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**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

**September 23, 2015**

**Voting Members Present**: Abdourazakou, Avila, Belu, Bowles Eagle, Chavez, Durand, Ellsworth, Ferris, Fitzsimmons, Furtado, Grasse, Heinz-Balcazar, Hutton, via proxy Macias, Jacobs, Jarrett, Jett, Jones, Kaplan, Krochalk, Kulikov, Ledesma, Ma, McGlynn, Merz, Monty, Mutchler, Needham, Oesterheld, Park, Parker, Peyton, Price, Tang, Thomas, Vanterpool, Villanueva, Wang

**Voting Members Not Present:** Bender, Ernst, Leonard, Navarrete

**Voting Ex-Officio Members Present:** Coward, Esposito, Hagan, Haney, Gamino, Hill, Kalayjian, Moore, Norman, Pawar

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

**Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present:** Bersi, Bragg, Brasley, Fenning, Franklin, Junn, Kaul, Manriquez, Stewart, Weber, Wen

**Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present:** Davis, Hart, Hay, Huizinga, Maki, Manriquez, McNutt, Poltorak, Sayed

**Guests:** Mitch Avila, Bridget Driscoll, Miguel Dominguez, Sal Valdez

**2015-2016 Academic Senate Executive Committee:**

Jim Hill – Chair, Jerry Moore – Vice Chair, Caroline Coward – Parliamentarian, Sheela Pawar – EPC Chair, Pat Kalayjian – FPC Chair, Thomas Norman – Statewide Senator, Kate Esposito – Statewide Senator

Recorded and Edited by SEW and the Executive Committee

Meeting Called to Order 2:30 PM

Approval of (Amended) Agenda MSP

Approval of Minutes (09/09/15) MSP

Senator Thomas requested the information promised by Provost Junn in the May 6th and September 9th Senate meeting. Junn said it will take some time to get the information out as Academic Affairs is still in the midst of reconfirming the budget as the system is still in the middle of giving money to the campuses. We are trying to make the allocations even as we speak. She hopes to have it no later than the end of October. Thomas he wanted to make sure they were speaking of the same thing, 1. Designing Your Life program, and 2. Innovation Funds. Junn affirmed that she knew what was being covered.

**Chair Hill’s Report:** Retreat Synthesis

* Redistribution of upper division general education workload – Senate Resolution [EPC/FPC 13-11](http://www4.csudh.edu/Assets/CSUDH-Sites/Academic-Senate/docs/documents/EPC_FPC13-11.pdf), the resolution Revising the Designation and Administration of Upper Division General Education courses to include department based courses. Surrounding this are issues of implementation of the policy and where the workload is going. It seems that there is a little confusion about who can fix that now, but it needs to get fixed.
* Shared Governance – budgetary matters, part-time faculty representation on several levels, ensuring engagement for tenured faculty, Hill commented on the irony of themes that came out of the retreat was that tenured track faculty have too much service to do and part-time faculty want more opportunities to do service.
* Most common FPC related comments had to do with uniformity, equity infused in RTP, and service overload. Faculty advocate work and that is ongoing; work on the faculty handbook.
* Tenure density – how we reach our goals in tenure density and where are we really (not just as a number, how are we counting faculty service work – what’s the denominator in a calculation of tenure density and whether we take into consideration course size and things like that.
* Budget Transparency utilizing OpenGov.com or some comparable modality. Making sure that there’s a timeline and that the end product is easy to understand.
* Housing
* Student Services – Hill commented that he happened to have the opportunity to get a tour of their facility. He highly recommended it. He discovered there was a lot being offered that he hadn’t been previously aware of. Additionally, he got some information to one of the concerns that had come up at the retreat, which had to do with the amount of visits a student can receive over the course of their time at CSUDH. He was informed that students are eligible for 12 visits which is actually above the norm at the UC’s.
* Facilities Issues – parking, bathrooms

**Vanterpool** – Faculty Handbook – when working on a committee in the past to update the faculty handbook, some of the complications with the Collective Bargaining Agreement matching up with what we believed to be campus policy. There is a need to constantly be revising in order to stay current. Vanterpool expressed how important it is for faculty, especially new faculty coming in can count on having something at hand, electronically or otherwise and that things are clearly spelled out. It’s time for a handbook that is current with union requirements and our own policy. **AVP Weber** responded stating that Kalayjian, Chair of the Faculty Policy Committee and she have been working on an electronic faculty handbook and that over the summer a draft was put together that’s an e-draft. There is a draft, table of contents, with electronic links to the various areas. The Faculty Affairs office will be working with the Faculty Policy Committee to review it all and make any changes. It’s well on its way.

