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**Senator Krochalk –** Krochalk requested time at the beginning of the Senate meeting while most were still present. Enrollment for Covered California ends at 2/15/15. A sign-up sheet was sent around the Senate meeting for anyone who wanted to be contacted for a presentation in the spring semester. These presentations can either be done in during class time, or chairs can arrange to have it during a faculty meeting, or if deans can request presentations be done at a faculty retreat or department meeting. Krochalk said that Grace Paredes, Covered California campus Representative, is available to give a report in whatever length that is necessary to fit your circumstance.

**Chair Moore Report** –began by welcoming colleagues from Mexico who are here at CSUDH, participating in an intensive English language course given by the College of Extended and International Education.

Moore said he has been principally concerned with working on issues relating to Chancellor White’s response to campus’ request for exemptions from the 120/180 unit rule. Moore said you should have received an email from Susanne Walker that had come from Steven Filling, Chair, Academic Senate for the CSUs which included the Chancellor’s specific response to each campus. It included information on every one of the campuses. 10 campuses including CSULB, CSUF, and CSUCI were in 100% compliance with the 120/180 rule. CSULA and Cal Poly Pomona were given a pass as they are in the midst of a changing from quarter based to semester units. Eleven other campuses requested exemptions, most of which were for engineering and related programs, and the majority of which were granted. Moore reported for our campus there were consequences of the Chancellor’s decision– requests were granted in Physics for their Electrical Engineering and general options, which are respectively at 125 and 124 units and also in Chemistry at 124 units. Unfortunately the Music department’s request for exemption was not granted – the statement in the letter directed to President Hagan from the Chancellor’s office read, “Decision deferred”. The Chancellor asked for us to look for further ways to reduce, including the possibility of double counting major requirements and general education requirements. Moore said that there seems to be a slight error in the Chancellor’s memo, as Moore was pretty sure that request was being made for music education, and what the letter reads is for the music performance option. Moore said that this clearly relates to the matter that will be on the floor of the Senate later in the meeting, EPC 14-13. Moore said at that time, he will ask that the Senator from Music to share some of the thinking on what steps we should take. The Chancellor’s memo asks “for the degree in which the decision is deferred, I ask you to engage the faculty and academic leadership to see if there are ways to reduce the total units and have a report back to me no later than March 15th, 2015.” Moore asked that the Senate view the immediate challenge within the larger context which is characterized by various political and economic pressures to improve graduation rates. Moore then referenced several articles, the first of which was in the NY Times December 3rd printing, entitled [Blowing Off class, We Know](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/03/opinion/blowing-off-class-we-know.html?_r=0). The second article Moore referenced was [State Senate leader wants to end UC scholarship program foe founded](http://www.latimes.com/local/education/la-me-pol-deleon-tuition-20141203-story.html) from the Los Angeles Times, also on December 3rd and finally an article from the NY Times on 12/2/14, entitled, [Most Don’t’ Earn Degree in 4 Years, Study Finds](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/02/education/most-college-students-dont-earn-degree-in-4-years-study-finds.html). Moore stated that these three different articles are highlighting a fundamental reality that public funding in higher education is a political matter. Moore further remarked that most politics will inevitably lead back to public accountability. Moore referred to a quote by Chancellor White which was about accountability, one that Moore had previously shared at the Senate, “We need to make certain we are measured on values we prize.” Moore said he felt that was a very useful guideline. What he’s asking of the Academic leaders is to adopt a position of thoughtful urgency, urgency because he believes these debates are going to intensify. Thoughtful because we’ll need to be responsive in ways that preserve what we value, and enable us to become the University that we and our students deserve. Moore remarked, “That is what this Senate’s roles is going to be.” He said he believes it is the central challenge we’ll need to face, both in this Senate and the next.

**Provost Junn** wanted first to address why President Hagan was not at the Senate meeting. Junn said Matt Jones wrote a grant, FUSE Grant, sponsored by the Helmsley Foundation which is First Year Undergraduate STEM Experience. Provost Junn had Jones speak to what FUSE was about. Jones said FUSE is for incoming students who are interested or declared majors in the STEM fields, includes a summer program and instructional support to improve passage rates and 2nd year retention rates. Junn said President Hagan is also out of town so that he may participate in a summit. [White House Day of Action](http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2014/12/03/watch-anywhere-white-house-college-opportunity-summit) –College Opportunity Summit. This event was by invitation only. It’s focusing on building networks of colleges surrounding promoting completion partnerships for college readiness around STEM fields. None of the “for profit” institutions were invited. Hagan will participate in 1 of 2 panels with only 3 presidents and only 1 of the CSU presidents invited to speak. Hagan only has 4-5 minutes to speak specifically to partnerships that cross K -12. It is designed to be an interactive panel. Junn said, “We have a lot to be proud of with a president on the national stage.”

