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Meeting Called to Order 2:30 PM
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2:30 Call to order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes: Chair Jerry D. Moore

**2:40 President’s Report: Dr. Willie Hagan**

1. President Hagan thanked everyone for participating in the investiture and inauguration week. He said from the first event, community engagement, the seminars, the symposiums, the investiture, the Investiture Scholars dinner, there was a tremendous amount of activity and energy surrounding them. He said when it began, he didn’t see a need for an investiture, as he felt he had been here long enough but he added it really did feel like a transition point. He said the dinner with the pianist was spectacular and he wanted to thank everyone around this table and those who weren’t there, who were able to participate. He said the whole event could not have been pulled off without the estimated 200+ people working on the committees, grounds, and events planning.
2. Hagan then reported that he and the search committee are completing the search for a Vice President for Administration and Finance. They will interview some additional candidates but hope to fill the position before the end of the 2013-2014 academic year.
3. Another issue that Hagan discussed was the initiative to establish a separate philanthropic foundation. He said while there is already a single foundation it is primarily focused on business operations, the bookstore, food service and some other things. He said they’ve done a very good job of that, and now we really need to have an additional operation where the focus is almost exclusively on philanthropic endeavors. Hagan shared that through the leadership of Carrie Stewart, they’ve been talking to some people outside of the current foundation board, who either have significant means or significant contacts, who we would like to get involved on a foundation Board and get more involved in the university. Hagan said that they’ll speak more to it as we move forward and that it can be up to a yearlong process in terms of going through the Chancellor’s office. He felt it would be a significant benefit to the university. **Moore** asked about the establishment of a philanthropic board for the Foundation and whether that board would oversee the administration of external contracts and grants. Hagan said that no, that would stay under the same auxiliary-wide it has been under. He said that one thing that will happen is that the position of Executive Director, which has not been filled for almost seven years, will be filled. Personally, Hagan said, he believes the University has had some missed opportunities by not having that position filled for so long. He said that Bob Lovitt and his team have worked out the finances of that organization in such a way that they now feel they can afford to refill the Executive Director position. **Senator McGlynn** asked if there was a timescale we can expect a Director for the Foundation? Both Junn/Hagan responded with “this summer”.

**2:55 Provost’s Report: Dr. Ellen Junn**

1. Junn began with update to the various searches that were going on. CEIE – is filled, Kim McNutt was the chosen Dean, and he will be joining us July 1. He was here this past week, visiting the college, meeting with folks, finding a place to live, and he has found a place. Two other college deans, HSSN and COE, the President and Junn are doing their last pieces of due diligence for calling additional people and will make a final decision in the next few weeks. The Graduate Dean search will be closing up in the next week or so. AVP for CEIE is in process, and the search for Dean of the Library will be doing their SKYPE interviews, Dean of Undergraduate Studies – those candidates will be coming in the next week. They are all moving forward.
2. Strategic Plan, many marathon meetings, revising the original plan so that it is aligned with the current the culture for the next five years. There is one more marathon meeting on Monday, May 12th. The plan is to have a draft of the plan out to the campus before commencement for feedback. Once everyone is back again in the fall, they’ll hold some town halls as well as a stakeholder campus summit to figure out next steps in terms of implementation, timeline, budget, etc. Junn said everyone will be given an advance draft so that they can start thinking about it and sending feedback either online or directly to Provost Junn. **Moore** asked Junn to talk about what the specific charge to the Strategic Planning Committee was. **Junn** said the original strategic plan was very broad and incorporated 43 separate initiatives and didn’t have more ways of measuring. Lots of ideas and goals, but not a clear way of measuring what progress the campus made as it related to those goals. And there wasn’t a campus process to track that on an annual basis either. She said if you recall we had a big university summit, where everyone was invited to talk about what parts of the strategic plan are most important to keep and where it could be economized and focused in so that we’re not so spread out. And then also build directly into the new strategic plan, clear goals, objectives, and strategies, so there would be a way to measure what is the overarching goal, and what strategies specifically could be identified to try to reach those goals and measure whether we are making progress on those goals or not. Junn said they have reduced the strategic plan down to six goals, overarching, with no more than four objectives per goal. Junn asked if Moore or Norman wanted to add anything more. **Moore** said that it’s been a very interesting group of folks, lots of great comments, great discussions, greater utility, greater direction, he said he is quite optimistic. **Norman** said he appreciates that time is being taken. He’s glad that there will be forums in the fall and they’ll be lots of discussion about it and he applauds the Provost and President for saying that they do not want to rush the process that the whole faculty should be involved in strategic plan, otherwise it won’t work. **Hirohama** said she appreciated the fact that there is a staff voice on it. Everyone’s opinions are heard and all the feedback that had been gathered up to this point has been considered. She further added that it’s been a really good process thus far.

**Senator Ganezer** asked President Hagan if there has there been any progress in the planning or building of a new science building or refurbishing of the current one. **Hagan** said that the Chancellor’s office has acknowledged the opportunities for additional funding. They sent out their guidelines this week and for the most part they’re focusing on renovation and cosmetics and not new buildings. Hagan said that even if they were focusing on new buildings, CSUDH is not in the top 10. He said they’ve been talking to them, not so much about giving us $80 million for a new science building, but more from the approach of how much baseline funds do we need to amortize that debt? Hagan said that maybe $5 million at most would amortize the amount of debt to get that building built. We’ve been talking to folks outside. Hagan then spoke of UB5 funding. He said the good news is that Chancellor White has built facilities before using UB5 funding. He said the program is where you can get foreign investors to get a visa by investing in U.S. construction projects. He said they’ve gone down this path with lots of discussions with the goal of trying to find a way to generate revenue to amortize the debt. Hagan said they don’t see a science building in terms of $80 million of bond funds coming, there will be bond funds, but we’re not going to be in that mix. He said he is fairly confident that we’re going to make it happen. Aiming for a figure of $4 million - $5 million annually is easier than aiming for $80 million at once. He added, “If we pull this off, trust me, you’ll hear about.” Hagan said it is one of the highest priorities, but that we’re also trying to make sure that we’re on the list for getting renovation funds, and we’ve got a lots of facilities on this campus that need extensive renovations.