**Bowles Eagle** said one issue she did not hear Hill bring up was the issues of faculty having to update their own websites. **Provost Junn** asked VP Manriquez to provide an update on this issue. **Manriquez** reported that a position has been posted for people to handle the content management of the websites for departments and individual faculty for the entire campus. **Provost Junn** reminded everyone that there would still be a need to chairs to appoint someone within their department to read through and review the content, as this person will only be responsible for the technology piece. **Hill** pointed out that there is also another issue that was brought up at the Retreat which was ensuring consistency of the look and feel of college websites.

Hill continued with his update:

* GE Committee Membership – half of the GE Committee seats are vacant. They are currently without a Chair as there has been a change in representation of Area F1 Humanities Subcommittee. Filling those seats in GE is critical right now.
* WSCUC – GE’s role in accreditation. A reminder of how important this is. GE and separately from that, assessment of GE – major central themes in the review process.
* The GE Committee Charge says very little about the Area F subcommittees, it says they must exist, it says how it must represent departments that have courses in them. While there may have been intention to have some variation at one time, it’s led to a lack of uniformity and a lot of confusion. It will need to be addressed. EPC will be working on this in conjunction with the GE Committee. Yet another change to the GE Charge, however we can expect it to be clarified how these Area F subcommittees are constituted and choose their leadership.

**Vice Chair Moore** brought up a survey that has been going around to department chairs regarding service. He said the survey was sent with very little context when it was sent out earlier in the summer. He commented some of the questions on it seemed awkwardly arranged, that it didn’t address the way departments are run and it didn’t really facilitate a description of how service works in the department. **AVP Kaul** said that a chair in a college who had those questions and asked her to facilitate data gathering. Kaul said when she put together the survey, the questions came from a chair who was looking for answers. If it’s useful use it, if it’s not – change it to whatever the needs are. **Senator Monty** said when he received the survey, he took it to be a substitute for the Faculty Quality Indicator III or IV that in the past we received every fall about faculty service and which was part of the PEAT report. That data collection was discontinued because the information was solicited and gathered in such a way that it did not provide any meaningful results.  It reported only the number of committees on which program faculty served, without indicating what kinds of committees they were.  If we were to tweak this survey – to show, for example, the specific committees and the rank of those serving on them - we could actually get some useful information that would help programs and also help Institutional Research and Effectiveness get aggregate data for service trends on the campus more generally**.Moore** asked what are the classes of service that WSCUC will likely be looking at. **Kaul** responded WSCUC is not specifically looking for details of service information, they ask cross cutting questions about faculty work in general and how it supports instructional service. This was not a WSCUC data element. The chair that did contact me was asking about day to day management of an academic program. The question was, when it comes to assessing service for individual faculty, how should I be responding. It was a much focused localized question and not in the context of WSCUC. **Moore** said one of the issues that came up last time during the WSCUC review was specific to shared governance and university governance. Are those issues likely to be what’s requested? **Kaul** responded, shared governance – yes; specifically service, no. **Thomas** asked for clarity on the purpose of the survey that was circulated and how are they going to use the responses. **Kaul** said in that particular department where this was initiated, they wanted to know how service is assessed across the institution in other departments. The responses are being collected and handed back to the chair and if others were interested they could have a copy as well.

**Vanterpool** – re. GE Committee membership with regard to election of the Chair. The resolution that was revised and approved in 2012, it says, “a faculty member elected by the committee members will serve as chair for one year term which may be renewed? Does this happen regularly? **Hill** said yes it does and the change came about because of the change in the Area F1 subcommittee was the person who happened to be Chair of the GE Committee.