**Provost Junn’s report**

* Faculty Reception for the RSCA Awards has been postponed until spring and it will be combined with recognition of those faculty who have submitted and those who have received funding for external grants in 2013 and 2014. We wish to recognize and will work through the deans and department chairs to see if you have published anything that has been a peer reviewed publication, journal article, or some kind of juried presentation or creative activity which has had an independent review. The week of 11/24 was the annual author’s awards, recognizing 27 authors and/or editors.
* As we gear up for WASC we will be asking tenured and tenured track faculty to update your vitae. A memo will come out requesting such through your department chairs.
* President will be issuing a memo primarily to managers and Senate Exec on his model for student success. It’s a memo that outlines how we want to formalize the student success model. We envision having a steering committee largely composed of the cabinet, and three critical task forces one of which is faculty and staff student engagement. This is where we’ll want faculty that are recommended or appointed or elected by the Senate plus two other task forces.
* Advising report with 117 recommendations – President met with acting VP Student Affairs Franklin and the Provost. The original report called for an Advising Czar – after the two hour meeting, it was agreed that it be an Associate Vice President for University Academic Advisement who help coordinate and implement the Advising Report; Junn said included in her plan is to hire 8 new academic advisors (college-based, pre-major advising).
* We’ve been working with last year’s approved honorary Doctorate Forest Whitaker to get him to accept his doctorate at the commencement in May as he had been unable to participate last year. The campus also forward an additional nomination for this year which will be revealed after getting approval from the Chancellor’s Office.
* In the spring, we’ll have AVP Gitanjali Kaul speak to the Senate about the plans for WASC. We had received 10 years of accreditation back to 2008. In 2018, we’ll need to have the affirmation process completed and in 2017 we’ll need to be ready for the WASC visit. The new WASC requires evidence of graduates having core competencies in five areas i.e., writing, oral communication, math/analytical, critical thinking, and information literacy. Passing the course will no longer be enough, they want some other way to assess and ascertain that when they graduate as seniors that they have those skillsets. We don’t have a systematic way to demonstrate competency and then to document it for WASC purposes. We’ll need help from the Senate to figure out who are great people to put on these various committees and taskforces with energy and really showcase the great work we’re doing with our students so that WASC can give us affirmation. It used to be that getting 10 years was relatively easy, but no longer. You now have to score tremendously high. Junn said if we start preparing now – we’ll be in good shape for 2017.

**Questions from the Floor**

**Price** – with regard to webpages, in the past we had someone from IT in every college or someone within IT to help us develop our webpages. Now we have to take training to do something that’s quite complicated and it’s up to us. It’s quite important to have current information and to be able to get our ideas out there on what our majors are about. Since students select a campus by reviewing the webpage; in the past colleges had their own IT individual who maintained their webpage and now chairs are held responsible for maintaining their webpages. Price said IT needs to help us, until now we’ve had students that were going to help us and now that student is going to be gone, so now we need to do it ourselves. Is there any way that IT can resume? **Provost Junn** said she would personally ask Manriquez to see if that can resume. **Provost Junn** – developing landing pages for each department; Donna Cruz will be working with the Chairs to create webpages that list success alumni, possible careers and salaries; AVP Maki will be working on college career tracks. **Price** asked if there was a way to be able to provide feedback on the international program that brought the students here so that we can improve for the next time we host students from another country**. Junn** asked McNutt to work with Price in pulling that information/feedback together from her and anyone who hosted. **Heinze-Balcazar** – with regard to the program review process – Heinz-Balcazar wanted to know what will be the process going forward? In the past we did not get a response. **Junn** – Graduate Dean Kaul will now be responsible for the program review process and a new memo will be coming out within two weeks. **Monty** said we’re in a good place, as we make our way from established procedures to more formalized new policies and procedures. Monty said we expect a lot of progress in the spring and fall and hopefully by next fall there will be a new process, with approval and publication. **Junn** apologized for the delay, she said with Kaul on board and Monty now the newly appointed Director of Assessment, Junn felt quite confident that it would be a robust process that would help departments, as the goal of it is to help departments to be stronger and updated. Junn said she will absolutely use it to tie resources to it based on the kind of data you’re able to show in support and the plans for how you’re going to grow and improve your programs. **Moore** – The model for student success is more than just the budget; but how we manage enrollment and other facets. **Junn** said we want transparency in how we’re setting targets, meeting targets, and making decisions.

