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EE 2:30 – 5:00 PM

Voting Members Present: Abdourazakou, Avila, Chun, Dam, Dotti, Durand, Ferris, Furtado, Galant, Grasse, Haney, Johnson, Krochalk, Kulikov, Ledesma, Ma, Macias, Monty, Moore, Oesterheld, Peyton, Pourmohammad, Price, Radmacher, Riddick, Robles, Shakib, Sneed, Still, Tang, Thomas, Tsuno, Villanueva

Voting Members Not Present: Barab, Chavez, Ernst, Heinze-Balcazar, Jarrett, Kaplan, Lacanlale, Nelson, Vanterpool,

Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Dellacioppa, Esposito, Hagan, Hill, Iheke, Norman, Perez, Pawar, , Talamante

Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present:

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Brasley, Davis, Hay, Huizinga, Kalayjian, Sayed, Wen LaPolt, McNutt, Stewart, Weber

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Avila, Carrier, Driscoll, Franklin, Goodwin, Manriquez; Poltorak

Guests: P. Camacho, G. Flores, B. Johnson, C. Miller, C. Stevens

2016-2017 Academic Senate Executive Committee:

Jim Hill – Chair, Laura Talamante – Vice Chair, Annemarie Perez – Parliamentarian, Sheela Pawar – EPC Chair, Kara Dellacioppa – FPC Chair, Thomas Norman – Statewide Senator, Kate Esposito – Statewide Senator

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

Meeting Called to Order 2:30 PM

Approval of Agenda MSP

Approval of Corrected/Amended Minutes (09/21/16) MSP

Senator Moore and Senator Shakib asked their comments reflected in the 9/21 minutes be changed.

**Chair Hill’s Report:**

* Next Senate meeting should be the presentation on Students in Distress
* Someone from Physical Plant will come speak to us at Senate at some future date. Hill has spoken to the Director of Facilities and he’s happy to come speak to us.

Senator Monty inquired on the status of a resolution in memoriam for Rex Heuschkel and Charles Walker? He said it’s customary that when long serving faculty pass away that the Senate prepare a resolution honoring their memory and service to the campus. Hill responded that Senate Exec had not taken that up and it had been suggested that it was usually someone with the department who brings it forward. Hill said he would check on it and provide them with a model of which to base a resolution on.

**President Hagan’s Report:**

* Provost Search: Hagan presented to the Senate a handout regarding the calendar for the search committee for the Provost. We see this search running into February. Hagan said he wanted to make sure he checked in with Provost Hay to ensure that he was able to stay in his interim role through February. We have a search committee in place, their first meeting is October 10. Search committee’s review of candidates begins December 5th with having their meetings with finalists at the airport January 16th, with the final Finalists coming to the campus January 30th. Search Committee recommendations and evaluations to the President February 13th. (Hagan said that these things are subject to change) Statewide **Senator Esposito** asked what the rationale was for meeting someone near or at the airport as opposed to bringing candidates to the campus where they might have a better visual understanding of where we’re located. **Hagan** said that with the final three or four candidates they will come to campus, with those initial eight or nine candidates, it’s easier in terms of logistics as they fly in, are interviewed and then fly out. Hill commented that having been part of a search committee, what has been done is that the committee sits in one room for a day, you couldn’t do that in one day on the campus and give them a real feel, logistically it doesn’t work.
* Board of Trustee meeting regarding the Support Budget Plan. Hagan provided a handout that shows what the Trustees are asking for from the Governor before it goes to legislature. $75 million towards the 2025 graduation initiative; the graduation initiative would include things like hiring tenured/tenure track faculty, support student success programs, hiring advisors, hiring support for research. There’s a broad array that falls under the category of student success. That $40 million would be to allow an additional 4,000 to 5,000 students into the CSUs. The $140 million is related to compensation in regard to the contracts that were negotiated both for this year and next year. The $10 million for facilities and infrastructure needs. What they’re looking for there is $10 million in baseline funds. Each million will debt service $14 million to $15 million, so it would generate about $140 million in funds that could go towards capital projects on an annual basis. The $26 million is what is called mandatory costs, which cover things like healthcare increases. Also on the handout depicts the anticipated revenues for 2017-2018 in terms of the General Fund Budget. $157 million which has been committed from the Governor right now. The $20 million additional tuition which refers to if you get those 4,000 – 5,000 students. There is a gap of $168.0 million which will be the focus of the legislative thrust this year, convincing the Governor to put in his budget the full $346 million. Hagan commented he believed there was only one time in the last three years where the Governor has put ii all in there and that was a result of a concerted push from the unions, the students and the administration. The Governor wanted to stick to the predictable 4%, 4%, 5%, 5%, per year increase promise. This is the last year of his promise. Hagan said what he’s hoping for is that all of the parties that support higher education and including our corporate partners, will go down and push for full funding. As a group we work with our legislatures to support the CSUs as a whole. Hagan noted that the other chart he included on the back of the handout was to make a point. He said if you look back at the 2007/08 fiscal year and then look at 2016/17, you see a 34.23% increase to community colleges and they’re part of PROP 98; you see 20.74% increase for the K-12 system and part of PROP 28; you see a 17.32 increase for prisons; you see a 13.3% increase to help health and human services, you see a 1.4% increase to the UCs, and the CSUs 0.05%, a less than 1% increase. We don’t have a prop 98 fund source assigned to the CSU. We don’t have any designated funding source. There’s been talk about trying to get a proposition that would direct certain oil revenue taxes. There’s been things that have been discussed but right now there isn’t anything like that. The UCs have a variety of revenue streams that we don’t have available to us. It’s really important that we keep pushing the Legislature and the Governor to support the CSU. Hagan said from his perspective, “this chart is unconscionable” given the fact that we’ve heard the Chancellor say that 1 in 5 of all bachelor degrees in California comes from the CSU; 1 in 20 of all bachelor degrees in the United States from CSU system. To get this small a part of the budget. Back in 1960 when the master plan was created, the CSU was 20% of the budget and prisons were less than 5%. There will be a lot of emphasis on our part in the next few months pushing to get more money for the universities. Hagan said you can see that it’s not just us, a lot of the campuses don’t have the resources that they need.
* [OPENGOV.com](https://opengov.com/) on the 11th of this month the UBC will be discussing. On October 20th there will be a Budget Town Hall where there will be a demonstration of it and we hope to go live on October 30th. We’re still in the process of loading up a lot of information. We’re moving forward quickly on our commitment to that. Hagan said he gives all of the credit to VP Naomi Goodwin.
* An issue that will be coming before the Senate soon is, according to the Fire Marshall, we’ve outgrown the tennis stadium where we hold commencements. Our student success initiatives have been excellent. We’re getting too many students down on the floor graduating. VP Stewart is going to present to Senate Exec and then to Senate laying out a number of options for addressing that.
* Facilities Master Plan process is underway.
* Convocation Picnic on the front lawn was a trial run and he’s received a lot of positive feedback on it and hopes to continue it as an annual post convocation event.
* Diversity and Tolerance – a number of folk after the Convocation approached Hagan saying they hoped we continued conversations around diversity, equity and tolerance on this campus. Hagan said he looks forward to doing that.
* Los Angeles Economic Development Future Forum Workshop – there are 4 FORUMs going around LA; healthcare, entertainment, cybersecurity, and one on robotics. We’re hoping to have our faculty and alums presenting on these topics. It’s a great way to have our name out there.
* BizFed Panel - which is an association of associations that represents 400,000 business leaders. They had a conference last week and the topic was Increasing Your Return on Investments. It gave us the chance to talk about the role that business needs to take recognizing that our graduates are helping them and that they need to have a strong voice in Sacramento and elsewhere in helping us. We don’t look at ourselves as just an investment in terms of producing a graduate for them, but in terms of the whole, well education citizens.
* STEM in Education Conference occurred on September 30th. It was well attended. There were a lot of teachers and administrators from around the region coming in to learn about how to get more students into the STEM education program.