**Senator Heinze-Balcazar** – “In the name of Shared Governance, I would like to suggest that the chair of EPC works with Area F subcommittees to establish a governing structure for them.  The SBS coordinator would like to collaborate with the chair of EPC in this endeavor. The SBS coordinator has experience on this since the SBS committee has an organized structure with regular meetings and elections.”

**Parliamentarian Caroline Coward** passed out ballots for the election of two faculty members for the Research Enterprise Pre & Post Award Services Task Force. Price withdrew her name from the election.

**President Hagan’s Report**

* Chancellor’s visit to the campus – encouraged faculty to attend. The President and Cabinet will not be in attendance at the open session and that’s by the Chancellor’s request. It’s important that the Chancellor know what the faculty and students think on whatever topics there may be. We are the second campus that he’ll be visiting. He wants to focus on innovation in the classroom. We’ll have him visit a couple of classrooms on campus. He’ll be visiting one of Tom Norman’s classes being held in the Active Learning Classroom. Chancellor White also wants to personally thank a variety of faculty and staff for things they have done. We try to take every opportunity we can when we have a Chancellor or Trustee member here to highlight the condition of our facilities. We’ll be taking him through the Academic Complex, those represent temporary buildings that are well past their time. I took the Cabinet on a tour over the summer of lot of the buildings that they don’t ordinarily see. I thought it important that they be reminded of the “felt” experience of our faculty and students in some of our facilities. 42% of all of our classroom seats are in temporary facilities. We’re trying to upgrade them where we can. The Active Learning Classroom is a nice example, but it does not address by a long shot the needs we have. It’s something constantly on our agenda. We are also looking at the issue of our restrooms, we know there are problems out there.
* Enrollment demand for this campus continues to exceed our funding capacity. We were tasked with not going over the 3 1/2 % target and we met that with a great deal of difficulty. Part of the reason the Chancellor is holding us accountable for not going over target is he’s trying to make a point with the Governor. We’re arguing to get additional resources and every time we enroll way more students than our resources technically allow for, the Governors’ office says, “See, they don’t need the resources.” Although it’s difficult to turn away students, we can only take so many. We’re still 1 of only 5 campuses not impacted. We’re also getting the redirected students from other campuses. It was a small number this year and there is a constant battle to make sure we hit our enrollment targets. We’re pushing hard to give us increased enrollment funding because the demand for our region is extremely high. We are only at about 50% of the capacity that this campus is sized for. We’re at 10,100 full-time equivalent students, the Master Plan calls for us to be at 20,000. That does require that we get additional facilities along the way. The Chancellor acknowledged that there’s a reality we must face, there is only a limited number amount of capital dollars that we have in the system. While we have enrollment growth there are still only so many dollars available. We’re pushing for those thing. Hagan said I’m fine going over target to the amount that’s allowed. Going too much over target generates cost. Our demand is high.
* Science Innovation Building - that building continues to move along. It’s gone from a considered project to being an approved project. We’re pushing really hard for the Chancellor’s office to put in more dollars from stateside. By taking Trustees and others through the buildings and having them see it – there has become a clear recognition that Dominguez Hills has been short-changed when it comes to certain facilities. While there are others who can make compelling arguments for other buildings we really can only go one at a time. That was deemed to be the first priority in terms of going after capital projects. Hagan said he does see the Science building happening, and before he was hoping it would happen, and now it’s a matter of having it happen with the least financial impact.
* AdHoc Committee on Land Development - There is a taskforce I would like to bring forward in the near future with regard to the land development issues. Some of you are aware that we’re going to be renegotiating our contract with AEG. It’s not a simple matter. AEG has a $150 million complex on our campus. We have a Master Plan of things we want to do. We need student housing, maybe faculty/staff housing, we’re in the process of trying to acquire land from the city that’s located across the street for faculty/staff/grad student housing. Any development done on this campus will need to answer how it benefits Dominguez Hills academically as it will have a major impact on our campus. Hagan said he would like the Senate to play a role in helping him to put together an AdHoc Committee on Land Development so that as we get proposals, that there are folks who are looking at it from different perspectives. Hagan also expressed appreciation for an issue that came up at the Senate retreat of “too much service”, saying while we have put together several task forces, he would like to think that the task forces we put together are surrounding issues that this body and others have said are important. There are task forces that we haven’t put out that are also important, but we try to recognize as was said, there are only so many people available. We are trying to spread it out.
* Taskforce/Committee update: Research Enterprise & Post Award Committee is going quite well. The completed Internationalization Taskforce put forth a lot of good recommendations. The CSUDH Business and Industry Incubator Taskforce met today to explore the possibility of engaging business and community leaders in working with our faculty and staff to support the entrepreneurial desires of our students, faculty and the local business communities that in ways that would offer synergy is almost off and running.
* $1.1 million grant received – Hagan asked VP Franklin to provide a quick update on the grant received for Veteran’s support programs. Franklin said that this is a grant that initiated from the Department of Education’s TRIO Program, which had three programs attached, now there are eight of which the newest one is Student Support Services Veterans. This is the first year they decided to focus some of the funding on veterans and CSUDH went after it aggressively. We were one of the few campuses in the CSU, in the region, and even the nation to receive the $1.1 million. This will really give us a chance to focus in on early outreach to veterans. There’s a window of time, and a limited time and amount of money that they get to focus on education. Getting to them early, getting to them often, and by time they get there, have good programs and services so we can really target getting them through here on time so they can get the degree they want and the career they want. We’re about to hire a Director who will come on board to really localize it. Getting the veterans the classes they need in a timely manner is really huge. So a lot of student support services will be connected to the grant, it’s a phenomenal opportunity to serve the men and women who have served us greatly.