**Second Reading EPC 14-13 Establishing a Review Procedure for Double-Counting Major/Minor and Upper Division General Education Courses**: EPC Chair – Jamie Dote-Kwan

Dote-Kwan thanked Coward for presenting at the November 19th Academic Senate meeting. Dote-Kwan addressed the concerns that had been brought up at the First Reading

* With regard to comment made about restricting double counting to 3 units – consulted with Tracey Haney and also researched it, neither could find where it restricts double-counting to three units
* Re. typo – it was changed from departmental deans to college deans
* Can we abolish area G? Dote-Kwan said that it’s not in the Senate’s purview, it’s something that would need to be brought up by GE and reviewed by a larger body
* Re. other classes that are already double counting – Dote-Kwan said according to the catalog there are only four programs that are allowed to double count upper division. Liberal Studies, Clinical Science, Interdisciplinary Studies and the Nursing program. They are allowed to double count, upper division major courses with the major. In trying to understand the rationale behind it, after further consultation with Tracey Haney – Clinical Science recently revised their curriculum and are no longer doing the double-counting. In IDS, it’s a minimum of 9 semester units, because they’re an interdisciplinary major, they were allowed to double count, each of the three main areas, Humanities, Social Science and Natural Science. As for Liberal Studies, they do have three upper division GE areas that double count for a total of nine units. One of those courses, the SMT course 416, and Earth Science is actually an approved course in the F area. In Nursing, the catalog does not specify upper division double-counting. There are designations for upper division nursing courses fulfilled, they are not fulfilling the F or G requirement. Dote Kwan read from an email message from Haney which stated “The catalog copy specifies that upper division double counting is there for nursing, but the designated categories that the upper division nursing courses satisfy are not the areas of F and G requirements.” There are online sections of the upper division GE courses restricted to nursing students, but there is no evidence in the catalog that these courses are still double-counted. Dote-Kwan asked the Senate if there was anyone in Nursing who could clarify this. **Sal Valdez** from Advising responded that there are courses in BSN that do double count for Upper Division GEs and the major and they are listed in the catalog as well.  BSN 346, Pathophysiology, counts for area F2 the upper division natural science and BSN 306, Culture Diversity in Health, counts for area F3 and G in place of SBS 318.
* Are we allowed to double count from major to minor – the answer is no, and that is in the catalog
* In addressing Senator Gould’s remark about one third of a minor that can be double-counted with GE. If a minor is only 12 units, you could have 9 units of a 12 unit minor be GE courses or double counted. Dote Kwan said according to the catalog – you cannot do that. Upper Division GE Courses may be double counted in the minor if at least 12 units are taken in the minor exclusive of GE courses. If you have a minor that’s more than 12 units than you can double count. 12 units has to be in the minor. If you do use a GE course in the minor, it has to be approved by the chair or coordinator responsible for the minor. Our minors are typically 15 units but they range in size from 12 – 48. **Monty** addressed Dote-Kwan’s remark about not finding in the catalog language on restrictions on double counting, he said that remark pertains specifically to this. A 15 unit minor that included also Lower Division units that double count toward GE. You have 3 units Lower Division and then potentially 6 units upper division that would be 9 of the 15 units in the minor.
* What do other campuses do in terms of double counting? Dote-Kwan said in looking at the campuses closest to us: SDSU = you are only allowed to take 1 course from the major to count towards GE, but they have a 48 unit GE. CSULB = 35 units must be taken outside of the major, 13 units can be taken within the major. CSULA = upper division GE may not be used to meet the major requirements. There GE can be met with 48 units. At CSUF you have a limit of 9 units from a single department in Area A, but nothing from the major in Area B, Area C, and Area D can count. CSUF’s GE is at 51 units. **Monty** said that something that needs to be considered when giving unit totals for GE across the CSU’s is whether or not those campuses include the American Institutions courses in GE or not.
* What about new courses? EPC added language to the resolution to address new courses.
* Other language was added to the resolution resolving that it be clearly articulated in the University Catalog along with appropriate advisement materials.