**Second Reading Items**

**3:05 FPC 14-04 Recommendation to Amend PM 78-15 Selection and Review of Chairpersons for Departments and Programs Which Constitute Primary Teaching Service Areas**

Moore requested that there be a motion to unmove this from the table. It was so moved and seconded.

FPC Chair Carolyn Coward said Senate Exec had several great discussions about what to do about the resolution. She said what you have before you is a scaled down version, and much less prescriptive. The recommendation is that the Presidential Memo that excludes lecturers from the department chair nomination process be amended. Coward said they built into the rationale references to the Fresno arbitration agreement and kept the references to the joint agreement between CFA and administration on this campus, and have appended both documents. She said they should read appendix A and appendix B and that she’s given Susanne Walker those changes. Coward said that these were included so that departments know full well what the issue is and what their responsibility is, vis-`a-vis the contract. She said if they want to take guidance from either of these contracts, they are welcome or if they want to make their own policy, they are welcome. But at the end of the day, she added, what we need to do is to somehow include our lecturers in the department chair nomination process. **Senator** **Magruder** asked what was intended by the phrase, “pending further clarification of lecturer rights in the collective bargaining agreement”. **Coward** said she would address it and then defer to her colleague Senator Kalayjian. Coward said the reason it was included was in response to a concern that someone had asked: 1. how does this relate to bargaining and 2. clarifying a confusion within the contract, so we wanted to refer to that directly within the resolution. **Kalayjian** added that we wanted to remind ourselves that we need to come back to this issue. She continued that it was forbidden for departments to include lecturers in their elections and we wanted to remove that, open it up and then remind ourselves to come back to this as the issue becomes clearer down the road.
**Senator Thomas** drew everyone’s attention to the word “may”. He said because the corollary of “may” is “may not”. And his understanding of reading the document is that “may not” is not on the table any more. He said you cannot restrict people from participating in the chair election process anymore. He said when you say “may”, it appears that “may not” might also be on the table which is inconsistent with what the actual agreement is. **Moore** responded by saying that while that’s true, there are differences of opinion across the CSU’s as to how much a precedent that particular ruling held. Moore said that we are not in a position to provide that kind of legal advice to the campus. It is true that “may not” is also implied by “may”, and it may be that departments decide to take actions that will be grieved. He said that there is an implicit encouragement that folks not do that. There is, as Carolyn pointed out, the removal of the current language that excludes them, but that’s where we’re at in trying to sort through these matters and present something that this body can make a decision about. **Senator Erbe** said that by including the actual arbitration decision as one of the appendixes, if anyone took the time to carefully read it that helps with what you’re trying to explain. She said she was impressed with how the resolution tied together with the appendixes. She said it helps if you read it line by line. She said she believed that what you’ve done helps us introduce this to everyone without trying to do what we’re really not in the power to do. **Senator Gould** said this looks to me like a necessary condition to put us in agreement with the contract, and certainly it is the right thing to do. We should certainly extend this privilege to departments. Whether or not we decide later on that we have to impose a broader condition that they must allow lecturers to participate, we can afford to put that off for the moment. **Senator Krochalk** asked for some clarification on the definition for a lecturer. Lecturers are referred to as those teaching 3 units, one semester a year to those who are teaching 15 units with 3 year contracts and everything in between on that continuum. Is that the definition of lecturer that we’re referring to here or is it more specific. **Coward** guided the Senate to look at the minutes, or Article 2, Section 2.13 h. of the agreement – it defines, the term – temporary faculty. What the Fresno arbitration agreement pointed out was everyone that falls under that definition and is classified as such is defined as faculty and a department is made up of its faculty including everyone you just described. **Senator Esposito** wanted to 2nd what Senator Gould said and said she spoke with her department extensively since they have a significant number of part-time lecturers, she said she thinks it’s a great resolution and absolutely the right thing to do. **Senator McGlynn** said he felt it important to speak because this impacted his department greatly with their student lecturers. Based on the Fresno agreement and the current status of the contract he said, this seems to be the only thing that makes sense that we can and should do right now, as far as he can tell. **Prado** shared that we’re presented with a great opportunity where we’re looking for language to incorporate our colleagues more fully, speaking as an independent professor and as co-president of the California Faculty Association. As Coward just identified, Prado continued, the contract is quite clear on the matter. Part-time faculty are unit 3 faculty and therefore fall within the purview of the collective bargaining agreement. Our contemplation of excluding part-time faculty from decision making processes is troublesome, because it counters the language of the contract which is grounds for the kind of security that we experience as employees of the California State University system. I congratulate us on our pursuit of solidarity amongst the different faculty on campus. **Senator De Velasco** said nurture your lecturers, chances are they will give something to the university and they will provide something to the department. The relationship goes all ways, she said and the University and the department will benefit. She further added that there will be part timers that will stay and stay longer and will provide service, there will be those who teach 3 units and will disappear and then asked, do you honestly think that they are going to vote in your department? De Velasco concluded by saying they will not spend the time to go to those meetings. **Senator Belu** said the reformulation says nothing at all. Belu believes it to be so vague as to allow almost anything to happen which she felt was potentially messy. She agreed it was less restrictive and more open, but it opens the gates widely to many different scenarios and she doesn’t see that as being particularly inclusive. **Senator Monty** said he wanted to echo Senator McGlynn’s sentiments in that this is the only thing that we can do at this point in time. He said we should approve it as it allows departments that decide to include their lecturers in these decisions now to do so, where doing so would create problems by requiring them to draw arbitrary lines, by including some and not others. In a department where you have 18 faculty and only 2 of them are full-time the implications are somewhat serious and that has to be weighed carefully. These are things we can’t decide now, but this is something we can do now which is to allow departments so inclined with lecturers who want to participate, to do so. **Moore** said shared governance is shared. There are issues we can provide guidance at the level of the senate, but there are other issues that really are matters for departments to look to themselves and try to make decisions about. **Erbe** said she is impressed with this last year being back on the Senate, so many more are speaking out for what we believe in, for the best education for our students. “I think we’re changing in very good ways.” **Price** said that she knows this is troubling for several folks because of the difference in departments and she appreciates that we’re trying to be cognizant of what the contract says. But she also thinks we have to think about who we are as a university. And the trend has been to pare down on tenured track faculty as we know. There’s an imbalance when so many, up to 70% of our faculty, don’t have a say in the university or the department in the way our faculty is run. Price said she knows this can be a concern where there are so few tenured track faculty members, but, she said we are entering an age where we trust one another and invite participation among our colleagues regardless of their status or rank. Keeping in mind the contract, aside from the contract, in terms of our unity and our ability to have strong university and campus community. Price said she is saddened that we weakened the resolution to say “may”, but I think the spirit of moving forward is very important. **Magruder** said she is glad that the tone is quiet. She said she wanted to say for the record that she hopes this means we’re going to bring this back in the fall. Magruder said she is wondering if there’s an assumption and pending further clarification of lecturer rights in the CBA that this is something that is on the bargaining table. She said she did not think there’s any ambiguity in the matter. She believes CFA’s position as a union that’s inclusive of all faculty, is very clear. She noted that CFA took the Fresno matter all the way to arbitration. The issue was whether to contract was ambiguous then there would be a reference to campus policy and procedure. But because in the arbitrators view there was no ambiguity, it was left up to the campus to come up with a policy. Dominguez Hills had two grievances on this matter, the settlement was to send the matter to the senate to try to come up with a policy. Magruder said she did not believe this settles the matter. She said she has been contacted by lecturers this year who have been excluded from the process this year. Magruder hopes we come back to this in the fall, hopefully we have settled contract so that the question that whether or not this is up in the air is off the table. She concluded by saying she hopes we would go in favor of inclusion, as I think we have far more to gain than we have to lose. **Thomas** offered that he understands the “may” and understand that we’re giving departments the ability to do “the right thing”, or something that may lead to an action. Thomas suggested providing a recommendation to review the attachment, prior to creating any rules. He said that many just read the resolution but not recognizing the consequences. If you read the attachment you can get the spirit of where this goes and he wanted to make sure that the attachments are just as vital to the resolution as the resolution itself. He said he would like to make a friendly amendment to add the following. “Senate recommends departments to review the attachments in connection with developing rules for departmental nominations. **Gould** suggested an alternate approach that the Senate Exec could simply go ahead and send these appendices to each department. He said it does not require the president’s approval to send information out and he doesn’t think it needs to be part of the resolution. **Coward** offered combining both ideas and add a second resolve clause that reads, *Be if further resolved that this resolution and its appendices be sent department chairs, deans and program coordinators and all faculty, including lecturers.* **Moore** asked are there any objections? And asked if there was any further discussion. **Clare Weber** offered that should a department decide to not allow lecturers to participate in the nomination process or vote to recommend a department chair, it could be a new grievance or the old grievance could then be moved forward. **Prado** said certainly we can all petition a grievance, but a grievance in this case will have greater success than grievance that effectively falls outside of the scope of the CBA.