**Q & A**

**Senator Thomas** volunteered to serve on the AdHoc Committee on Land Development. He said that his background includes commercial real estate and negotiated these kinds of deals regularly.   
**Vice Chair Moore** said he assumes shortly there will be requests for proposals on the land development and wouldn’t it be appropriate to include in those documents the educational mission and have that be an explicit part of the RFP, deciding that a certain number of points would be allocated in the evaluation of those proposals. **President Hagan** said yes and no. There will not be any related RFPs in regard to the negotiation with AEG since we’ve already established the partnership. But if we are looking at a faculty staff housing, than we would put together an RFP and would be able to say something along those lines. We have informally been talking to a lot of developers just trying to find out if we are right in thinking there’s interest in private developers building. We have to build a lot of things outside of the state system. The CSU system only allows for $750 million worth of debt service capacity and one building costs $100 million. With 23 buildings you exhaust that quickly. So we’re saying let us build a lot of these offices using outside contractors. But yes, using a statement like that makes a lot of sense. **Moore** said the reason he asks is before the Home Depot Center was cited on this campus, we were promised that there would be all sorts of academic programs that would come a long and really the only thing that came out of it was that a few of our students got jobs in food services. There’s not always been a connect and it would be a good thing to try to get that into the document. **Hagan** said he agrees. He recalls reading the original AEG contact with regard to the Home Depot Center, now Stubhub, and I thought wow, look at all these great things here in writing, how come they don’t exist. I was told it was because it was in the preamble, not in the actual contract. From my point of view that’s on the university. When I got here no one came to me and said how much they love the relationship with AEG. They are aware of how they are perceived on this campus. Recently I was riding to LA with one of AEG’s managers and I asked them point blank, why didn’t you do some of those things that would have made the campus feel, from an academic perspective, that you’re a valued partner. The response Hagan received was that they came to the university, they made an offer to do those things and were told that we didn’t have the time or the capacity. Hagan said he then came back to Cabinet asking is this so – did they come and offer? This was during Hagan’s first year here and a Cabinet member said yes they did. And we said to them our faculty is too busy to build these programs. Hagan said it’s hard to separate out what were their failures versus what were things that we did but it does point out the issue of shared governance. If you have a group that’s going to discuss these, it doesn’t become the unilateral decision of one individual. And this wasn’t at the presidential level, it was down further. I think our whole AEG relationship has suffered from multiple modes of communication that weren’t always tied together. The position I’m taking is the past is the past and that we in fact should sit down and start over and see where we’re going. They have said when I sat down with them recently they will help us build our sports management program to the extent that we want them. They manage or own 125 entertainment venues around the world and some of the biggest around the world. We should have internships at some of their facilities in China, their facilities in London, we should have Coco Cola donating money, there are so many ways that a company that large can contribute to us and I don’t find the evidence that we aggressively pursued it with them. I don’t see that. I agree - having people around the table asking how is the faculty housing unit going to contribute to the academics. We should be able to point to the fact if a private developer is building this and they don’t have to buy the land, then their net return on investment should be large enough to spin off cash to us and that cash could be used to pay off some of our debt services, or renovations to the College of the Arts building or renovations to the College of Business. We’re hoping to have a process where that doesn’t happen. Where you or others can ask questions. Hagan said related to that we will not be doing the negotiations. There is no one in this room, including myself, at the AEG level. We have been talking to attorneys and real estate advisors and people at the Chancellor’s office who are extraordinarily adept and do this for a living and have them do the negotiation s and make recommendations to us. **Senator Mutchler** said a comment about AEG and the collaboration that didn’t happen. I believe I do speak for several faculty when I say that it’s really incumbent upon them to provide something back to us. I don’t think it makes sense to blame the “victim”. We’re just a small campus and they have 125 venues around the world. I think they have the capacity to make sure something happens here. **Hagan** said he agrees and in talking to our lawyers, even they said they should be showing up. Some of the issues that are irritating us now, I wonder why are they doing that. If it were me I would be bending over backwards. But I also know they are a business and are business negotiators. I’m not blaming us, I’m saying that somewhere along the line we have to take responsibility for how we approached our end of it. For them it was a $150 million gamble to put it in there. **Mutchler** said their guests and when you come to someone’s home, you should bring something. The new Science building it is very exciting, how is it going to be decided who will be in that building? **Hagan** said it would not be my job. There are Provosts and Deans and a whole lot of faculty that would be working on those thing. My job is to get it built. First there needs to be a committee that should be working on the design process. At the end of the day there will always be someone who wants to be somewhere that someone wants to be and someone gets left out. There will be battles, but I would love to be in that position. **Mutchler** said he would just like the process to be transparent. **Hagan** said yes that’s fair and one way to do that, as we get into the design phase, it would be fine for Senate to request a presentation be made. My goal would be to make sure a process exists and that it’s open and transparent. **Senator McGlynn** said whileit slightly predates my time, it is my understanding that the development of the Home Depot Center was a disaster in terms of environmental protection and sustainability. As the biologist here, I need to represent the interests of our campus in making sure that the new developments are done responsibly and sustainably. The mitigation plans that were supposed to happen with the development didn’t come through the way they it was understood. I don’t know what the legal and financial basis for that was. **Hagan** said he does not know either. He does know that everything that we do has to go through the Chancellor’s office even if it’s done through us or the Foundation and they usually ask those questions. Our goal is to do things in a financially sustainable method. Obviously it’s something we teach our students and it’s the right thing to do. Also this comes back to a committee asking those kinds of questions. Someone asked why are you working with the Senate to put this committee together, it’s not required. I said you’re either committed to shared governance or you’re not. It could slow things down but to me it’s never been about getting things done speedily, it’s about making sure we have the right input on this. I don’t know what environmental issues happened in the past. I don’t know what they could have gotten away with. But we will make sure that we don’t do that and we have a committee in place that asks those kinds of questions. **McGlynn** said I’m not even an expert sustainability but what I am saying is that as we negotiating with AEG for big plans, we should have the Center for Urban Environmental Research consulted and involved in that process. **Hagan** said I agree, one of the faculty members from that area be on the committee.  
**Senator Heinze-Balcazar** said with regard to the Women’s Resource Center is entering its third year on campus and we wanted to thank you for your support.  
**Senator Monty** said,I know it’s not perfect and everyone is not satisfied, but I wanted to thank the President for acting on campus equity issues. I know that only about all of campuses administrations have done so and I think we owe our thanks to President Hagan for taking the lead. **Hagan** responded that it’s about what do you view are your priorities. Hagan said when he got here he heard nothing but discussions about how long this campus have gone without. We set aside $600,000 for three years, we ended up having to spend $2.1 million. That’s baseline money that could have gone to any other area on this campus. But what I heard was that compensation was a critical issue on this campus. And we also knew that no matter what plan we put in place, we weren’t able to get everyone. Collective bargaining, that’s moving forward, hopefully that will come out some way to make adjustments even more. We’re changing the processes by which people can apply for a market increase. The contact does call for other ways to look at market and so I make sure that we do look at other ways. We’re revamping the process by which staff would go for increases. It’s not perfect and we’re going to make mistakes along the way. I would like to think that we worked together to make this happen and I appreciate the acknowledgement.

**Provost Junn Report**

* Academic Affairs Strategic Plan – with the completion of our University Strategic Plan we now wish to finalize the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan, which is what are the key principles that are fundamental in how we think about the academic side of the house? Over the past few months, the AVP for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment, Gitanjali Kaul put together a draft that we would like to have a committee review with representatives from each of the colleges to massage the draft, to see if it’s something that we as a campus believe represent what we hold to be true. I brought the draft to Senate Exec for review and to help identify the best way to populate this committee, whether by selection, nomination or appointment, however we want to do it. **Provost Junn** asked Senate Chair Hill where Senate Exec is in the process. **Hill** said that there were a few names being discussed and we’re identifying some others. **Junn** said this task force should be a fun one, its short, it’s asked that the draft plan be finished by December. And in the meanwhile the Deans are crafting college specific plans on how you want to fulfill the overarching university strategic plan. That will be taking place as soon as Senate Exec provides me with name.
* The Active Learning Classrooms are open for business – hearing great feedback from the students. 24 faculty have signed on to teach over 30 courses for in the spring semester. It’s in pretty good utilization. It’s something the Chancellor absolutely wants to see.
* The Chancellor will also be visiting with the faculty who are teaching the Freshman Dream Course. These are freshman who ordinarily never get a chance to meet tenured and tenured track faculty in their first year on campus. We have 13 faculty who have signed on and are teaching the Dream Course right now. Junn said she would send to Chair Hill the link to the Freshman First Year seminar programs so you can see the courses and the faculty who are teaching the courses. The call went out to see if there are more faculty who might want to teach a course for spring. We’re offering this as a University 101 that once existed on this campus and meets the General Education category F for GE credit. They get to get to learn from you and learn more in depth about one of your disciplines where you received your doctorial disciplines. Junn thanked Helen Oesterheld, Marisela Chavez and Keisha Paxton who helped draft the call and create this new program working with Kaye Bragg. We’re looking for more volunteers, there were some who were unable to meet the call last spring and there’s another call out right now.
* While taskforces do require a lot of work, a lot of good comes out of them. If you came to the Fall Welcome you might have seen some of the pictures of Bridget Driscoll from Advising with a scroll of the 117 recommendations that came out of that task force that Clare Weber and Keith Boyum chaired and we’ll hear from her after my report.
* I will also ask Chair Hill to invite Gary Rhodes to come speak to the Senate to let you know all of the progress that’s been made as a result of the findings from the Internationalization Taskforce led by Jan Gasco and Keith Boyum. Junn said that William Franklin and I met last week to talk about how to build out the infrastructure so that we can recruit, mentor and better support both our existing international students and those we recruit as well. Our University Strategic Plan states that we hope to increase by 300 new international students in the next two to five years. We are making great progress. I’ve charged Gary Rhodes, SIO, to come up with a comprehensive infrastructure and budgetary plan about who we hire, what should their duties be and work collaboratively with all the units on campus. He’s almost done with that plan, after he rolls it out, we’ll start making sure we’re partnering with all the relevant units; Student Affairs, Admin and Finance, IT, Student Affairs, Senate and the faculty as well. So he can roll out some ideas and take your feedback as well. It’s not just for international students, but it’s for internationalization, which includes Fulbright’s, study abroad, faculty exchanges, etc.

Comment from the floor a reminder that to apply to teach a Dream Course is Tuesday, October 6th. Junn confirmed.