**Q&A**

**Senator Moore** asked about one of the charts that Hagan sent out regarding the preliminary support budget. With regard to the line regarding the graduation initiative. Moore commented that there are so many things that goes under that term. Is this 2025 graduation initiative the one in which funding is going exclusively to students who are taking 15 units a semester? **Hagan** said no, this is not that. It is a pot of money that would come to the CSU and the Chancellor would sit down with the campus presidents and others about what are the significant graduation initiatives that your campus needs. Hagan noted that each campus’ needs are different and that we might say we need more funding for tenure/tenured track faculty where Stanislaus that may not be an issue. They’ll give out part of that money based on a standard proration formula and set aside part of it to allow campus’ to make the case for their specific needs. **Senator Price** asked where we find a proposal from Dominguez Hills for distributing money that might come to us. “Also”, said Price, “we hear that the Board of Trustees is talking about raising fees again, is Dominguez Hills doing anything to try to stop that?” **Hagan** responded, “We’ve not submitted anything yet, because there’s no money to submit for. When they put together the $35 million one-time fund for this year, we did have to submit a [seven page document](http://www4.csudh.edu/Assets/CSUDH-Sites/Academic-Senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/Presentations/CSUDH%202025%20Graduation%20Initiative%20Campus%20Plan.pdf), we can make that document available to you. With regard to anything related to the $75 million, nothing has been developed.” **Price** noted that the seven page document had no numbers in it.” **Hagan** responded, “That was at their request.” **Price** asked for a response to the second question. **Hagan** said “I am not under the impression that the CSU is looking to raise tuition. I do know at the meeting what I heard said was that if you don’t get their $168 and you have to cut back or look at other issues. And if you’re going to have a discussion about tuition, you have to have that discussion with student leadership early. But that, from my perspective and from what I understand is that no one is looking to raise tuition but if you were going to have that discussion, you have start them now because of the law with regard to timeline.” He continued, “We’re not doing anything on that because we’re not advocating for a tuition increase, and I do not believe anyone is advocating for a tuition increase, but if you’re going to have that as a discussion for a possible revenue source, you would have to start those conversations now. And that’s a conversation that the CSU leadership starts with the state student leadership.” **Hill** said since it was brought up and talked about, [if we could link it on the Senate webpage](http://www4.csudh.edu/Assets/CSUDH-Sites/Academic-Senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/Presentations/CSUDH%202025%20Graduation%20Initiative%20Campus%20Plan.pdf) that would be great. **Hagan** requested his assistant send it to the Senate office. **Vice Chair Talamante** asked Hagan what we could do as a campus to help with making the case to the Governor. **Hagan** responded that there are a number of things such as the organization that we represent, making it known to the local legislature that this is important. Hagan said he also believed personal voices are important because people on this campus have personal relationships with legislature and folks that are their neighbors or their friends. As often as we can tell our story or our needs is important. We’re the last piece that’s swept into the discretionary part of the budget. So when the budget cuts hit, K-12 and community colleges are protected by Prop 98. Work with your organizations as a body. The Senate can send correspondence to the local legislatures and the Chancellor and others. Let the Board know that they support them. We’ll be in Sacramento quite often as part of the CSU presidential delegation. As many voices as we can bring to bear on supporting their request. It’s not just that they’re asking for money, its reminding people of what we do. With all the competing pressures out there, you need a strong voice. **Senator Thomas** said he wanted to follow up on the questions about the graduation initiative, do we have any goals as it relates to what our graduation rates are anticipated to me by virtue of this infusion of cash if we receive it? **Hagan** said there’s the goals that we have and there’s the goals that were assigned to us by the Chancellor. We were working on the six year graduation rate and we set a goal of 60% which we thought was fairly ambitious. The Board of Trustees assigned us a higher goals. Six year graduation rates has practically vanished from the discussion. The Governor is interested in four year graduation rates. Hagan said he does not recall the numbers as he did not bring them with him, but there are goals that we’re meant to achieve by a certain year with regard to four year graduation rates, with regard to graduation rates for transfer students and with regard to closing the achievement gap. **Thomas** said he happened to get a glimpse of the document and was sort of shocked by it and asked Hagan to confirm the numbers he saw. The four year graduation rate is currently at 6%, and the target is now 31%. Where did that come from? Provost Hay handed President Hagan that Senator Thomas had been speaking to. **Hagan** said yes, the four year graduation rate says 6%, which he said is actually 9% in terms of numbers that we recently calculated. And the target that was assigned to us is 31% in 2025. **Thomas** asked, are those people who walk in in 2021? **Hagan** responded yes and that what we