**Vote by show of hands**

**31 approve/0 oppose/3 abstentions**

**Resolution passes**

**Reports:**

3:30 **Parliamentarian Report: Matt Jones** - Last week the result of our elections were sent out. There are a number of new people and returning people to the Senate for the upcoming year. Jerry Moore was elected as Chair of the Senate, Thomas Norman as Statewide Senator, Emily Magruder and Begona De Velasco as the non-full time faculty senators and Anthony Cipriano as the staff senator. He reminded the Senate that passed on the senate floor was a potential amendment to the constitution to have two staff representatives, and that will come to a vote before the General Faculty at the fall meeting. Jones said there were nominees for the Academic Senate representative to the UCC committee for the next term which will begin the fall – the nominee for UCC is Ellie Zenhari. VOICE VOTE – Unanimous

Jones reported that Caroline Coward has stepped forward as a nominee for the for the Academic Senate representative to ASI. VOICE VOTE – Unanimous

3:40 **UCC report: Cathy Jacobs** - Report forthcoming, we will get it in written form and then distribute it to you.

3:40 **GE report: Lorna Fitzsimmons** – forwarded a brief report, Lorna is ill at this time and separately, Marek Suchenek who was the chair in the fall of 2013 also sent a report, these two reports needed to be melded together. We will get this out to you in written form as well.