**Hill** asked if there is anything we should know or do about the chancellor coming on Friday? **Hagan** said no. It’s an opportunity for the campus to say to the head of the CSU what you want him to know. I have my time with him. Somethings I’ll keep pushing with him are: some students are more expensive, some of the smaller campuses need additional resources, as an unimpacted campus – we are not a catch basin for the campuses that have declared impaction because to the extent that we’re forced to take those students it limits our ability to service our region. I think it’s an opportunity for you to say whatever you think he needs to hear. OPEN FORUM with Chancellor White – 9:30 to 10:30 am.

**Vice Chair Moore** – One of the things that I believe is really a remarkable occurrence this fall is we saw our total FTEs go up about 600 to 800 but we only saw our headcount go up about 100 people, which means our mean unit load has increased dramatically and we’re getting closer to 12 as opposed to 10, which is where we were five years ago. I would think that growth like that, we’ve always been behind the eight ball because if we had 10,000 FTEs than we had to have 15,000 people on the campus and provide for them. So I think that kind of enrollment growth in that context needs to be discussed. **Hagan** said that’s right. And I’ve had that conversation with him. When it looked like we were going to come in at 108 or 109 over target, I thought it best to be preemptive and go in and tell him. Chancellor White, you’re telling everyone to come in maybe 1% maybe 3% over target and I’m way over. But we wanted to explain to him how the mean unit load, every increase in mean unit load equals x amount of FTEs. Our folks gave me all those numbers and we walked him through that. I said to him I don’t mind getting chewed out if it looks like I ignored your targets for just pure students coming in, but if we’re doing the things that are showing success and taking increase in mean unit load, that we shouldn’t do. We can disaggregate our enrollment increase by what’s related to unit load increase versus by what are pure bodies. We’ve had that conversation. We’ve also been arguing that we’ve got to get more funded enrollment to continue doing what we want to do. We know there’s a small pie, but the pie needs to be divided differently.

**Bridget Driscoll, Interim AVP Advising Update** – Bridget Driscoll, Interim AVP Advising Update – Driscoll shared that when she got to the campus she was given 117 recommendations that came out of the Advising Taskforce, a comprehensive amazing guide of what needed to be accomplished on this campus as it relates to advising.  These 117 recommendations fall into four categories 1. Administration & Support Sevices 2. Information Technology. Policy and Assessment 4. Training and Professional Development. Driscoll said that these four areas are well under way and we are making progress on 85%. Driscoll passed out a form to all of the Senators that had a draft of the university advising mission statement. Driscoll asked everyone to review and add to it something they believed should be included in the university mission statement. Additionally, the form included a space under Student Advising Learning Objectives for feedback on what the faculty members believed the student should walk away with whether they’re sitting down with a faculty member or student advisor in the UATC or elsewhere , at the Freshman, Sophomore, Junior and Senior levels. Driscoll gave the Senate time to gather suggestions. Several Senators offered out loud some suggestions of which Driscoll opened for a discussion and encouraged the Senators to include on the form. Driscoll commented this was specific to undergraduates and that there will be a similar process for graduates in the future.  Driscoll reported on two additional level of support provided to students and faculty within their college, College Specialists and Faculty Advising Fellows.

College Specialists are from the University Advising Center and they come to your office and help with advising needs:  <http://www4.csudh.edu/avp-advisement/college-specialists/index>

* Reviewing lower and upper division General Education Requirements
* Reviewing Overall Graduation Requirements including: CSU Statutory requirements, the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), unit and residency requirements, and GPA requirements
* Providing support to students in academic distress, who are on academic probation and/or academically disqualified
* Submit Advisor Request and Records Component (ARRC) requests for course substitutions
* Guide discontinued and returning students on options for returning to complete their undergraduate degree
* Assisting in the utilization and navigation of online advising resources such as PeopleSoft, EAB, Student Success Collaborative, CollegeSource, and ASSIST
* Reviewing Title V, CSU Executive Orders, and campus policies

Faculty Advising Fellows are dedicated faculty who have been training in the UAC, and serve as college experts in general education, graduation requirements and their area of expertise.  Debbie Best, John Keyantash, Laura Talamante and Tom Landefeld are the key faculty supporting optimal progress to degree completion, closing the achievement gap and offering vital support to their colleagues. Driscoll stated we will strive to have experts in all five colleges to make sure the students have comprehensive, developmental advising. Your role as a Faculty Advisor enhances the university experience and enables students to make meaningful connections between their current academic experiences and their future life goals and plans. She encouraged any other faculty who would like to participate as there is plenty of room. Junn pointed out the University Advising website is updated and all of the 117 recommendations are listed there. She said you can see what has been accomplished and what’s being worked on and if you have questions or any area you need support in, contact Driscoll.

**Parliamentarian Caroline Coward Report -** provided the results of the paper ballot election handed out earlier in the meeting. Katy Pinto and Leena Furtado have been elected to serve on the Research Enterprise Pre & Post Award Services Taskforce. The Senate gave a vote of acceptance by acclamation for Mohsen Beheshti and Kamal Hamdan to serve on the Student Fee Advisory Committee. Also we are requesting volunteers for a taskforce for the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan. We are looking for volunteers to serve on that group. It is neither onerous nor long term. We still need a Senate representative to the GE Committee. We need to send a Senator to the GE Committee. That call went out several weeks ago.

**CFA Report – Vivian Price**

We spoke earlier about the Chancellor’s visit to Dominguez Hills. We’re encouraging everyone to come and talk to the Chancellor hear about his interest in our campus and of course the question of the funding formula is very important. We feel that Dominguez Hills has been short changed for many years. We also have a question of our wages and we recommend that you wear red in solidarity and show the Chancellor that we mean business. We really want a 5% raise and we feel we deserve it. We appreciate the equity and we appreciate the change in the misclassification of lecturers but we need 5%. Prior to the Chancellor’s visit, Thursday night, September 24th at 6 pm we’re having an informal CFA dinner, El Rocoto, the Peruvian restaurant on Artesia. Ivonne Heinze-Balcazar is coordinating that. November 17th, unless the Chancellor relents and decides to budge on the 2%, we plan to mobilize on this campus and across the other 22 campuses to bring faculty to the Board of Trustees. Please put that on your calendar. This is a very important year to push for a raise. The CSU has gotten an infusion of $97 million into its budget. We still have Prop 30 which is putting sales tax into our budget, and we don’t know what’s going to happen next year so we’ve got to make this big push now.

**ASI Report – ASI VP Adriana Gamino**

ASI will be beginning classroom presentations in efforts to promote the importance of ASI and to let students know that we are more than just an office that gives out scan chrons. Please support us and help us identify times that work best for all of you so we can come in. We will have Dr. Franklin and Miles Nevin from CSSA at the September 25th Board meeting. Gamino asked every professor at the Senate to reach out to your respective ASI college representatives with regard to having an event at your college. Parliamentarian Coward thanked ASI for providing two students to the GE AdHoc Committee. We’re still trying to fill that committee and the students stepped up very quickly. Hill said there is also an open student part of the GE committee.

**OPEN MIC**

**Chair Hill** asked if there were any adjustments that needed to be made to our Senate mailing list and/or roster. He let everyone know that the Senate webpage that lists the Senators is not updated yet and if anyone has a headshot or needs a picture, let Walker know at [swalker@csudh.edu](mailto:swalker@csudh.edu). The next meeting is in Extended Ed.

**Vice Chair Moore** with regard to the Sexual Harassment training called “Not Anymore” being required of all students said he’s received questions from students who would be graduating at the end of the semester if they also would need to complete that as a requirement of graduation? Also the Faculty Online Training, when is that going to be available? **Weber** said the notice on that went out in email today, 9/23. **Franklin** said the bugs have been fixed and if not, reach out to him and he will work with Chris Manriquez to make sure there is nothing hindering them taking this online survey. **EPC Chair Pawar** asked if CAM students are required to take the survey. **Franklin** said, no. **Statewide Senator Esposito** asked when students seek to opt out are they opting out of the research that’s being conducted or are they opting out of giving their responses. **Franklin** said this is a system wide issue and there is no opting out of the Not Anymore training. **Esposito** said once you get into it there’s a place that they’re collecting research data. **Franklin** said that they can opt out of as it’s the demographic data that they’re trying to get them through. They only can opt out of the research piece but they must complete the training.

**Meeting adjourned**