**Moore** asked Jonathan Grasse, Senator from the Music department to speak to the current situation within Music as it relates to the matter of EPC 14-13. **Grasse** said the Chancellor’s note does remark on the performance option rather than for the music education option which was what was being requested. Music Ed is currently at 131 which is a problem. The Department is trying to approach it with a double counting strategy, or even cuts, but it involves NASM, National Association of Schools of Music. In looking through their handbook, there are some loosely worded vague paragraphs about requirements for Music education. We can go the route of removing some of the requirements, and it’s something we’ve been looking at for some time. **Moore** said he felt it was important for the body to understand, in addition to Engineering programs, one of the programs that is explicitly excluded from the 120/180 consideration are Bachelors in Music, which is different from a Bachelor of Arts in Music. Moore asked Grasse to explain why the Music department didn’t go that route? **Grasse** replied, “Bachelors of Music requires facilities that we do not have. It requires a lot of detail and available services that we don’t have and functions of classrooms. We’ve been looking at that down the road, and the lack of practice space. Opportunities for students that we’re just not able to offer is what it’s all about. **Junn** said it wasn’t until the last Senate meeting that she had even heard there were facilities issues. “If there are issues of space that prevent you from executing your program,” Junn said, “contact me through the department chair or dean so they can make plans immediately to start addressing it if it’s the direction the department wants to move in.” **Moore** said that ours was the only Music department that was in a situation where they had to ask for an exemption within the entire CSU. Moore said this is an example of how this resolution intersects with a program on our campus.

**Q&A from the floor**

**Monty** thanked the EPC committee and the Executive Committee for taking this on and bringing it to the Senate. He said it was exactly the step that should have been taken two years ago when the decision came down. It was why he had introduced a Sense of the Senate urgency to stop the AdHoc case by case decisions exempting programs from certain GE requirements without any sort of consultation or transparency. Monty said unfortunately it’s taken some time to get us to this place, and now have a coherent approach that will help us navigate through this difficult issue. **Zoerner** said he would vote against EPC14-13. He noted that Magruder read from the catalog at the last Senate meeting the historical philosophical position which Zoerner said he took to mean that majors and minors is for depth of knowledge in experience and general education is for breadth. Zoerner said he does not think that by allowing double counting of any kind that you’re doing anybody a favor and that you’re sacrificing one or the other and it’s usually breadth. **Heinz-Balcazar** asked it be noted that in fall 2012, the GE committee approved the double counting of SBS 318 for Business and Physics. **Magruder** said having sat on the GE committee when departments like Music came through we were in a very difficult position as we certainly want departments to be able to comply with mandates that come from above. Magruder said that as she reads the rationale of the resolution, it seems to assume that the only program quality that is threatened here is that of the depth in a major. Magruder said what seems to be missing from the conversation is what the role of GE is. It seems that as a group we aren’t at a consensus of what GE is. We need to have a larger conversation and part of that conversation needs to be what happens to the GE program. What does the educational program of the students who graduate actually look like? Magruder said we think we need to balance the depth of the major with the breadth of GE. **Kalayjian** said she would like to ask if there’s a way to table this as she is also concerned. Kalayjian said she would also see us have a larger conversation on this issue. She said she would not want to see us driven by pressure from above to make every major available within 120 units. **Junn** spoke about the possibility of reframing GE so it meet mission of CSUDH. And creating a package to meet this. **Coward** said considering we have a large number of transfer students who are presumably doing their General Education at Community Colleges, and we only see them for their upper division GE classes. Coward said this is an opportunity to fulfil both breadth and depth in General Education. **Moore** said this is an attempt to create a process by which a procedure is put in place that allows for these kinds of adjustments to be made, the procedural aspect of it. And then there’s the other issue, the degree of balancing breadth and depth in our education. Moore said one of the other things we’ll be hearing about today is a report back from Kaye Bragg of the AdHoc Committee on Lower Division GE. Moore said that what we could do is take the current motion, table it, and revisit it at the first meeting in the spring and in the meantime have the benefit of the AdHoc committee’s formal report and suggestions on Lower Division GE and it will also give the Music department more time to try to figure out what opportunities they need to consider. Moore asked for a motion to table.

