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Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

October 7, 2015

Voting Members Present: Abdourazakou, Avila, Belu, Bender, Bowles Eagle, Chavez, Durand, Ellsworth, Ferris, Furtado, Grasse, Jett, Krochalk, Kulikov, Ledesma, Ma, Macias, McGlynn, Merz, Monty, Mutchler via proxy Dellacioppa), Needham, Nelson, Oesterheld, Parker, Peyton, Price, Robles, Tang, Thomas, Vanterpool, Villanueva

Voting Members Not Present: Ernst, Fitzsimmons, Heinz-Balcazar, Jacobs, Jarrett, Jones, Kaplan, Leonard, Navarrete, Osisioma, Park, Wang

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

Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Moore,

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Davis, Fenning, Huizinga, Junn, Manriquez, McNutt, Stewart, Weber

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Bersi, Bragg, Brasley, Franklin, Hart, Hay, Kaul, Maki, Poltorak, Sayed, Wen

Guests: Naomi Goodwin, Gary Rhodes, 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 (09/23/15) MSP

(Amended agenda – 1st reading item presented by Parliamentarian Caroline Coward instead of Vice Chair Moore and the addition of 1st reading item FPC 15-15. Hill noted additional corrections added to minutes after printing.

Parliamentarian Coward sent around ballots for the call for service for the Presidential Scholarship Committee to report results later in the meeting.

**Chair’s Report**

* Status update of the GE Committee stating that John Wilkins is now the chair. Hills said they’re missing the Senate representative to the GE Committee and the question is does it have to be a Senator and does it have to be a faculty member Senator. Hill noted that when looking at the charge and the Constitution, nothing says it needs to be Senator but since this person is to be a conduit of information between the Senate and the GE Committee, it should be someone who attends Senate meetings. The other question, must it be a Faculty member Senator. Hill said maybe we do or don’t want that, but it does not appear to be anywhere in the Constitution to forbid it being a Staff member Senator. So that is an open possibility. Hill said when the Parliamentarian does her report – she’ll be asking for someone to step forward to serve in that capacity.
* GE Review and AdHoc committee is missing people from many different areas. The Parliamentarian will address that later on in the meeting.
* Statewide Meeting of the Senate Chairs – some topics that are being talked about is something that Statewide Senate has also been talking a lot about which is Presidential Searches and openness in the process. A call went out to all the campuses to see if there were relevant documents supporting such or if not, to create resolutions about if there are opinions on Presidential searches. The idea is out there that maybe the finalist candidates for Presidential searches do not need to visit campuses. This idea was also out there four years ago and on our campus we did have a Sense of the Senate on that. Resolution EXEC-11-09 (<http://www4.csudh.edu/Assets/CSUDH-Sites/Academic-Senate/docs/documents/exec-11-09-presidential-candidates-campus-visits.pdf>). Hill read the following excerpt from the resolution: “Eliminating campus visits would greatly diminish the role of the campus community in the presidential search process and make it virtually impossible for campus constituencies to provide meaningful feedback to members of the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for Selection of the President. In the absence of a campus visit, and with reliance solely upon the input of the Advisory Committee, the depth and breadth of consultation provided for in the current policy disappears.”
* Hill said another issue that people will talk about at the meeting is Academic Freedom. There is not a specific move to get anything to get going right now – but Statewide is working on that.
* Visit by ASCSU – Steve Filling will possibly be visiting several campuses and be talking about shared governance and best practices in shared governance. We would like to invite him to speak to our campus when we can. There are some logistics that still need to be worked out.

**President’s Report**

* New Science Building - At the November Board meeting, the Trustees will vote on whether or not to approve the funding for the new Science building. Everything appears to be done. VP Fenning said we’ll be receiving some funding for the schematic design and working drawings. The actual construction funding would be in the 2017-2018 fiscal years, about 18 months from now we should be breaking ground.
* Budget – President Hagan asked VP Bob Fenning to provide an update on the budget. Hill said that VP Fenning has also been asked to give a presentation at the next Senate meeting, so this will be some quick notes on it. VP Fenning – “For many years, dealing with the historic underfunding of the institution, and the years of restricted spending, during those times there were considerable amount of reserves that were being built up which resulted in fairly substantial carry-forwards. Over the past couple of years, we’ve been fortunate to have new base resources, but most importantly, the use of those reserves and one time funds to do a lot of good work around here. For example, the restarting of replacement faculty process to attempt to make a substantial dent to improve the tenure and tenure track density of the institution. In addition, the Provost, Dr. Franklin and others have spoken about all of the investments that have been made particularly with interventions and programs that are already having immeasurable impact on students and their success. In order to sustain those efforts and in particular the 20 faculty that I believe the searches are well under way in the various colleges, but yet allow our base resources catch up with our spending. We’re going to be engaging in some targeted fiscal measures to replenish those one time resources. The message today is that there will not be base budget reductions. During the Strategic Planning process there was a clear discussion and an emphasis to both stabilize and to grow the institution’s resources. That’s what we’re all about right now. As we look ahead we see an increase in base resources, the Governors’ commitment continues. Fenning said he’s involved in reviewing something at the system level, which is the development of something called a sustainable financial model, which talks about the importance of making specific investments, many of which have to deal with further investments in areas like student success. We also anticipate that there will be other resources we’ll recruit to the institution. We’re going through a process now here – developing a sustainable financial model. While we do that, we are going to be doing some targeted fiscal measures that include working with various divisions on less critical open positions, to freeze some of those positions and utilize those resources, some discretionary spending that we would like to suspend or defer for a while, while we continue to grow our base. Right now that process is going on. The VPs are working with me as we identify the various targets and what those things are going to be.”

Floor was opened up for questions:

**Senator Thomas** - The was a Senate Resolution that was passed last year dealing with reporting and utilizing a website that Cal State San Luis Obispo is using, so we can have some comparison data. Where are we with that? **Fenning** said it’s in process. There are not budgets yet established. We’re still working with each of the various areas. We’ll be posting the new base resources and the one time funds over the next several weeks. When all of that is done and those budgets are established, we will fully implement that resolution. Right now we’re in the process of developing all of those budgets to be posted. **Thomas** asked if last years’ budgets could be posted in the meantime. **President Hagan** said he fully supported the resolution that Senator Thomas is referring to, and the bottom line is our fiscal house is a mess in terms of tracking everything. A lot of what Fenning has been doing is trying to determine who has what money spending? On a macro level they have that, what you’re looking for is to actually be able to compare things at the detail level, the department level, Fenning knows we want that information and on OPENGov, he also knows it’s not quite clear. Within the Divisions it’s not always clear what you’re spending vs. what you have. We’re committed to making that happen. OpenGov is a good sources, but it’s that whole thing of garbage in garbage out. We want to make sure we put the right data in there. AS soon as we have it we’ll put it in there. **Senator Bender** offered a suggestion – what about the possibility of bringing both ideas together? While you’re pulling all of this complex data together, you could have a box that has missing data and as it’s filled in, you’re getting a sense of the data as you go along. Or does it have its downsides in that having all this missing data doesn’t make us look so good? **Fenning** said he could consider that. There were allocations made and there was money spent. What’s happening right now is there would clearly be a budget that’s established which would provide the spending authority and the responsibility to the respective areas, that comparison becomes very difficult. The data that we would have is what those base allocations were plus the new base allocations. And then what ultimately then happens to that relative to what’ s responsible for each budget in each department and then division and so forth would then be added. Fenning said he will take a look at that. **Thomas** asked when? What is the time line for “in process”? When is reasonable to ask again. **Hill** asked is it just a question of having the numbers and then needing to fill them in in OPENGov? Or is it the whole implementation of a system as well as generating the numbers to fill in? **Fenning** said we will be attempting to get the resources managers of the divisions together before week’s end: there is both the allocation of the resources; the new base that we’ve received; and then they’ll be the one time funds. By utilizing the fiscal measures we’re going to apply, by identifying specific positions, as well as to look at spending targets, such that at the end of the year what carry-forward we would have going forward. We anticipate most will take place by the end of the month. Then becomes the mechanics of having to set that up because once you set it up in the budge that becomes literally the score card or how we’re going to track things. Fenning said he met with Stephen Mastro to figure out how we can implement and use the data warehouse to produce some specific that haven’t been generated to date. We think by the middle part of November that not only the numbers will be well understood, and the mechanics of how it’s going to be operated can be established.