have said over and over is not every student comes here to graduate in four years. A huge number of our students work. We have made that case to everyone, they understand that, but these are the graduation rate that has been assigned to us. **Thomas** said it doesn’t sound like they get it. **Hagan** said is it a hell of a stretch goal, yes. No one will be fired if we don’t make it. But on the other hand, more students will graduate if we go after it. When we set the 60% goal, he was told by his own management team that it would be almost impossible to make. And that was a goal by 2020. We have already exceeded the target we set for now. We’re going to get there. It’s just now the four year one which is more unreasonable. The other issue within all this is the achievement gap of unrepresentative minorities which is taking that to zero. We’ve said you cannot take the achievement gap to zero without a significant influx of resources here. And without a number of programs working with the K-12 system and the community colleges before they get here. We don’t set the goals, but we’re going to go after them. **Hagan** said he thinks that we can look back at that if we hadn’t set the 60% goal we wouldn’t have gotten as far as we have. We’re projected to be at 52% for the 2020 class. This is part of argument for the $75 million because what we’re saying to them is you can’t give us targets, you can’t ask us to be more and not give us more resources. There’s as much an aspiration to make these goals happen as making a statement to the Governor and the Department of Finance this costs money.

**Provost Hay Report**

- Graduation Initiative Symposium on 9/20 and 21 at Chancellor’s office to look at best practices. The different CSUs were asked to submit information to the Chancellor’s office on what we thought we did best in terms of graduation initiatives so that we could share these ideas. They selected our Male Success Alliance our Student Affairs presented on it. Hay said he went to several different sessions and from what he could see was that our campus was already doing a lot of the things that were being suggested, such as intrusive advising, the stretch math classes. Part of the reason for that is we were trying to raise our six year graduation rates so we put a lot of those in action. Including the different technologies that help to identify students who are close to graduate.

* With regard to the seven page document and the one time infusion of funds, it’s about increasing graduation rates this year and so we’re talking about raising four year graduation rates and the two year transfer graduation rates as high as possible in the system. We’re get a little over $1 million this year. It will be about taking all those things we did to raise our six year graduation rates and apply them to students who may have the ability to get out in four years. It’s about looking at those students, finding out who those students are who are close and can graduate this year, and making sure they’re taking the right classes. They’ll be a lot of advising going on. We find that students may be 15 or 30 units from graduating and yet they’ll take some other classes. We’ll also be trying to identify those classes that aren’t in the schedule and making sure that we can get them into the schedule either in the intersession or in the summer and graduate within that time period.
* 2025 graduation initiative – We realize the same kinds of things that we’ve done for the short term initiative is what we’ll apply to this one. Providing the services students need and the classes they need and removing any blocks for those students who are trying to get it done.
* Provost and VP of Student Affairs meeting was held yesterday and today at the Chancellor’s office. The first part of the meeting was an onboarding meeting, which is about learning how to be a provost. There was a lot of information on how to be a provost and who to contact in the Chancellor’s office to get things done. Hay noted that we’re in the pool with everyone else as there were eight provost who had served as a provost for 3 months or less. There were eleven provosts who had served for less than a year and seven of the provosts who are interim.
* CSU office of the Counsel General came in to the meeting to talk to us about legal issues. The Chancellor’s office is trying to get legal advice for each campus. Right now it’s shared where there’s an attorney who services two campuses. They’re trying to make sure we have our own legal counsel. They have about 27 attorneys and there’s 48-50 specialty areas and they try to get 4 or 5 attorneys who can cover specialty areas so that people have expertise and be able to support us in some of the issues that we have.
* There’s a push to continue existing chairs workshop. That training will continue. Please make every attempt to participate. One of the things that’s beneficial is for us to grow our own administration. If we can get people who go on to be chairs and get decent training and then find that it’s something they may want to do, the more we can help people get into administration on our own campuses, the more effective we can be in keeping people around.
* [Staff Awards](http://www.csudhnews.com/2016/10/staff-awards-2016/) [hyperlinked to news article regarding awards] was held today and very well attended. Hay said it continues to amaze him how many people are dedicated to the campus. There were awards in Academic Affairs that he said he thought was superior. There was a 30, 35 and a 40 service award. To name a few was Shirley Arceneaux with 40 years and her husband Collen with 35 years, Collen was actually on Dominguez Hills’ first baseball team. If you see those folks, they’re great colleagues, thank them. It’s not so much that they’ve put in the time, it’s that they are truly dedicated to Dominguez Hills.

**Q&A**

**Thomas** asked what our 4.5 year rate is. He thought he understood Hay to say that the system could go up to 8% to 11%. And because this is a one year target, what our current 4 year target. **Hay** responded he does not think there’s a current four year, they’re just trying to increase it as much as possible. He added that he did not have the numbers in front of him but if you go to the link that was provided, the 7 page report. There’s one section in the report we talk about how many students we have that are eligible to graduate this year both as freshman and two year transfers and has the amount that we would be able to increase it. **Moore** asked how as a department chair in a small program he’s supposed to deal with the two year graduation rate. The challenge that he has is in the two year transfer rate, in the upper division courses, there are key courses that are offered on an every other year basis, typically courses that are relatively small. They don’t show up as being bottleneck courses under the way that we normally identify those things. When you’re looking at adding another section at a schedule to serve 10-15 students as opposed to 60 students of course the money is going to go with the larger enrollment. The other question we’ve got is a matter of expertise. As we have a low full-time faculty density, a number of those upper division courses that students are transferring to us in order to take in a major like ours is not necessarily that just any person can teach that particular course. Moore said that he realizes there isn’t a magic answer to all of these but he believes they need to be thought about at the micro level as we talk more and more about the transfer rates and the goals and objectives that we’re trying to achieve as an educational institution. **Hay** responded that they’re excellent comments and he couldn’t agree more. He said if you look at the seven page document we’ve been referring to, one of the leading issues is to increase tenure track density. It’s also understood at the Chancellor’s office, they’re current developing a tenure track density analysis. In this year, they are giving us funds, if you have a number of students who are in that situation where they wouldn’t get the class because it’s not going to happen for another semester, I think what they’re trying to tell us is that they’re going to try to fund that. If you have the expertise, then let us know. We’ll be working be working with you as we go forward to try to identify what those classes are. We may be able to offer it at a reduced enrollment. **Talamante** said I know we’re doing a lot of great things on campus to move those rates forward, including funding for summer school last year for students who only had one more class. She said her question goes to addressing the prohibitive costs of our summer school and intersession programs. We can’t as departments offer courses because we can’t get enough students to take them even though they would like to. There’s only certain kinds of courses they can take in those sessions. If we have students are coming from behind because they had to do remediation; who are losing units in that first year, even though they may be taking 15 units; students who have to take less units because of their commitments off campus. One of the ways they can make up time is through these intersession courses, through summer school, but we can’t offer our students enough choices beyond general education because departments run those courses because they know they’ll get enough enrollment that they’ll be funded through the summer. Talamante asked, what might we do in that direction? **Hay** responded one of the things we would love to do is to be able to get financial aid for all classes and that’s something that’s been a conversation and we’re working on that. One of the things that these folks who are working on the graduation initiative, is one of the things we’re being asked to do with the funds we have now is only for students who can graduate within this 4 year or 2 year transfer period. We’re going to put on extra classes which may not be what you’re speaking to with is the long term plan for students who get a slower start. Hay continued, one of the things he believes is a long term part of this is that if we can get these students through is what we’re trying to do is make a case to the Department of Finance and to the Legislature that we can do this if we have extra funding. And then that extra funding then goes to being able to put on some of those classes and figuring out those bottlenecks. **Senator Monty** said he is happy to hear that the Provosts are discussing and the Chancellor’s office has begun to conduct a tenure track density analysis. Monty said he would like you to advocate and the Senate to advocate for the Chancellor’s office to adopt a couple of companion plans to go with the graduation initiative and that is a ten year plan for improving tenure track density that comes with some concrete commitments to fund and support it. If we really want to improve graduation rates and sustain them overall in the long run, this has to be a holistic effort. **Senator Price** said she has the seven page document in front of her and it does mention on page five that Academic Affairs is focusing on tenure track density, but it does not appear as a long term strategy or a short term strategy in the executive summary of the goals for our university. So we do not have tenure track density as part of this years’ plan. I hope that we’re going to have that as a goal. Price said she has read that out of the 23 campuses, 7 of the campuses did include tenure track density in this years’ plan and we were not one of them. **President Hagan** responded that the plan that we were asked to submit was direct related to one time dollars and we got slightly over $1 million in one-time dollars. Tenure density is still our highest priorities with baseline dollars. To put out there a plan that linked tenure density to one time dollars wouldn’t have gained us anything so if anyone put in their plan that they were going to increase tenure density then they were talking about their own dollars because it wasn’t going to come out of the dollars of that $35 million. So our focus on tenure density is if we get dollars from state, fine, if not we’ll make reallocations decisions. We had a five year plan, it turned into a six year plan and the goal is to keep it there. I think we’re going to be able to keep it there. I think we’re going to be able to be back to the levels we were at before. The intent was not about hiring replacements, replacements should be a given, the intent was to hire is to hire more and we’re still on that plan.

**ASI Report – VP Grace Iheke**

- Voters registration – our goal is 150 student registered to vote, we’re about to reach that, we’re at 130. We’re tabling on the east walkway and will be there until next week.

- We are still seeking a College of Education representative, if you have any students that can fulfill the requirements to serve as an ASI rep, please have them come to the ASI office to pick up an application.

- We are going to be having town hall forums for some local officials that are running for office right now. We’re hoping to have Warren Furutani and Steve Bradford. We’re working with external relations to bring them.

- Leadership workshops will be held by ASI for all students on campus to gain knowledge on how to operate in the workplace.

**Senator Thomas** asked VP Iheke about an initiative discussion that ASI was sponsoring with the League of Women Voters which he had heard was happening as October 26th. Is that the same date as Warren Furutani and Steve Bradford. **Iheke** confirmed that it was.

**ASCSU Chair Christine Miller**

Miller stated she hears passion and care for academic quality and student success and it’s wonderful to sit in a room like this and hear that manifested. One thing she said she wished to reflect to the Senate is that Tenure Density Task Force that’s meeting right now came about as the result of a resolution from the Statewide that was a recommendation made to the Chancellor. The Task Force has only met once thus far, but is supposed to be done with its work by March. She said one of the struggles they had when they made the recommendation that this task force go into effect was to move the discussion from something that aspirational, from something that talks about the goal to meet tenure density to something that’s very much more like the plan that you’re talking about this Senate supporting. She said she’s not completely sure that’s the task force is going to get there, it’s early. What she does know is that the faculty on that tenure density task force are fighting hard to make it not just be goals and aspirations but a plan of action that the Chancellor’s office will help the campuses to attain.

On October 6th, at the San Jose campus, there are some hearings that the legislature is putting on. Its joint hearings for both the assembly and Senate on faculty diversity. They might not get specifically to the tenure density issue. Miller said she will be attending it and if something comes out there, she will report it and send the information to the campus senate chairs and it can be sent from that.

Miller said that the Executive Committee and the Statewide Senate had three priorities they wished to establish for this year. Promote academic quality by 1. Strengthening shared governance 2. Faculty advocacy and governmental relations. 3. ASCSU relationship with campus senates. One of the ways this is being operationalized, that the third priority is by Senate visits. In addition to the many campus visits that Miller has already made and will continue to make, she recently attended a conference on shared governance in Washington D.C. She listened to a panel on shared governance and governing boards, Miller made mention of a study that had been referenced from the Association of Governing Boards that had appeared in Inside Higher Education. It was a study where they surveyed governing boards and presidents entitled [Shared Governance: Is Okay Good Enough](http://agb.org/reports/2016/shared-governance-is-ok-good-enough). [title hyperlinked] Miller stated that the report talks about the principle of shared governance and acknowledging the authority that’s distributed to both the administration and the faculty as a tenant in higher education. She quoted the report with “When working well, it brings a wealth of ideas to critical conversations and creates a sense of inclusiveness that strengthens support for decisions” and “can be an essential institutional asset.” She noted that one of the priorities of the Executive committee is to promote shared governance. The central question the report asks, “Is ok good enough”, and she said it is not. The graduation initiative, the goals that have been established for graduation rates have been called audacious. We need to be just as audacious in shared governance. One of the ways that shared governance manifests itself in the CSU’s is through our resolutions. Miller mentioned that there was a statewide resolution in support of Prop 55, Academic Freedom, Intellectual Property and policies therein on campuses. Those issues will be getting more of our attention and might trickle down to discussions you might have on your campus. One more thought that Miller said she wanted to share based on things she’s already heard today, and observing the California Promise Bill for four year graduation rates. When she hears the term “graduating on-time” she takes issue with that language. She said she believed it sets up a rhetoric of failure that might occur in a student’s mind when they don’t hit that four year target. She said she believed it does a disservice and would like to replace that language with graduating in their time. It acknowledges the constraints under which they operate. She said she would hope that we embrace the notion of helping them graduate in their time rather than on- time. **Moore** said he was glad to hear those comments, and that one of the other things need to be introduced into the conversation is not only does that rhetoric of failure adversely affect students, it also adversely affects faculty. Faculty are working their tails off. They’re dealing with populations of students who come from lower economic backgrounds, who wisely take the community college path to our campus, they’re not counting those. Moore continued, the other thing that’s important to note is the way in which a low tenure density has the capacity to engage in shared governance. We’ve got programs that are being coordinated by part-time faculty, we’ve got departments in which some 800 students are being served by single full-time faculty member and a very qualified, but not permanent adjunct faculty. It dilutes the capacity of an institution to participate in shared governance. Moore added that we take this conversation from something that’s aspirational to something that’s pragmatic. **Thomas** said he wished to share with Miller what Dominguez Hills is and who we are. Much of the discussion that we have as it relates to particular graduation rates with a student population that is not typical. Two thirds of our students are transfer students, they’re the larger group rather than our first time full time freshman. The average age of our student is 28 years old. Compare that to San Luis Obispo, which is the average age of 22. What does the 6 year difference mean? Those six years mean children, jobs, and “I cannot put my life on hold to go to college”. All of our discussion are premised upon that “on-time” rhetoric, which has to do with the notion that you can put your life on hold. Thomas said he just wanted to make sure that the Statewide Senate is aware of the unique challenges that are here at Dominguez Hills. **Senator Villanueva** said another area that we’re unique in is the amount of lecturers on our campus which is 73%. It’s going to be impossible to reduce the amount of lecturers on each campus and it is important in the spirit of shared governance that the CSUs make more of an investment in lecturers especially when it comes to them making commitments to service, Ways for them to be rewarded for that service; ways for lecturers to become attracted to staying in the CSUs system as permanent faculty; salary increases. Otherwise you’ll have a revolving door of lecturers and that’s not going to help achieve the graduation rate goals that we have across the CSU. **President Hagan** said to reinforce what Senator Moore and Senator Thomas said in regard to “their time” vs. “on-time”, and that it can have adverse effects on students and faculty, it can also adversely affect the institution, by implying failure as an institution. When you talk about our graduation rates using the IPEDS measurement, the transfers, the part-timers, the ones who go somewhere else. Our graduation rates are calculated on less than 15% of our student population. The vast majority of the things that we do to transform student lives are never taken into account. By all kinds of other measures, this campus has been extraordinarily successful, but this simple notion that the graduation rate is what they count is not a fair measure of this campus.

**EXEC 16-14 Resolution Calling for Timely Notice and Scheduling of Provost Finalists’ Visits** Hill said this will be presented by Vice Chair Talamante, originally it was requested that it be a W\* resolution except that the resolution what was included in the Senate package was not the most updated version. Thomas asked that it be brought up on the screen so that it can be kept as a W\*. Senator Monty recommended that deferring the resolution being we were already given a revised outline of the current search and instead focus on revising PM 2014-03 that outlines procedures for hiring full-time academic administrators. Monty suggested that the policy be amended to include the stipulations outlined in EXEC 16-15 such as finalists will not be brought to campus when classes are not session; that the open forum events will be scheduled in a way to facilitate staff, faculty, and student participation, etc. Talamante said when we discussed the resolution in in the Senate Executive committee meeting, that policy did come up and that it was something we needed to pursue further. Based on our meeting with President Hagan we did revise it and we knew that the finalists weren’t going to come until the spring. We still thought it important that there were several messages in here we wanted to make sure were taken into the planning for when the provost finalists do come to campus. Talamante said it’s probably still relevant and we do plan to take that up in terms of future policy. Moore asked that change between the one being brought to the floor and the one that was included in the Senate package, was eliminating the fifth resolve. Talamante moved to strike the fifth resolve that states “*for the current search, we demand that if this cannot be done in the fall semester that the search continue into the spring semester*.” Motion to strike fifth resolve passes by a vote of 29 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstaining. Moore strongly urged support of this resolution and “the need to establish procedures that are clearly legitimate in the search for these key members of our university community.” Monty moved that the first reading be waived and that we keep it as a \*W item. It was seconded and voted on. First reading was waived unanimously. **Hagan** said his question was with regard to the 2nd resolve regarding two weeks’ notice, he said he understands the intent of that, but sometimes a good candidate may come in on the end of that so should the resolution read, “every effort made”, knowing that things can be difficult to schedule sometimes. Talamante said that in the third resolve it’s really about making sure that everyone if given at least one week of dates and times for each open forum. **Hill** said Hagan was welcome to request a friendly amendment. Hagan chose not to.

**EXEC 16-14 was put to a vote and passed by a vote of 30/0/1**

**EXEC 16-15 Resolution Calling for Guidelines and Rationale for Campus Tenure-Track Lines, Vice-Chair Talamante** As follow up to discussions that have come up on the Senate floor as well as directly from the Senate retreat, is Exec 16-15. Talamante read the resolution aloud and moved the resolution to the floor for a first reading. **Monty** said he advocated that the Senate take up this issue. He said all faculty, and particularly the chairs of programs who have the write the faculty recruitment requests every year to the Deans then only to be told what lines are coming to the college in June when all the faculty are gone; and when if you receive a recruitment it puts you in a position that you’re going to get a late start. There’s never a clear account given of the basis for the rationale for the decisions that were made. It creates a sense of arbitrariness and he said he did not think the process was arbitrary, but the important thing is the process that the process creates. We can do better, make it less arbitrary and consistent, and increase the transparency and help us to improve morale and cut down the mistrust that Monty said he believes exists among some faculty. Monty said that the Dean in the college of Arts & Humanities has his own plan and that would tie tenure track density in each program by pegging it as a percentage of FTEF which is related to FTEs. So if each program were to have between 60% and 80% of its FTEF in tenure track faculty then we would have some soothing of equity across the college and across the university based on the services that program provides to students. But, Monty said it is not something at the college level, our Dean might have a plan, but what if the other Deans and the Provost aren’t playing by the same rules? Monty said that Deans, and Provost and the President certainly have discretion here and that they would likely insist on maintaining that discretion. There won’t be any hard and fast rules, we’re talking about guiding principles. We’re asking that these explanations be given to us in a timely fashion and that we discuss this more publically and transparently and more regularly. Monty recommended two friendly amendments to the resolution. In the first resolve, Monty commented that it’s good that we want them to make public guiding principles, but he felt that we might want to discuss them more here in the Academic Senate. Not that they require approval, but that we discuss them giving us an opportunity to express our opinions. In the second rationale, adding the word “end” so that it read “three weeks prior to the end” and add the word “the” prior to spring semester. **President Hagan** asked regarding prioritization and allocation. Is this just for new tenure track positions? What about reallocations? Additionally he asked about the language, “three weeks prior to the closing of the spring semester – this seems somewhat linked to knowing what kind of dollars we’re going to get from the general assembly, because they’ve often not approved the budget until way later. You can put out here’s what we will do if the monies come, it’s something to think about as we move forward. **Moore** said his question is similar to the President’s. Is this also to be applied to replacement positions? And it sounds like that point should be clarified by a revision from the Executive committee. He said he would think that in light of the previous comments, to have it refer to all hiring, and to have it acknowledge the problem with knowing how much money we actually get, that those would be useful things to incorporate into a revised resolution. Talamante put out to the floor do we want this to apply to all faculty hiring, replacements and tenure track? An opinion poll was taken and by a show of hands, the Senate wished it to apply to all faculty hiring. **EPC Chair Pawar** said when you’re talking about all faculty hiring, are we including the hiring of part-time instructors at the last minute before the semester starts when we find that someone’s dropped out and we need to hire someone. **Hill** said the right question would have been to ask, do we want this to apply to all tenure track faculty hiring. **Pawar** asked about a comment that Monty had made earlier – how to change the first resolve so that the principles and processes be discussed by Senate? Are you speaking about the principles and processes that are made at the university level or whether you’re including at the college level? **Pawar** said she’s wasn’t sure that Senate wished to discuss individual colleges decisions about how they prioritize hiring within the colleges. **Monty** replied that it was his intention that the resolution applied to the college decision process as well. He added that it would mean that they would not be able to get that specific. He said we’re talking about guiding principles. Every college is different and is going to have its own challenges and the Deans will wish to maintain some discretion. But he does believe that it would be difficult to achieve anything significant without also including the college level decision making in this process.

**EPC 16-16 Credit by Examination for Undergraduates** - EPC Chair Sheela Pawar. The Chancellor’s office had made some communication saying that they did not want to pay faculty for instruction if faculty aren’t’ actually doing instruction. They’re not saying that faculty couldn’t be paid to grade exam in credit for examination, but that shouldn’t be classified as a course as if you’re teaching a course. We surveyed the departments across campus about their procedures, we found that they’re no consistency across campus about how credit by exam is done and it became clear that the current policy is insufficient for distance programs. We included language about determining appropriate course level fees. **Senator Galant** asked what is the difference between this and the previous credit by examination. He said this is how they were doing it and then they were told by the Chancellor’s office that you shouldn’t be. He commented it looks like it’s a hybrid because you could do it within the context of the offered course or you could do it separately. **Pawar** said in the original policy, you could do it either through a course offering. The difference now is you can’t be paid as an instructor in that course. You can receive a stipend for grading and administering exams. You could still offer it that way, and you can offer it on an adhoc basis, so it doesn’t necessarily have to be listed in the course schedule as an exam. That hasn’t changed. The Chancellor’s office was concerned about how people were being paid if they were offering it as a class scheduled with the regular schedule of classes. Pawar said what was changed was the timeline. For distance courses, when they use proctors off courses, they need time for students to be able to find those proctors, for those proctors to be vetted by the department, to get the exams back in a manner in which they would be graded. They added a fourth resolve that is a procedure for distance courses that alters that timeline. **Galant** asked if this passes, we can resume what we used to do before? The response was yes. If it passes and is implemented as policy. **Furtado** said that ENG 350 is an equivalent to GWAR, would anything be affected through this? **Pawar** said according to policy now, credit by examination is not available to graduate students, this only applies to undergraduate students. **Furtado** said if you take what we have in the graduate studies, if you take ENG 350 and get a grade of 8 – 10 or an A, then it is equivalent to a GWAR. **Pawar** asked if Furtado was asking if a graduate student fulfill ENG350 by credit by examination? Pawar said she would probably the answer is no, but she would have to look more closely at the graduate policy. Departments decide which courses can be met this way. This policy only applies to undergraduates. **Senator Dott**i asked if the student fails the examination does he receive an F? **Pawar** said yes, they have to say if they’re taking it for a letter grade or for a credit-no credit.

**Presentation by Dr. Brasley, Library Dean on Library Usage and Plans [**[**presentation linked**](http://www4.csudh.edu/Assets/CSUDH-Sites/Academic-Senate/docs/insidethesenate/academic-senate/Presentations/Library%20Usage%20and%20Plans.pptx)**]**

* Review collection, recently hired “collection services guru” was Wendy Vermeer who will be helping us go through a strategic review of the collection to help us to increase discoverability of the materials that support student success and to increase alignment with the curriculum
* Reimagine next generation
* Approach review with a “just-in-time” vs. “just-in-case” philosophy

Interesting statistics

* Of the 421,000 approximately of circulating books 76% were published in 1990 or earlier
* Currently 302,772 ebooks, 44% of which were published between 2000 and 2009 and 40% of ebooks published in 2010 or later
* Of the 421,000 books we have, 71% of the books have never been checked out or used in-house
* 2% of books considered high-use (5+ uses)
* Uptick in electronic materials usage.

Ultimately moving a portion of our collection to compact storage is not impactful in any significant way.

Next steps:

* Close consultation with discipline faculty
* Project updates and communication with college faculty through website, newsletter and liaisons

Brasley continued with an overview of what’s being considered. She also talked about the current trends for browsing among library patrons. She spoke virtual browsing and the millennium online catalog. She spoke to the Unified Library Management System: Primo online catalog available in summer of 2017. With regard to closed stack requests, Brasley noted that the turn-around time is suggested to take 15-30 minutes and that as we get further along, they’re confident those wait times will decrease. Complete presentation is linked on our Senate Presentation webpage. **Senator Robles** said Emeritus faculty had expressed that they are really concerned with closed stacks, but based on what she heard today she will be reporting back to them that those resources are still going to be available and she will send to them the presentation so that they can be assured that the library is serving the students very well. **Talamante** said she also sees that Brasley addressed some of the concerns that had been expressed at an earlier Senate meeting. She asked for the timeline and if she goes into the stacks with her students directly, that we would try to incorporate how they could still those kinds of things because virtual browsing does not accomplish the same things pedagogically as actual use of the stacks. **Brasley** responded that this is an ongoing discussion, with only 35% or 40% of the collection, the core browse ability function will still be there. However, she suggested that if Talamante sees that there are some things that are in their storage, that she believes are more appropriate for the open stacks, they definitely want to do that. She added that if Talamante takes a class over and she wants them to be able to browse the open and the closed stacks, the Library would make those accommodations available. She said they want to be sensitive to the disciplinary needs and requirements of each of the units. Dotti asked if the 4th floor would remain as open stacks? Brasley they’re talking about moving both the 3rd and the 4th floor. Brasley said there was an initial conversation of moving just one floor. After looking at it, they thought from a research, curricular and pedagogical point of view that it would be better to not break up the collection and do a quick fix, but to step back and look at how to best provide good current relevant collections.

Reports

**Parliamentarian Annemarie Perez**

* Reported that regarding the search committee for AVP of Student Life/Dean of Students we needed two and we have two faculty from different colleges. Maria Montero and Lee Hancock from Political Science from Kinesiology. They were affirmed by a vote of acclamation by the Senate.
* Additionally we need one faculty member to serve on the search Committee for Associate Dean for CHHSN (Adm III) from a college other than CHHSN and we need two faculty from different colleges to serve on the search committee for the Director of Employee Relations.

**EPC Chair Sheela Pawar**

* Met with the Senate IT committee and they are planning a day long symposium/conference on distance education. She said they hope to tackle some of the issues that were brought up at the Senate retreat.
* EPC has begun to draft a revision of our campus policy on course instructional modality. We’re doing that in conjunction Senate IT Committee. Hopefully we’ll have that be roughing that out by the next EPC meeting.
* We hope to have a draft of test proctoring guidelines for you at the next senate meeting
* We’ve begun to discuss super senior policies, we will be working with enrollment management, registration and advising as well to discuss the current procedures and need for policies. We’re looking at revising policies around time of declaration of major and minors as well as the number majors and minors allowed. EPC meets next Tuesday @ 4 PM.

**FPC Chair Kara Dellacioppa**

* Tenure track density campus inequities. There was requests for data from AVP Weber. Dellacioppa said she has had a conversation with her but not specifically met with her regarding lecturer pay across campuses and looking into whether or not it’s an issue or not.
* Also AVP Weber will be meeting with the committee regarding campus climate. That will fit into an issue from the retreat of workplace of hostility and a possible resolution or policy that could be drafted around that.

**Statewide Senator Thomas Norman**

* Have already been to the Chancellor’s office twice this week, once for the search committee for the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources.
* Served as Extended Education Commissioner. Chaired the McNair Award Committee and was able to get an additional $5K out of the budget committee from Extended Ed. So there will now be three awards, one specifically for faculty. If you feel you’ve done something innovative, we want to award faculty who have contributed to an Extended Ed project. The second award is for a student. I ask for your help in identifying students. The criteria has not been established yet. The other award is for staff and administrators.
* Tenure Density Task Force is soon to be underway.
* Norman said as a member of the Academic Freedom Task Force we are working in a tripartite process with CFA, we will be getting our work started. Please give any ideas you have regarding Academic Freedom to him.
* As Chair of Faculty Affairs, one of his committee members was tasked with creating a resolution on new pathways for lecturers to permanence. If you have any ideas, please bring them to him. Norman said if he could make a mark as chair of the committee this year, he would really like to move forward to realizing the new work environment we have and how we can make this environment better for those of our colleagues who are lecturers, full-time, part-time and temporary. **Price** commented that USC has some sort of modal along those lines that Norman might wish to look into.

**CFA Report – Vivian Price**

* Prop 55 – Price commended those who have helped do telephone banking. Prop 55 is an extension of Prop 30 that taxes the wealthiest Californian, those making $250,000 or more and that money goes to our general fund which helps to ensure our raises will still be there and funding for the CSU. Without a passage of Prop 55 we may see ourselves losing $250 million a year. The next phone bank is Thursday, October 13th in LSU113 from 4:30 – 7:30 pm.
* We will be precinct walking, we go every Saturday
* Next Senate meeting, the CFA will be presenting

**Meeting Adjourned**