**Majority approved motion to table.**

**Update on Lower Division GE Ad Hoc Committee from Kaye Bragg -** Bragg said the committee was very collaborative and engaged and that there were two student representatives who were also very active in all the different discussions. She said all members were very candid and everyone was willing to give up their area. She said the committee began with the basic premise:

* When we look at Lower Division GE, how do we view it and see it as a package contributing to the overall GE program
* What do students learn from it?
* What do students gain from it?

The Committee reviewed all the CSU’s GE packages in comparison to our package, based on requirements, units and topics. In addition the committee referenced Executive Order 1065 and others regarding GE requirements. The committee also reviewed WASC guidelines regarding core competencies and learning outcomes. Bragg said that the recommendations along with all of the resources and minutes from the committee meetings will be available in the final report that you receive. Bragg said for the purposes of today’s Senate meeting, she will be giving high points of the recommendations. She pointed out that the guidelines provided on implementation were placed within the context of where we are now. The committee also looked at the processes that were in place and how those can be used to facilitate the type of implementation we’re looking at. The following are the recommendations:

* A recommendation to reduce the number of GE units and modify how courses are counted given the guidelines of [EO1065](http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1065.html) and the CSU Institutional learning outcomes.

There were a number of debates about this, it began with a student centered revision of the different areas that we have in GE, based on our knowledge and skills we want our students to have in order to succeed. This revision presents a flow of courses to help students plan their academic path. The revision of how courses are counted is related to courses in the major in GE. Interrelation in the GE learning and the major learning for a single interlinked student academic path is one of the major points of debate we had. According to some students, is that you do GE and then you do the rest, you just got to get it done. Students shared some pretty strong viewpoints about what students think about GE, it’s a check list, its busy work, you just have to get through this stuff. We wanted to get a sense of how to interrelate GE with Lower Division with the Major, with the Baccalaureate experience, how to get them connected. Within the recommendations are several options regarding how majors could submit proposals for Lower Division GE courses to satisfy the GE requirements in an area.

* A recommendation to revise GE area learning objectives and incorporate WASC core competencies into each area.

There was great concern on the committee that we were going to look to eliminate in order to get to a count, but we did not approach it that way. When we talked about incorporating the WASC core competencies, we wanted to identify what is it you mean in DH experience admission that is found in the GE program. Through the revision of the GE program learning objectives, the connection between the GE program and our institutional learning goals would be explained. Also be revising the Lower Division GE, we can understand how Lower Division contributes to the overall GE program. We wanted measurable goals that are relevant to all of the courses that are listed or accepted within an area. We also agreed we should have high impact practices learning experiences as a formal part of GE.

* A recommendation to expand student choices through designing alternative themes based on a collection of inter-disciplinary courses across GE areas.

When we looked at all the different GE packages, a number of campuses have gone to this. Some of them are called paths, some are called themes, some are called discovery. The two we thought were most interesting were Chico and Long Beach. Students explore a common theme or issue through a collection of courses across disciplines of different areas in the GE Lower Division. The key is it cannot be all in one area, it must be across multiple areas. Interdisciplinary options engage the students in drawing connections between courses and begin to build on the critical thinking skill. This package of GE courses would make GE more relevant to the student interest and their backgrounds. The students felt very strongly about this and were very excited about increasing choice within GE. The unique package of courses would integrate a common activity, project or research question into each course in the package. Advising would be required on this. Students would need to understand within a theme or a path that they would need to take all of them in order to get credit across the path model. This would not be a replacement of the current collection of Areas that we have, this would be an alternative. The suggestions for implementation strategies are based on existing committees, processes and courses. The collection of courses from GE that engages students in the learning experience, the foundation of the major, preserving both breadth and depth, but clearly through these changes we would explain how GE Lower Division relates to the GE program and then give us insight into how the GE program relates to the undergraduate Baccalaureate experience.