**Senator Monty** brought up the campus shooting that took place in Oregon. He expressed that it is incumbent on us to be more intentional in our approaching providing safety for the sake of students, faculty and staff and he said not only for security threats but all manners of emergencies. Wanted to know what the administration is thinking about that? **Hagan** said he’s spoken with VP Fenning and the Chief of Police on this. What happened at that Community College resonates with all of us. I’ve asked for a couple of things to be done. 1. To look at past issues with locks. 2. Put together a communication that will go to the campus on where we are and link to any public safety reports that currently exist. 3. The Chief of Police will be holding a meeting that includes the police and risk management with the campus on October 12 at 2 PM, to share what exists on the campus and to hear what the concerns are.

**Provost Junn’s Report**

* Junn reported that the [Torrance Daily Breeze](http://www.dailybreeze.com/social-affairs/20150925/csu-chancellor-timothy-white-visits-dominguez-hills-on-latest-campus-tour) did a story about our campus and the Chancellor’s visit. They specifically focused on our Freshman First year seminar – the Dream Seminar. They had a chance to hear from faculty and student. There were six of the faculty who are teaching it and each of them brought a student. Some of the students and faculty gave amazing and compelling examples about their experiences so far. Junn said she’s received kudos and emails from those who saw it outside of our campus who recognized it as being a good piece.
* UFO – Untenured Faculty Organization – which is a new organization that we’re starting. Junn said she sent an email out to all 72 untenured faculty asking them if they would like to participate in creating their own untenured faculty organization. About 25 untenured faculty stepped forward and are now going to be meeting and creating a whole series of opportunities, presentations, and workshops and other things for all faculty to participate in the next year. They’re first kick off meeting is on October 23. Junn said it will be very excited to see the kind of support we can provide for them who will also provide support for all of our faculty and lecturers as well.

**AVP Weber – Electronic WPAFs**

Have had a couple of meetings with Senate Exec and the Faculty Policy Committee around the idea of establishing electronic WPAFs (working personal action files). A number of campuses are instituting them or have set them up. Weber said she sent two of her staff members to observe how they do it in San Marcos who uses Moodle which is similar to our Blackboard. Eastbay uses Blackboard. Humboldt uses an outside vendor. Weber said there are a couple of external vendors that give you all the bells and whistles but that may run around $25K. There are a lot of issues to consider. Weber said she and FPC Chair Kalayjian have participated in a couple of webinars that have been run out of the Chancellor’s office. Weber has another meeting the week of October 11th system-wide about this idea. Weber said the FPC Chair suggested she come before the Senate to get a Sense of the Senate on whether or not this is an idea we should continue to pursue. At this point it would only be WPAFs. **FPC Kalayjian** said a number of campuses have looked at this already and some have adopted it and really like it. It will take time and energy from Faculty Affairs and from the Faculty Policy Committee if we really want to pursue this. And we wouldn’t want to invest the time, energy, time and money until Senate at least thinks it’s an idea worth pursuing. Benefits: would be for those putting their files together. You can upload it as you go, build it electronically, and it would also benefit the reviewers. Ease of building and ease of reviewing. Being able to review the files – the WPAF and the SIF could be logged and viewed, the permanent file would need to be viewed in the Faculty Affairs. **VP Manriquez** recommended if we’re getting a sense of the senate as to whether or not we think this is valuable, it may be beneficial to put in place, here are some core requirements that are across any system you choose, bring that back to the Senate and ask do we think this is valuable or not. And then build the campus specification and say, what we’re looking for that may go beyond this would be the following. If we’re asking generally do people like the concept of e-portfolio using it in this manner, that’s one question, another one is to talk about the specifications of it because the answers are going to be very different. **Hill** said today the first question we can answer, if the answer is yes, we can address it next time. **Parliamentarian Coward** said it seemed there is an electronic piece to this and there is a paper piece to this, does the electronic piece become the paper piece. How does the working turn into the permanent? **AVP Weber** said these are details we need to work out. The general idea is your working personal action file, the documentation you submit when going through the reappointment tenure and promotion process would be electronic. So you could upload your documents, organize your documents and the reviewers can view it online. **Thomas** said the idea of this is working on the presumption it’s already in a digital format. To the extent that it’s not – then it’s also presumed that all of us who are preparing WPAFs have the ability to scan and digitize this documentation. The current binder is a physical binder that is in a room that actually has protection as it relates to confidentiality, as it relates to who has seen it and what times it has been seen, all of which would disappear in a digital world. We may reach a point where we’re going to receive these electronically and then I as a reviewer will need to print these out and if there are others who review it, they may choose to print a copy. **Senator Bowles Eagle** said she has friends at other universities who are already doing this and she’s jealous. She added, we are doing RTP at the same time and they see me creating this binder and all they’re doing is attaching things that already exist in their computer. I would love to explore this option. **Senator Vanterpool** said whether we like it or not we are heading in this direction. The physical space to keep files is an issue. We have to deal with electronically accessing information and it is the faculty members’ burden to do as well a job as possible. Some of Senator Thomas’ concerns can be addressed. There is a privacy protection there as much as in the real world. We have enough experts who can produce this process whereby our privacy is not tempered with. I support the notion of moving in this direction. **Statewide Senator Esposito** said she also supports the idea as she was already submitting electronic files 16 years ago and then when she came here and had to do it manually, it was very challenging. **Senator McGlynn** said on behalf of the RTP Committee of the Biology Department and tenured faculty with whom we’ve already discussed, there would be a general sense of outrage if we passed this over the notion that we could do this. **Senator Kulikov** said it would be much easier rather than having to go to Faculty Affairs to view these files. **Hill** said while there were some cautionary comments on privacy, many of which may related to technology and have heard a lot of positive comments. Hill asked for a Sense of the Senate. We’re not holding a vote on whether or not the campus should adopt this, **the vote is on whether or not we should explore it further.** **FPC Chair Kalayjian** asked for a Sense of the Senate vote on whether or not we should do more research into having E-Portfolios for WPAFs and RTPs purposes.

Chair Hill took a vote – **Senate voted in favor.**

**First Reading EXEC 15-14 Establishment of a Council of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators** – presented by Parliamentarian Coward on behalf of Vice Chair Moore. Coward summarized the resolution. Coward said, Senator Moore drafted this resolution and brought it to Senate Exec. It is in existence at other campuses to facilitate communication across departments and across programs because often different discipline programs and departments of similar sizes share similar issues and can talk with each other not just within a college, but across the campus. **Senator Monty** expressed that he does not like the idea. He said he’s not sure what this body might do meeting bi-monthly and there are enough advisory committees engaged in the kinds of activities outlined here. Monty said a) that’s the purview of the Academic Senate, b) we have a University Planning Committee, why would we need a council or program chairs to basically serve as a double of those bodies. c) While it would be a useful purpose for creating this kind of body, if we do it for that purpose, does the membership need to be that large? I’m not sure why every chair and program coordinator would need to be on this body. Monty added, “We complain about workload and here we are proposing to make more workload for chairs and coordinators, and the bi-monthly meeting schedule and the size, I can’t imagine this being an effective body.” **Vanterpool** said he supported what Senator Monty is raising here and he endorses the spirit in which it was crafted and put together. He added, “Already in some or all of the colleges we have Chair Councils, we meet once a month or as meetings are called, to me, our voices are heard and the Dean and appropriate personnel can take material to the Provost, to the President. It seems that there could be a doubling of role playing here that might not be necessary and accomplish a valuable end. We’re putting ourselves in the middle of something that we don’t have to and I’m against it.” **Bender** asked if taking what the spirit of the resolution is and having it connect with the existing body so that the intention matches the pragmatics of the university workload? **Thomas** said he echoed Senator Monty’s concerns as we are over serviced. Thomas asked if in the 4th resolve where it says it shall be a standing committee, given the extensive conversation in the past with regard to the by-laws and standing committees within our charter stating that there are only two standing committees, if this does go forward and it is a standing committee don’t create the same problem we were discussing just last May? How would we resolve this? **Senator Furtado** – We have two Deans, the graduate and undergraduate Dean, we do meet, especially at the Grad Council. We do let ourselves know what’s working and what’s not working. That message is carried down to Academic Affairs. Already I’m in Senate, and then I’ll have to be somewhere else and somewhere else. We do have a graduate council that is addressing these things. **Senator Dellacioppa** - if other meetings are going to be moved around in order to accommodate it and not have another set of meetings I have to go to, than I would support it because I think that Chairs have unique problems in dealing with departments across the whole university and that having meetings among the chairs without supervision, or without administration could be a good thing in empowering chairs to come up with solutions that aren’t feeling like there being brought from the top down. But I don’t want to go to more meetings. **Senator Kulikov** – The meeting that Faculty Affairs is having once a semester is sufficient. I don’t believe we have more time for additional meetings. **Senator Krochalk** said she was very much in favor of the resolution. Without dealing with the issues of reporting to the Senate, which is something I believe warrants a great deal of discussion. There is ample evidence for the need for it. Provost Junn has had several meetings with chairs and coordinators and there was also a meeting with an outside consultant that was brought it to talk to chairs and coordinators and consistently across the board there was constant amazement, “oh, you do this, I didn’t know that”. No one knows what is going on in the other departments and there is a great deal of knowledge to be shared among us, as well as commiseration to be shared among us which is equally valuable. I think it is really something that’s quite needed and quite beneficial and perhaps if we had had it, we would have avoided the discussion that took place at the last Senate meeting with regard to the survey that was done for service events. A chair of a department was interested in this information and that could have been taken care of easily within this form. The reporting mechanism back to Senate is another issue, but the basic concept and what can be accomplished through it is very positive. **Senator Needham** said bi-monthly and the reporting back needs to be talked about, but I feel strongly that the opportunity for chairs to get in the same room talk with each other and communicate, to find out what’s going on in your department, what’s going on in your college, how are you implementing new initiatives, how you dealing with various issues. How are you overcoming obstacles? There’s a lot to be gained through these conversations and opportunity to have them. **Senator Mc Glynn** – depending how you define bi-monthly, it means twice a month or once every two months? **Hill** said the intent was every other month. **McGlynn** continued, “That’s four or five times a calendar year. Chairs do things that Senators don’t do. They’re scheduling, they’re managing W2 loads throughout the department, they’re managing departmental budgets and they’re responsible for things that effect our quality of life on a day-to-day basis, far more than what we do at Senate. There are practices that are radically different from college to college that represent inequities that probably don’t serve us or our students well. McGlynn said that anytime Vice Chair Moore has brought something forward, he’s focused on really specific things he feels need to be changed, after having had several conversations with different people. McGlynn said he was to going to make up his mind about it until he’s heard from Moore. **Hill** said during a First Reading, Senate Exec generally does not comment and just takes in all of the feedback in. Coward has lots of notes about this and we’ll take it back to Senate Exec. **Provost Junn** said as a point of information, campuses that’s she’s been at prior to CSUDH, both had Council of Chairs formalized. Junn said she personally appreciates more interaction not only with faculty but with chairs in particular because what happens at the department level is critical for student success and the quality of the degree. Junn said since we didn’t’ have a Council of Chairs here, she had requested of Weber to hold a series of Chair programs, consultations. This is just another vehicle to establish a clear communication pattern at a higher institutional level.

**First Reading FPC 15-15 Faculty Policy Committee Charge** - FPC Chair Patricia Kalayjian

Kalayjian summarized resolution. Kalayjian said if there are any comments the floor is open or and if you have any suggestions for improvement, please email her directly. **Junn** suggested to keep continuity on any committee of this sort, so they don’t rotate off at the same time, stagger the terms so at least half of the members who are on the year before so that not everyone is new. **Oesterheld** asked if this was a substantial revision to the existing charge. **Kalayjian** said there is no charge. **Hill** said it’s not mean to be a substantial revision of what was assumed to be the charge. **Monty** asked if EPC was working on a similar charge. **Hill** said yes, it’s in draft form right now.

**Parliamentarian Report** – Parliamentarian Caroline Coward

* Presidential Scholarship Committee winners of ballot vote were John Keyantash and Kirti Celly
* AVP for Marketing Communications Search Committee - needed two volunteers from any college – Gary Polk, CBAPP and Joshua Bender, CHHSN stepped up. Coward asked for a vote of acceptance by acclamation. **Senate voted in favor**.
* Writing Competency Committee - call for one tenured/tenured track faculty member with TSL Competency. Vanessa Wenzel from the College of Arts & Humanities stepped up and has TSL Competency. Parliamentarian asked for a vote of acceptance by acclamation. **Senate voted in favor.**
* GE AdHoc Committee still needs representatives from CBAPP, COE, NBS
* GE Committee – someone is needed to represent the voice and interests of Senate on the GE Committee
* Academic Affairs and Strategic Planning Committee – need someone from CAH, NBS, COE, and a representative from the Library
* Student Grade Appeals Committee – if there is a college representative already, please let Parliamentarian know. Still need someone from CAH, CBAPP, and the Library.

**Hill** said we’re really needing the Senate to appoint someone to the GE, so if there’s someone who would like to step forward and nominate themselves or someone else.

**CFA Update**

* Vivian Price handed out posters for the Watts Riot Rebellion Symposium. She asked especially for people to attend the afternoon events at 1:15 pm on 10/8 to hear Robin Kelley, international speaker and Distinguished Professor of History. She also highlighted Tim Watkins who is going to be speaking at 4 pm. Watkins is the President and CEO of the Watts Labor Community Action Committee.
* Price also handed out flyers with regard to event happening Wednesday, October 14th for the Fight for 5% from 11 – 1 pm on the east walkway. It’s informational on what’s going on with bargaining.
* Strike vote will be taking place. We’re finishing mediation this week then it’s on to fact finding. We need to let the Chancellor know that we’re serious about wanting a raise. The Chancellor has not moved from the 2%. If we want a raise, if we want to get 5%, we have to show up and we have to let them know that we’re willing to strike over this.
* November 17th is the Board of Trustee meeting and we’ll be having two buses from the university going to the Board of Trustees on November 17th in Long Beach.

President Hagan said he supports Price’s call to attend the symposium.

**ASI VP Gamino**

* 10/6 ASI celebrated their 50th anniversary. Good turnout, free food, lots of giveaways. Happy there was a lot of support of the students and that they actually know a lot more about ASI.
* ASI has been working the final details for the CSSA event happening November 13 – 15. It’s the first time we’ve hosted it in over five years.

4:00 PM Meeting Adjourned -