3:45 **Vice-Provost Dr. Mitch Maki, implementation of revisions to Upper Division GE**

**Chair Moore** gave a very brief update with regard to Vice Provost, Dr. Mitch Maki’s report as he was unable to attend the Senate meeting due to a last minute request to go to the Chancellor’s office. Moore said with regard to the implementation of revisions to upper division GE, the AdHoc committee got information from departments about courses that are currently being offered as SBS HUM and SMT courses that people would like to offer with their own departmental prefixes. He said we put that information together in a pilot run and now we’re in the position of trying to figure out what has to be done as FTE’s and workload and money in some cases gets moved from College of Natural and Behavioral Sciences to College of Arts and Humanities. Dr. Maki sent an email to Chair Moore with the remarks, “the most salient thing I would have said is that Janna Bersi and I are working on the budget implications of the plan.” Moore said that Maki also notes and Moore agreed, that the said Chairs of the affected departments should also note, that we will need to take these courses that are moving, through some UCC review. Moore reported that Maki said, even with all of these kinds of modest complications, our goal to have this ready in place by spring 2015 is quite doable. **Gould** wanted to know if there is any sense as to whether departments actually intend to request a change in these courses. **Moore** said yes, that one of the things the AdHoc committee prepared is a full matrix of requests of courses under the current prefixes, proposed new prefixes and some cases numbers for the courses, we added information about the number of sections being offered on a yearly basis, the chairs provided us with their best estimate as to impacts on temporary faculty. Yes we do have that information in a full matrix, but have not shared it with the full senate. **Gould** said he would like to get an estimate of how many courses are going to change their prefixes or have applied or intend to apply. **Moore** said he cannot speak from the top of his head as to the number of courses, depending on the variations in which one semester you offer two and some semesters you offer three courses, he thinks it’s in the area of 60-65 sections are going to be changed and of those he believes that between about 20 or 25 of those will involve a change of courses moving from one college to the other, about 1/3 of those, and there are 10 departments involved. Moore said he believes there is enough diversity among the departments that gives a good pilot study to figure out how to go about doing this. Moore said it may be off by two or three sections.

4:00 **Keith Boyum and Janine Gasco: Status of CSUDH Internationalization Initiative**

Boyum began by saying there are two parts to a report I expected to deliver with Dr. Jan Gasco, professor of Anthropology who co-chairs the taskforce on Internationalization with me. Because we’ve started 30 minutes early, I will begin without her. The two parts to the report, are the last two pages of your Senate package for today’s meeting, pages 29 & 30, plus a handout which is on your table is also on the screen. It’s worth reminding ourselves why we’re doing this. We’ve been doing it for a year and we expect to end next December. We’re doing it because we think that internationalization is a major contributor to the high quality of the baccalaureate degree. We know that in general the faculty and staff agree with this. In addition, study abroad and similar international engagement opportunities are defined high impact practices. Beyond that, making international professional opportunities available to faculty make us attractive in a context of hiring, and it’s a natural part of the mission of a place that sits at footsteps of the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and can zip to LAX quicker than most in the basin to see someone coming in from another country or to depart yourself. As a strategy for international we joined a cohort with the American Council of Education in Washington D.C... There are 13 universities in the cohort. We get to talk to them, learn from them and learn from ACE, which is particularly valuable. We think some of the others are learning from us. We’re doing pretty well in comparison. ACE gave us a remarkable tool, an internationalization review comprising 60+ questions that we answered laboriously. They had sub questions and details sought and we got there. And having got there, the leadership, in what we jokingly call a quartet of leaders, Jan Gasco, Keith Boyum, Anupama Joshi and Sonja Daniels sat in a room for most of an afternoon and drafted a SWOT analysis for consideration by a full task force which comprises about 30 people. We took that to the full task in two lengthy sessions in March and emerged with a refined SWOT analysis as a means of where we are and what we’re doing going forward. On the handout, you can see nine items that we reported to ACE and to the other 12 cohorts about our current environment. On the last page of the hand out are the highlights we gained from surveying staff and faculty at this university about their knowledge, experience and attitudes relative to internationalization. You all told us this is a priority. You all told us you know more languages, you have more experiences, you have more interest in all of these things than we had expected. It was heartening for anyone trying to lead a taskforce on internationalization. On the handout provided by Dr. Gasco (see attached) is listed the Plans for February through December 2014 that was reported to ACE and cohort meeting in Washington D.C. by Dr. Gasco. Dr. Boyum then referred to the SWOT Analysis that was laid out in a PowerPoint Presentation (see attached). Having done the SWOT Analysis, we then take it to what are we going to do, in the 3, 5 or 8 year period and we will propose some things that we believe we’ll find consensus on, based on what we know from the survey that Dr. Gasco led. **Dr. Gasco** then joined the meeting and thanked everyone on their response to the survey, which helped a lot on which way the campus wanted to go and took it very seriously, both from students and faculty, staff and administrators. When she took the highlights to the ACE lab in April, they were quite impressed namely because of the high response, percentage wise, over 50% of full time faculty responded. We looked really good, and some of the things that were highlighted were quite remarkable to other people at the D.C. meeting. Gasco said we feel very confident that we have a lot of expertise on the campus, a lot of interest, and now what we need to be is a bit more coordinated. **Erbe** said she wasn’t sure who is working with the campus brand, but Erbe said she felt that this is our brand, this is our community. She said the survey shows this – and others are surprised, thinking – wow, what a campus! **Moore** asked, with regard to the Updates for the Internationalization Laboratory, March 2014, will be something that come before UBC and more detailed discussions will be held to make the vision a reality? Is that what you envision? **Boyum** agreed, to preface that, it’s really important that we’ll have a new Dean, a designated leader and agent for change. **President Hagan** agreed, he said if you look at the “Ways Forward”, on the PowerPoint presentation, and you looked at the points of building on our strengths, shore up weaknesses, take advantage of opportunities, strategically anticipate threats, you see a role for the campus leadership and budget committee. Hagan said he does see that making this happen would involve different parts of the campus with responsibilities, such as when making recommendations, in “Shore Up Weaknesses” in the area of language – questions like what languages should we offer, do we have the expertise on the matter, do we need to add more classes or do we need to add more people and what are the budget implications. He said he sees this all coming together at the UBC. Hagan said that not all these require dollars, some of these require a change of focus. He said he believes this is going to be a great example of where administration and faculty leadership will work closely. Hagan said he is also heartened, in that strong faculty interest and experience was found, and that we already do a lot of things on an international basis, and probably more than many schools, we just need to tie it together. **Gasco** wanted to add with regard to comprehensive internationalization, it applies across the divisions of the campus, it’s not just that we want to bring in students from abroad, it’s not just that we want our students to go abroad, that’s another thing, its curriculum, it goes across academic affairs, student affairs, that’s the goal. That’s what we’re learning in the ACE workshop is how to be sure it’s really comprehensive. **Hagan** said we’ve been having discussions that will lead to launch of the completion of a new dormitory. If we want to strengthen international enrollment, we need more dorms to have students come in to. If we build new dorms, in addition to being able to house more students, it will also free up some apartment like building in the existing which will allow us to have a place to house visiting scholars. Internationalization is a part of our rationale for a lot of our capital projects. **Fawver** shared that she felt the report to be outstanding, far exceeding her expectations. She said she was a little suspicious early on when ACE came on, but need to go public and say it was worth every penny. Universal application of international approaches is what is needed now. Talks about internationalization is a current priority, plans are afoot at college in the university, regarding the slide where you talk about plans being set up at the college level and at the university level, can you elaborate on that? **Boyum** said the Dean of CBAPP is working hard toward which mandates international capacity and programs and he is a member of the taskforce and he’s been working with faculty to develop deeper ties with institutions abroad. That’s just one. Boyum said he’s also heard tell that there the dean is going to be the president of a university on another continent. CAH has international plans. MBS has lots of interest and lots of activity. Whether these are all formal plans, but the kinds of daily planning and activity that we have discovered indicate that faculty in all of the colleges of the university show this kind of interest. Relative to the big plans that we expect to bring forth for the university, we imagine there will be attendant college plans. **Moore** asked Junn to discuss the role of the internationalization initiative in the Strategic Plan. **Junn** said that it is embedded in goal number one. It says we strive to become a comprehensive university with a global perspective and internationalization fits in there, some of the consultants felt it might be over-reaching, but we explained that there is such strong sentiment among the faculty of this campus to really expand and broaden our international efforts. **Gasco** said there’s a lot of support for internationalization. She said she attended one of the health programs at the beginning of the semester and many people there were very interested in our programs. That was one of the things that was really outstanding about our survey across the colleges we had huge support. Generally there are some colleges that are not as supportive. People were astonished at how deep the support was across all of the colleges, yes, there is not a lot of formal stuff, but there is a lot of rumblings about the potential. **Fawver** said it seemed the plans are independent of this initiative, and that while it dovetails nicely, it seemed to be on its own instead of part of the cohesive vision. **Gasco** said that was true, and another college coined the phrase, “random acts of internationalization”, to describe it. **Thomas** offered as it related to the strengths in the PowerPoint presentation, instead of using the term “low cost”, use the term “great value”. Thomas went on to talk about the Time Magazine article which ranked 4500 institutions across the country as it related to the setup that President Obama suggested for ranking institutions. Thomas pointed out that Cal State Dominguez Hills is 29th, and Harvard is 31st. He said we need to find objective means by which to toot our horn and by which other people toot our horn. He said if you remove graduation rate from the list, we are #2 in the country. Thomas said that he believes how you define graduation rate makes every bit of difference. He shared that at his institution he is counted as a non-graduate, because it took him 5 years to graduate. He said “It’s all about how you define these things, and we need to be spending the time pressing the issue about how our definition is defined, because 28% graduation rate is not indicative of what this campus does.” **McGlynn** then said he doesn’t mean to speak on behalf of other faculty, however in addition to himself, whose work is primarily abroad, if he took the temperature of the faculty, with respect to conducting our own work abroad, we are disheartened. He said that after being here for eight years, every year working abroad has become more difficult. The bureaucratic roadblocks if we look at the weaknesses of the infrastructure, some people, not myself have not been able to work abroad for purely bureaucratic reasons. Students have been deprived of opportunities. 10’s of thousands of dollars from federal agencies have been squandered because of delays in paperwork. McGlynn said that he has $15k on his credit card right now waiting for approval to go to Costa Rica, even though he submitted it a couple of weeks ago. He said he had to buy the tickets because the prices are going up. He said he is used to this by now. He said if we’re really focused on internationalization, bringing people to campus is great but if we want to look out and send our students abroad, right now he said he is tired of the roadblocks. McGlynn said, let’s not just look into bringing people in from abroad, but having faculty and students engage abroad needs to be built into the process from the beginning. **Hagan** responded by saying he agrees, administrative roadblocks have been a problem in this institution in so many areas, everyone needs money, but everyone is also aware of some of the administrative challenges we have on the campus. We’re working on that. **Senator Furtado** shared that this campus is hosting the International Study Abroad program from the CSU’s and there will be many CSU students and their parents here at the Extended Education International Center beginning at 8 PM. Furtado said she will be speaking about one of the countries they’re going to and said that it’s another way to make our campus visible that we do support international education.

4:25 **Senate Chair’s Report**: **Dr. Jerry Moore** thanked the faculty for re-electing him. He said he would also like to thank Heinze-Balcazar for her many contributions to the University. Here is his report verbatim. *Many of us feel that we’re at a special moment in the history of the university, a moment of forward movement and shared commitment. President Hagan, Provost Junn, and all of the other members of the administration, the Vice Presidents, the Associate Vice Presidents, the Interim Associate Vice Presidents, Deans, Interim Deans, Interim Associate Deans and all of the others, I look forward to working with them, whoever they might be. Turning to the members of the Exec Committee, we’re lucky to have a group of dedicated Teacher Scholars serving the Senate. As you know Pat Kalayjian stepped down as Statewide Senator after six years of service. Tom Norman has been elected as the new Statewide Senator, bringing a breadth of knowledge and experience into that position, Kate Fawver continues as the Senior Statewide Senator from CSUDH, serving as a tireless advocate for our campus and higher education in our state. Matt Jones has agreed to continue his yeoman service as the Parliamentarian and is hoping for an upcoming year with fewer elections and search committees. Kate Esposito has agreed to continue to serve as Chair of the EPC, a role in which she so ably served this year. Pat Kalayjian as agreed to take on a new role Chair of the FPC and Carolyn Coward has agreed to serve next year as Vice Chair. Carolyn has done an amazing job for us, combining services as Vice Chair and FPC Chair in addition to that service on the UBC. Carolyn – thank you so much. I would remiss if I didn’t mention Mary Brooks for her long term service to the Senate and also to Susanne Walker for her really outstanding work this semester. Beyond their individual contributions, I think this body of Senate should know how profoundly well served you are by this group of people working together. Throughout this year I’ve been repeatedly impressed by how thoughtful these people are, how balanced in their judgments, and how fair and decent they are. The academic senate and our university is very well served by these people and so I much look forward to working with them and with all of you in the upcoming year. Thank you very much.*

4:30 **Statewide Senator Report: Patricia Kalayjian** –reported on resolutions that were passed in the last year and what they advocated for and what they fought against. She said that they generally put everything in the affirmative, and try not to advocate against, so much as we advocate for.

* Advocate against - legislation to allow community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees, especially in nursing. We generally spoke against that by saying why would we do this.
* Advocated against - lowering maximum number of units for vast majority of majors down to 120 units. Not exactly in those terms, but always looking for ways that we could push the agenda of not all majors being cookie cutter processes.
* Advocated for increased commitment by the Chancellor’s office to hire new tenured and tenured track faculty.
* Worked to pursue a change in the way that faculty trustees are elected to allow the sitting trustee to remain on if there was a lag time in appointing a new trustee.
* Advocated for lecturers around the system to be eligible for emeritus status.
* Advocated for increasing the unit limit above the 120, for the engineering degree specifically, but keeping in mind that there were other majors that we might also want to look at.
* Advocated in support of the Ethnic Studies program around the system.
* Advocated for legislation that supports the CSU, but does not obtrude.
* Advocated to increase communication between the ASCSU and the faculty on campuses. There seem to be roadblocks between ASCSU and campuses. There are some Senate Chairs who do not allow their Statewide Senators to make reports or they limit their reports to just 2 minutes. Many Senate Chairs do not have access to the faculty list. So we’re trying to improve that relationships.
* Advocated for creating very thoughtful responses to all the legislation that comes forward and there has been a lot of it lately in Sacramento that has do with the CSU’s and the campus constituents.

**Chair Moore** requested that all those that are in support of the proposed 2014-2015 Senate committee signify by saying aye.

**4:35 Statewide Senator Report: Kate Fawver** informed the Senate that in the week of May 12th, the General Education Advisory Committee, will be considering the request by the Bakersfield Engineering Program to waive the critical thinking requirement at the lower level in order for them to fit and meet the 120 requirement. **Moore** asked for clarification by stating it’s not to substitute an engineering course for the critical thinking course, it’s just to eliminate it? **Fawver** said yes, for the Bakersfield Engineering Program. **Senator Pinto** asked as to why they would eliminate it? **Fawver** said that they feel that they already meet this requirement at the lower division as an engineering program. **Kalayjian** added that it is prompted by the 120 cap.

**4:45 EPC Report: Kate Esposito** said it was really a pleasure working on the Exec team this year and thanked her team, Tom Norman, John Price and Jill Aguilar. She said that 5 resolutions were passed through senate, with the most recent being the establishment of an AdHoc Committee. Esposito said the only thing left hanging to do is that last year Jan Gasco had worked on an online manual and although the EPC met and had significant work on that, at the statewide level they’re going to be making some changes so that will be the first thing we undertake in the fall.

**4:40 FPC Report: Caroline Coward** thanked the members of the Executive committee and thanked the members of the Faculty Policy Committee, Ivonne Heinze-Balcazar and Linda Goldman. She said she is proud of the work FPC has done this semester, and that they’ve gotten a lot done as evidenced by the resolutions brought forth. She said they’re probably most proud of the resolution we passed today, and I want to thank the body for empowering our lecturers to participate in department chair nominations, and also the reclassification of lecturers, something that was very important and a long time coming. We had a meeting yesterday which was a recap of what we’ve done and the status of resolutions that are pending that we’ll work on over the summer. Coward expressed gratitude to Pat Kalayjian for taking the FPC Chair and will forward everything to her.

**4:45 ASI Report: Curbin Pitts** – said it was a pleasure serving in shared governance with you all. He will be graduating May 16th. He said it was a great year, a great three years. He explained that he was an international AB540 Student. He felt that being on this campus has been a great experience, and said he’s learned so much. He thanked the Senate for holding it down and making it a great university. He highlighted that ASI had a very successful year with a strong and a full board this year. He said there will be a new ASI Vice President of Academic Affairs, Oliver Baquiax, for next year starting July 1st. He will join the next Academic Senate in fall. Pitts said he is happy to hear that we have appointed someone to be the liaison between the Senate and ASI. His concern is, that while he maintains a very hectic schedule, between being on 3 search committees for the university, more than 10 university committees, umpteen amounts of meetings, events, and he’s been all around the campus in an attempt to get to know everyone, making sure that the student voice is heard all across campus was his mission and his goal to be able to do that. He is concerned that his invitations at the Senate meeting to come talk to the students at their Board meeting, have not been responded to. He was surprised that he still did not get any response from anyone to be that leader and motivate student leadership. Pitts reminded everyone just how important it is, because, he said, you guys are our role models on campus. He said if he can do all that he does with his busy schedule, he would hope that 30 minutes of your time would not be too much to ask to speak at an ASI Board meeting. He said it’s a place where you get to interact with the students and learn from them and also they can learn from you. He said there are 3 more meetings with the ASI, and hopes you stay involved and get involved so you can hear directly from the students. **Erbe** asked when the 3 remaining meetings are. **Pitts** responded, the end of May and two in June and that they are in the minutes on page 12. **Erbe** said she would volunteer and she believed you’ll get some more. **Coward** asked as the new Senate Rep to ASI, where she could get the meeting dates throughout the summer and requested they be emailed to her? **Pitts** said he would. **Hagan** highlighted Pitts’ AB540 status and what it took to get here, starting back 9 – 10 years old. Hagan said if you look back at the things he had to do to constantly stay on course, you would have said there’s no way. Pitts is representative of a lot of our students. He understood the importance of education and put a lot on the table to make it happen, great job. **Junn** shared she worked with AB540 students elsewhere. The first student body president was Pedro Ramirez, an AB540 student and that made national headlines. The newspaper tried to oust him against his will originally and the campus stepped forward to make more resources available. Junn said she worked very closely with student affairs and she will continue to support this work on this campus as well. A formal announcement has not been made yet, but Senator Pinto has volunteered to help out, so that we have more resources available on the website and more support programs. Junn said there were approximately 245 AB540 students on our campus from 13 different countries and she looks forward to hearing more about that this fall.

**4:50 CFA Report: Jose Prado** – Congratulated Curbin Pitts. He reported about the closing luncheon, which was held on May 6th, where Theresa Montano from Cal State University Northridge was the invited guest speaker. Prado said that during the meeting she challenged us to consider the implications of two designations (1 official and 1 unofficial) used to identify our university, our university as a minority serving institution and the unofficial one, a minority enrolling institution. As it concerns the allocation of funds for our university. What does it mean to be designated as such and what does it mean as far as the funds that make their way into our university. That was at the heart of our luncheon. We also spoke of the things we accomplished throughout the year and shed light on the activities we will be pursing this summer and into the following school year. Our 100 day contract count down is ongoing, 68 days until the expiration of our contract and you can see more about it on our website and on Facebook, please like us on Facebook. One of the other ways we are pursuing that builds on the solidarity of the university system is through the bolstering and defense of stateside instruction across the CSU’s and we’re doing this at CFA, through the CFA sponsored bill 2153, which would keep required coursework for graduation on stateside. **Fawver** asked Prado to explain the process, with 68 days until the contract expires, what timeframe is everyone shooting for in terms of ratification. Is there anything planned. **Prado** responded that he does not have details to give other than to say whenever 68 days is from now is when the current contract expires and cordial discussions are happening right now between CSU and CFA, and we’re expecting on the 69th day, we’ll begin work with a new contract. Prado offered that you can email him specific questions and he will respond to everyone. Fawver wanted to know if it would be ratified by union members? **Moore** said that once there’s an agreement, there is a standard election/voting process. **Coward** said re. the CFA email blast about bargaining specifically as it related to salary, that gave the details about their salary proposal, specifically as it related to compression and inversion. They put forward a multi-year, both GSI and SSI raise for everyone, including lecturers that addresses general salary increases and a service step increase, and they went into detail in the email blast about how this would address both compression and inversion. Coward said it was actually the most detail gotten out of the bargaining team this entire period. Question – bill 2153 is that Assembly or Senate, SB2153?

**Open Forum: Senator** Furtado brought up an experience she had on campus today, (May 7) that she felt was very disturbing whereby a student was accosted by a group on the campus about the way she dressed. They were quite vocal and almost threatening. The student contained herself and then responded with an outburst. Speculation was that it might have been the Jehovah Witnesses that are sometimes on campus. Furtado invited the student to speak with her, if she would want me to tell someone. Furtado said she did not know who to go to. She suggested that we should know who/what to do in such situations, and because it happened to a student, she thought she should let the senate know. She further added that with so many individuals on campus with leaflets and pamphlets – as she doesn’t have anything against it, verbally insulting because of orientation shouldn’t happen on campus. There has to be a way to address this. Safety comes to mind, today it was verbal accosting and tomorrow it could be something worse. **Senator Belu** brought up an incident that occurred on campus two months prior whereby people were passing out leaflets, on that particular day they were yelling you will burn in hell if you don’t believe in God. Belu said that this is a place of education not intimidation, that there’s a line, and when that line gets crossed, the police need to come and remove them. **Senator Pinto** brought up in terms of not knowing what to do in such a scenario, that there is available on campus, Safe Space Training. She encouraged everyone to take the time to go to one of the meetings so that you know how to handle. She said she felt that Furtado did the right thing when she asked her if she wanted to talk to someone. Sometimes students need to vent, sometimes students want to take it up to official levels, what I learned is it’s important to listen first. She said she found out about these courses through Lui Amador’s office, <http://www4.csudh.edu/safe-space/>. You will receive a sticker to put on your door so that students know it’s safe to come to you. As more faculty have these stickers, it sends a message to the students that most will stand in defense of the student. Training was well worth it, 4 hours, usually on a Friday. While there are larger issues being brought up, it is one concrete action we can be doing to help. Another Senator brought up the opportunity to take advantage of sexual harassment training, which is offered by CSU, and found it to be very informative. **Hagan** said he would check on the policy with regard to people who come on campus and make presentations. He said that they are supposed to register, and adhere to standard behavior. Anything is a concern, don’t hesitate to call the police. The campus is welcome to everyone, but in fact there of rules of behavior. **Weber** said if/when there’s a safety issue, definitely the police should be called. Faculty Affairs – Clare Weber, Human Resources – Gus Martin and Student Affairs – Sonja Daniels, handle any title 9 or any related discrimination, harassment, complaints or issues. They coordinate with each other but this should probably be reported to Dr. Daniels. **Heinze-Balcazar** said last semester there was an anti-abortion group on campus specifically targeting young women and threatening them. It would be important to know who is allowed and given permission to be here on campus. **Pitts** said that several students did come in to the ASI office complaining about this particular incident as well as about the individuals trying to get them to sign petitions. Another incident that occurred to Pitts personally was when he was in the restroom in the gym and met up with a homeless man who was getting ready, changing. It shocked me to know to that this person was in our restroom changing and doing his thing. It’s important for us to be aware of who is coming on campus and having policies to make sure everyone is kept safe. Dean **Hay** said he took the harassment training eight times, and reminded everyone that you actually don’t get to decide “if” an incident should be reported or not, you are actually required to report it automatically. If someone tells you, just report it to faculty affairs or human resources. Don’t try to make that decision it’s kind of the law, you have to do it. **Hagan** said with regard to the homeless person, this campus is in an area where homeless folks hang out. The gym in particular seems to be a magnetic place, you go to gym, or to the shower, especially on the weekend, a homeless guy is usually there. Extensive conversations have been had with the police, they’ve added additional patrols. There are people who leave doors propped open, the doors are supposed to be locked. If you see something report it. It is a large campus and a lot of “unincorporated land” out there. We have cut down on the number of homeless people on the campus. Those who do are using our facilities to shower and to change. If you see it, don’t hesitate to report it, the police try to respond to every call they get. **Junn** said it may be useful to invite the chief of police to the board and to ASI as well. I say this because at Fresno, they had 1300 acres and 1000 of those were farm. San Jose is in the middle of an urban setting. Their library is a city institution library and therefore open to the public. When it is cold, there’s a whole series of homeless waiting to get in. Every campus, in an urban situation does have police that are ready to handle any situations that come up. It also helps to educate student that as a public institution we do allow people to come on to the campus, but when it’s a safety issue that’s where we have to be careful. So it’s also educating our faculty and mounting a campaign of when you see something suspicious say something. It may be worthwhile to have a report at the Senate from the campus police to keep people aware. If we do it on an ongoing basis, people are informed.

**Heinze-Balcazar** said she believed under Chief Velez things have changed. We actually see the police throughout the campus in the daytime. At night, those of us who teach have seen a change. He’s done a good job of making us feel safer and has changed the attitude of the police on the campus, so that we feel safe morning and night. **Junn** said of the three campuses she’s been on, CSUDH is the safest and the crime rate has gone down. **Hagan** said that there is an informal understanding with the folks in the community that CSUDH is an asset, so to treat the campus as a place which everyone benefits from. Safety for all of us is a top priority. Bringing the Chief of Police in is a great idea and I’m also thinking that we may want to do some mailings on the campus. I’ll find out what kind of policies we do have, and have that sent out to the campus so that if you see something that you believe inappropriate, you can call the right person.

**Senator Magruder** thanked the body on behalf of herself and De Velasco for making the move at the beginning of the academic year to include part-time lecturers. She thanked the body again for giving part-time lecturers some representation and for entertaining some very significant policies that impact lecturers. **Moore** said one of the things that he has learned was how often is the case that we can arrive at some of the best decisions the more voices we have around the table. He said, “What we just heard are probably issues that I might not have known anything about, ideas about courses of action, future action and I think that is what the Academic Senate is supposed to be doing.” He added, “Like I said last year at the beginning of the semester, as we tackle sometimes contentious issues with a sense of mutual respect and civility is something that we want to do.” Moore congratulated the body for having participated.

**Hirohama** said she wanted to also thank President Hagan for approving and the body for adding another staff representative. Anthony Cipriano will be taking the position for next year and another staff rep will be decided upon. She said she learned a lot about the academic side and how things work and she appreciated the opportunity to sit on the body.

5:00 Adjournment