**Questions from the floor:**

**Belu** – with regard to the students and their thoughts about the GE program, was it a sample of two or how representative were they of the student body. **Bragg** – the students on the committee shared candidly about their feelings and they expressed that this was also shared by their friends. Also several faculty members on the committee shared that they had also received this kind of feedback from their students. **Belu** said she is concerned that it is not necessarily reflective of the total student body. **Moore** said these are substantive changes that affect thousands of students, perhaps a survey could be used, or do we take this report to ASI and if ASI came back as a collective, would that satisfy the concern instead of a survey. **Monty** said I believe we need a full task force working through it from beginning to end. If we are going to change GE that dramatically, we need to have an in depth study and an open, transparent inclusive process. Monty said he appreciates the efforts of the AdHoc Committee and he feels they’re pointing us in a good direction, however a much larger in-depth process needs to be embarked upon if we are to head in this direction. **Ganezer** said we’ve had this discussion many times before. The whole idea of GE is to give students the motivation to take classes from areas in academia that are very important and they would never take or otherwise be exposed to those fields. There is plenty of good reason for GE. The GE courses that seem more difficult than other GE courses students would by-pass and that is the wrong reason to change. **Bragg** said Math is one of the GE requirements that we cannot overrule, it would be there. Everyone in the committee agreed with those basic competencies and the ability of analyze, those are all part of those competencies. On the committee there was very strong consensus that we need students to do more writing, more critical thinking and that we need to spread that out, and not limit to a single department area or responsibility. **McGlynn** said first he would like to see the report so that they can actually speak to it. Secondly, McGlynn said he is stunned that no one has pointed out that the GE curriculum, half is motivated by campus politics. Programs generate FTE’s by keeping students in their program. McGlynn said he appreciates that we want students have a diverse broad curriculum and he absolutely wants students in his major in science are able to take literature and art. That said, individuals here are arguing positions that protect their own interests, let’s not entirely pretend it’s all about our benevolent interest of student education. **Moore** said that all three provosts before have referred to GE reform as the third rail of academic politics and McGlynn’s point is well taken. However, Moore also agrees that we should wait to talk about it until we’ve seen the report. Moore pointed out that the reason the report has been postponed has been to make certain that feedback from all committee members have been incorporated. **Bragg** said the report was a collaborative effort, it did not come from a single individuals’ viewpoint, it is a report from the committee. We want to make sure that the report is representative of everyone’s input as it will be signed off on by all committee members. Bragg went on to say that if there are minority views or alternative views, they also will be included in the report. **Moore** said Monty’s point is also well taken. It is one of these things that a seemingly innocuous change has unanticipated consequences. It is essential to begin the process and having a report in front of us with specific recommendations which we may either accept, reject or revise is an important starting point in that process. Moore thanked Bragg and the committee.

**Parliamentarian Report** – Katy Pinto

50th Anniversary of the Watt’s Rebellion – Creation of the planning committee – the Academic Senate has been asked to appoint several members to serve on this committee. Pinto read from a document giving an overview of the background and charge of the committee.   
*The 2015/16 academic year marks both the 50th anniversary of the Watts Rebellion and the 1965 decision by California Governor Pat Brown to relocate the state college we today know as California State University, Dominguez Hills from Palos Verdes to Carson. In 1965, a community was in crisis and the leaders of the day turned to higher education as a mechanism to bring greater opportunity, upward mobility, and hope and transformation to individuals and a community at large. Fifty years later, California State University, Dominguez Hills is compelled to explore, examine, analyze, and discuss conditions preceding the Watts Rebellion, the current status both nationally and regionally of these issues, and the impact of higher education as a catalyst for change.*

During the 2015-16 academic year, the request is that one faculty member from each college would be appointed by the Senate. Currently there are five colleges that have put forward volunteers. Brenda Riddick (CBAPP), Justin Gammage (CAH), Alexis McKurn (NBS), Terry Richardson (COE), Maria Avila (CHHS). **Senate M/S/P**

**Price** asked what if there are other members who wish to serve on this committee. **Moore** suggested emailing him if anyone knows of anyone else who might be interested in serving on the committee, and he will forward that information to Naomi Goodwin.

**Increase Participation in Student Research Day – Laura Outland**Outland encouraged faculty to go back to their peers to find ways to engage more students in the Student Research Day and suggested looking at the syllabi before January, and modify it in ways that would allow for more participation in Student Research Day. Pinto said the class became more enjoyable to teach because students become more creative. She said that the December 3rd deadline is helpful, as students tend to drop off in January. Outland said even though the deadline has passed, there’s no reason you can’t begin to plan for the next Student Research Day now. Erbe asked about the possibility for students who are not on campus to participate. Huizinga said that one of the reasons we currently to not include students who are not on-site is because we can select best researchers to represent at student research competitions which so far are face-to-face only.

