t exclude any temporary faculty. If there were to be future grievances on this issue, it would come from people who had looked at the contract, by the letter of contract and ask why did the university adopt this policy that excludes me? There are a lot of issues that have to be hammered out – Monty further shared he did not think it’s something that could be done in the Senate and that it needs more dialogue across campuses and union and arbitrators, and so on. **Moore** – this is exactly the same issue, based on emails that I get from other campus senate chairs, that is exactly the same that other campus senates are trying to hammer out right now. **Senator Erbe**: agrees we’re setting us up. We need to hammer this out in bargaining. **Gould** offered a specific amendment to add at the end of introductory paragraph, “except that no temporary faculty vote to nominate a chair in a department in which they are a candidate for a degree”. **Thomas** said he had been thinking along the same lines, except when it was brought to the floor that these parties have rights under the contract. So, he added, “if we are arbitrarily trying to take those parties out of the contract in any way shape or form, we have a problem. We need to address why we have grad students or undergrads as Faculty.” **Pinto** agreed with what Thomas had said that it wasn’t up to us to state whether their master status should be student over lecturer. She said she believed that we have to treat them as lecturer if they’re hired as lecturers. The moment you hire them, they’re lecturers who happened to be your students. Pinto further added that we should not take away the rights that they have earned. **Moore** – are we in a position to have a vote on the amendment that Senator Gould proposed.

**Zero in favor**

**Proposed amendment has been defeated**

Back to resolution – **Coward** asked if there were arguments against removing #2. **Magruder** responded these are different categories of employees, part-time appointments and full-time appointments and believe these two clauses can remain – part-time vs. full-time. **Moore** said that this resolution is on the floor. We have enough substantive changes that we could probably have revised document that came back. **Coward** disagreed, she felt that if we’re keeping #2, and then there has not been any substantive changes. Monty said, Carl actually said that he moved to table. The motion to table has been presented and seconded. Moore, the motion to the table has been moved and seconded. Ivonne – intention of this resolution was to include not exclude. Departments are waiting for today to carry out their elections to see if they can include their lecturers. Gould stated a point of order - A motion to table is not debatable.

**All those in favor please signify by raising your hand.**

**17 in favor/9 opposed/5 abstention**

**Motion to table has been passed**

**Coward** – I don’t know what to change – what are the substantive changes? **Krochalk** said she voted to table not because of the substantive changes but because it created great deal of conflict. She said in principle she strongly advocates for the inclusion of everyone having a vote on everything and having a say. She said, however she would like help from fellow senators here while this is being tabled, to think through the potential ramifications for departments that have 25 lecturers that could qualify here and maybe a few full time faculty. She asked how many more full time faculty would the department need before it would be governed in any significant way, as the election of a chair is very significant, and it wasn’t being determined by these part-time faculty who are in and out. **Fawver** felt that Senator Krochalk summed it up very well. Fawver recommended that this does not come back to the floor unless the following issues have been resolved within the body of the resolution. 1. This a realistic problem in many departments the lecturer is the majority vote 2. McGlynn’s concern that you’ve got graduate students under the letter of the law, you don’t start here removing rights that are guaranteed under the collective bargaining agreement. **Moore:** part of the problem that Terry’s drawn our attention to is a classification problem that could be handled through administration and finance or academic affairs? **Weber** agreed to look into this. **Fawver:** I’m hoping that it doesn’t come back with recurring issues that have been brought up before. Not until these issues directly have been addressed. **Magruder** hoped that we can focus on what can be gained on including all lecturers in all levels of governance. Lecturers are a great untapped human resource. Including lecturers in collective governance will strengthen all faculty. Senator Sneed felt it would be important to see how this resolution relates to collective bargaining. **Esposito** said she comes from a department where all lecturers are vital. She said with elections coming up, she would hope that we find something that would provide something – something on the record that is admissible. **Monty** offered that there is nothing preventing any department from voluntarily creating its own policy to enfranchise any or some or its lecturers. It’s a document that’s binding all programs that’s why the stakes are a little bit higher and we need to be mindful of that. **Chair Moore** pointed out that the other intention of this resolution or something like it is to try to provide guidance to departments about what sort of policies could be implemented that would not make them subject to the same sort of grievances that Fresno State went through. **Weber** clarified that the current policy excludes lecturers from the nomination process for chair. So departments cannot come up with their own policies at this point. **Fawver** asked about a moratorium on that PM by the President on the involvement of lecturers for this round of elections until the Senate is able to hammer out something? Her suggestion was to run the elections this semester, guided by the principles in the resolution, but not binded by them, and then report back to the Senate if there are problems. **Gould** felt that Fawver had an excellent suggestion, that we have a sense of the senate vote requesting the president to suspend the memo on the voting rights of lecturers for this semester and to allow department to construct their own policy on voting rights for lecturers. **Junn** spoke in opposition to a moratorium for departments to create their own policy. 46 departments will create 46 different approaches. She felt it would cause more confusion, and add to future confusion in terms of letting people feel more empowered and then less empowered later. **Moore:** We agreed that this was tabled. **Coward** wanted to make sure she captured the ideas the senate wanted to be sure was addressed in a future resolution:

1. Ratio of lecturers to full time faculty in regards to nominating full time chair
2. Grad students being involved in the nominating process
3. How the resolution links to bargaining
4. Service requirement

**4:00 PM First Reading EPC 14-03 Resolution to Create an Ad Hoc Committee to Review CSUDH Lower Division General Education:**  Kate Esposito presented on the forming of an Ad Hoc Committee and the members of that committee. She said they would be elected from each of the colleges and that there would also be three appointed members, two of which would be voting, the Executive Senate Rep and the Faculty member who chairs the Student Learning outcomes committee and once we have a dean of undergraduate studies, we would have that person on the committee but they would not be a voting member. She further stated that they would like that committee to make a recommendation about the GE package, and report back to the Senate by December 2014 so that the changes could be implemented for Fall 2015. **Moore** wanted to bring everyone’s attention to the background information provided on page 18 of the Senate meeting package. This has been on the floor for the last two years – the Board of Trustees issued a decree that all B.A. programs should be able to be completed in 120 semester units or 180 quarter units. On the floor of the Senate we went through several efforts to discuss that and we had a number of departments went through some creative efforts to get their programs to fit that cap. We currently have 4 departments that have requested an exemption from this and they are Chemistry, Physics, Music and Electrical Engineering within Physics. Our four departments are the only non-engineering programs in the entire CSU who are asking for these exemptions. One recommendation from other Campus Chairs, are concerns about the policies on double counting units. Some campuses have no restriction about double counting. There are other models that other campuses are using and the idea is that this committee would look into this. **Gould** – would like to combine the 2nd and 3rd resolution. In the current 4th resolve replace “make” with “consider”. **Heinze-Balcazar** recommended a representative from the student body and one from the GE committee. Esposito offered that there had been discussion on that point and felt that once we add GE, they would need to think about having someone from UCC. And as they went through the list, having one person from each of the colleges they felt was sufficient but agreed that it was something worth considering. **Gould** recommended having two student representatives. **Monty** would like to suggest having minority or dissenting voices being reported on in addition to the committee’s recommendations. **Pitts** asked after it’s approved, when would it convene – **Moore** responded there would first have to be elections and it would convene after the fall semester had begun.

**4:15 PM EPC Report on Online Instruction Guidelines and Recommendations, Educational Policy Committee  
Moore** requested in the interest of time that Esposito give a high level overview of the EPC Report on Online Instruction Guidelines and Recommendations. **Esposito** said that EPC is going to be meeting on the 17th – if there’s any input you’d like to provide or if you’d like to join the meeting – it starts at 2:30. That this report came up at the end of last year and there are some questions within it that need to be addressed such as should students be required to pass a computer literacy test prior to enrolling in an online class; however, there would need to be a policy created on that and it is just one example. Esposito requests to forward to her any recommendations.

**4:30 PM Parliamentarian Report** – Matt Jones was absent, so Moore proceeded to the Election part of the agenda:

Search for AVP for Academic Technologies  
Voice Vote: John Davis, COE; Ellie Zenhari, CAH; Susan Einbinder, CHHSN; Tom Norman, CBAPP; Wei Ma, LIB. Ok’d – Passed

Moore then passed around a ballot vote for candidates for the search committee for AVP for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment and for the search committee for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Two members are needed.  
**RESULTS**: **Search Committee for AVP Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment**

1. CAH Rep. : Jose Lopez Morin, Chicana/o Studies
2. CHHHSN Rep.: Kathy Chai, BS Nursing
3. CNBS Rep.: Carl Sneed, Psychology

**Search Committee for Dean of Undergraduate Studies**

Brenda Riddick, CNBS

Susan Einbinder, CHHSN

**4:40 PM Statewide Senate Reports:**

**Statewide Senator Kate Fawver** – most immediate priority for the statewide senate is to participate collaboratively and collectively with the other presidents and administrators requesting the $95 million augmentation to our 2014/2015 budget. She said they will be doing their part on April 22 up in Sacramento spreading the good word about what the system does. She said she absolutely thinks that Perez is correct in saying you don’t go up to Sacramento and say give us more money. You say we provide a valuable contribution to the state and not only do we provide our goals values and objectives align with his honors values and the objectives.

**Statewide Senator Pat Kalayjian** – reported that there are virtual interim meetings this Friday. On 3/26 you all got a summary of all of the resolutions that were passed in the March plenary and also those that came before us as 1st reading items, so the most productive thing is if you have any comments or interest in having either Senator Fawver or I following up, please let us know.   
**Statewide Senator Fawver** – reported that Senator Chai contacted us (the statewide senators) about Assembly Bill 850 which was about creating the opportunity for community colleges to offer baccalaureates on a limited scale in nursing. And they were able to contribute a very valuable position strenuously objecting to the provisions within the bill right now. Right now the bill is undergoing revisions and while she had started a resolution on behalf of our Senate strongly opposing it, she stopped because she now knows it is undergoing a change and said that we don’t want to come out and say no to the wrong thing. She will update the senate and the nursing faculty as changes come around and believes it sounded positive.

**ASI Rep Curbin Pitts** requested the Senate to wear your Toro Tuesday gear – to show support for school pride everyone should wear their Toro Gear on Tuesday. He said they just held their election and that results from previous year was 940, election results from this year was 1460 students. He pointed out that that is 10% of students who are being involved in student government and learn more about what the university is doing for them. He said that during the election they included a survey at the bottom asking what the most important things are or improvements they would like to see and that once they have the results, they’ll let the Senate know the top priorities for students - so that when making decisions, you’ll know what’s important to the students. He said additionally in terms of Important student decisions; ASI is going to have 6 more board meetings until June and invited the Senate to come to the Board meetings so they can introduce the future incoming board to everyone on campus and they can get to know them sooner and work more closely with the Senate in a collaborative approach. He hopes the Senate would attend the meetings to gain input from the students so that it can help you know what decisions to make as it pertains to the students. [asivpaa@csudh.edu](mailto:asivpaa@csudh.edu) that is Curtis Pitts email address. The dates of the future ASI Board meetings are 4/18, 5/2 5/16 5/30 6/13 6/27

**CFA REPORT Jose Prada** – shared that this weekend is the 80th assembly at the Westin at LAX. They will gather in caucus organizations and committees, general sessions and workshops and strategic and tactical use of social media. The video booth they had up last week was a great success regarding the value and Importance of your work. All that is posted on Facebook, he requested that you like us on FB and you will be able to see some of those videos. Facebook address is: <https://www.facebook.com/CFA.DH>. Prada said they plan to set up another where we can continue to gather more video testimony about the value and importance of your work here at the university and statewide as well. We’ll have that at the Labor and Social Justice Fair that’s coming up in a couple of weeks. He reported that bargaining is scheduled between CFA and CSU on Thursday in Long Beach. The final All Faculty CFA meeting with CFA officer and the bargaining team will be held in Monterrey Bay on Wednesday April 6th from 2 – 5. 89 days left to go for the contract to expire. We continue to work on the contract and hope that you provide feedback and words that we believe are important and should be made to the bargaining team. And you can do that on the CFA Facebook page, once you like us. For further information on CFA happenings please visit the CFA website. **Fawver** asked what the status was for the bargaining process? **Prado** offered that the discussions have been cordial but both CFA and CSU are keeping their cards close to their chest and they’re not revealing too much yet. He said we can expect things to be done at the 100 day mark based on how things have been proceeding. **President Hagan** said that the very fact that the Chancellor, the CSA, the AFI met jointly in Sacramento was huge. That did send a very positive signal of a stronger CSU, just that fact that they’re able to present issues on a common cause was very positive. **Prado** responded by saying that the opportunity for different groups to come together was a positive sign.

**4:50 PM Meeting Adjourned**