**CFA REPORT** – Vivian Price spoke about the CFA end of the semester party/meeting at the new Faculty Development Center on Thursday, December 4th. RSVP would be appreciated at ext. 2160. Price thanked Provost Junn and President Hagan for meeting with CFA where they spoke about raises and the reclassifications of lecturers and the timeline for that. Understanding that it won’t happen automatically, and that Faculty Affairs is working on it. It will be retroactive to July 2014. There will be a meeting for all AVP’s with the Chancellor’s office to provide guidance and clarity around it. Price said the other thing that was discussed was the equity program. Those presidents that are willing and feel it’s important to go beyond what the contract requires can do so. Inversion across the board for all of our faculty was probably the worst problem. People who have been here longer and find that they are under water compared to new hires, regardless of their rank, classification or status. Close behind that was compression, you may be a little bit above. You have years of experience, but as we didn’t get raises for several years – we find ourselves compressed. These are the two areas that we feel need to be handled by the equity program. **Weber** said we meet at the Chancellor’s office on 12/15 to look at the statewide contractual pieces with regard to raises to look at the implementation of the contract language and they’ll be more information after that meeting with regard to tenured track faculty and the GSI, etc. The lecturer reclassification, we’re probably one the worst in the system in terms of paying PhD’s at the level of Masters. There was that resolution that the senate passed to address that which puts us ahead of the curve in some ways because we’ve been working on reclassifying and getting those estimates from the colleges so we can implement that right away. **Moore** said he understands why there would be a backlog, but he thought they already had a commitment from the President that new lecturers would be hired at the correct rates. **Weber** concurred that we are hiring now at the correct rates. **Junn** said keeping in mind that we need to make salary adjustments in three areas, tenured track faculty, lecturers and staff. It will be clear once we know how much we will be getting and what are the contractual requirements are. **Weber** said with regard to campus based equity program, President Hagan has said several times in the Senate that he was under instruction not to implement the campus based equity until we had a contract and now that we have a contract we have to implement the salary changes that are in the new contract and then we can look at an equity program. You don’t need to submit data, you don’t need to submit individual requests. We’re going to be working with a consultant. In consultation with CFA, we’re doing data analysis for it and continued dialogue. Then it becomes a budget issue on what we can afford and how does the President wish to move forward. **Moore** asked for clarity on the CFA contract regarding the form to indicate how faculty would receive raises and the equity program. **Price** said contractually the staff was awarded 3%. Contractually the staff was awarded 3% which will be divided based on what the new contract says. What is required that we reclassify the lecturers as soon as possible, and that tenure and tenure track faculty will receive raises according to the percentages based on their distance to their SSA max. A small required equity program also is attached to the contract. Furthermore, the contract does allow presidents to use discretionary power to develop equity programs for their campuses. **Moore** said what is the connection between the two processes? The small equity program is required by the contract. The campus based equity program is developed by the president and the provost with a meet and confer with CFA. **Provost Junn** offered current stats in terms of number of full-time vs. part-time students

**Undergraduate Students**Fall 2013 – 72.2% are full time and 27.8% are part-time

Fall 2014 – 72.3% full-time and decreased by .10% for part-time

**Graduate Students (1600 students**

* Fall 2013 - 46.4% are full time and 53.4% part-time
* Fall 2014 - 49.2% full time
* Average age: 25.5 in 2013

**Moore** asked Junn to confirm that by “full-time” we mean a student taking a minimum of 12 units per semester, thus a full0time student still requires 6 years to graduate. **Cipriano** asked with regard to implementation of equity and salary increases, he said he is unclear how the president’s implementation of the increases in terms of which group gets paid first, second and/or subsequent years. Cipriano said the pool of money should be distributed among all group at the same time. He didn’t understand why any group should be postponed, when all of groups have been without their increases. He asked how he should communicate to his peers when they can anticipate this increase and when they did get it, would it be retroactive to last July, or will it be retroactive until now? Who decides and how does it pan out? **Junn** said she wasn’t sure how it’s a function on how much the Chancellor’s office is giving. **Price** said she thought there was two things Cipriano was talking about, first was the 3% raise which is part of the new contract. The second thing is In terms of an equity package – you would even need to meet with Administration. **Moore** offered that what he recalls that when this came up earlier in the year was when President Hagan addressed this issue, one of the principles he discussed was trying to address where the need was the greatest. If you only had X amount of money to deal with the equity issues, you would go to the least paid people and try to meet that need. Moore said this was all the information he could recall and again, that this was from memory.

**Cipriano** asked how he goes about getting this information. **Moore** said your union representative and setting up a meeting with administration.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM**