Call to Order 2:30 p.m.

Approval of Agenda MSP

Approval of Minutes from 12/08/10 Amended MSP

Introductions of SEEDS Cohort—Marge Gordon- Marge Gordon introduced to the academic senate a group of scholars from Central America visiting our campus. They are health professionals and are here studying our best practices. The senate welcomed them and thanked them for being here. Gordon also introduced Erica Valdez who is working very closely with the scholars.

Time Certains:
3:00 p.m. President’s Report—Mildred García –García offered a Happy Chinese New Year to everybody. García began with points of pride. She said that many of us knew Jerry Groomes, the Carson City manager who retired on January 8, 2011. The Watson Land Company announced the creation of the Jerry Groomes endowed scholarship for excellence in public administration at CSU Dominguez Hills. The scholarship will support our students from Carson majoring in public administration.
On July 12th and 13 student athletes at Dominguez Hills welcomed Michael Rouse. He is the vice president for philanthropy and community affairs at Toyota motor Sales USA. His company will be giving a gift of a fully loaded 2011 FJ Cruiser. It will be made available through an opportunity drawing to support scholarships for Toro athletics throughout the spring semester, with the winner announced at the annual Toro’s Scholarship Golf Classic on June 17.

In the area of building community 100% of the faculty travel requests submitted in the fall were fully funded. On January 20 we began an evening with award winning poet Lorna Dee Cervantes and the unveiling of the second painting of the 50th anniversary art series called “The Heart of CSU Dominguez Hills” by Aydee Lopez Martinez. We are also having Toro Days and today we were serving pancakes. Many programs on the campus are sponsoring Toro Days. February is also Black History Month. The 5th annual Martin Luther King symposium will be held on February 10th. On February 15, Terry McMillian will be our guest; she is the author of many books including “Waiting to Exhale”. She will be lecturing and there will be a book signing.

For external points of pride, García gave congratulations on The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching selection of CSU Dominguez Hills for its community engagement classification. We are one of 115 institutions nationwide and only 6 higher ed institutions belong in California. In addition, Southwest Airlines highlighted in their bulletin called “The Mosaic” our Super Sunday, García’s visit to the White House, and they highlighted the William Randolph Hearst/ CSU Trustee Award for outstanding achievement. Wonderful things are happening here at Dominguez Hills.

In the area of fiscal stability García knows that we have all heard the Governors proposed budget for 2011/12. The CSU/UC are supposed to receive a $500 million cut. Depending on who you listen to our deficit is either $25 billion or $26 billion. Governor Brown said he will get the budget in balance. We have all heard that the proposed budget assumes it is the extension of the taxes such as the income tax, automobile tax, sales tax. If these taxes are not extended by the voters in June then our cuts could be worse. The polls are indicating that the voters are seeing that it would be good to extend the taxes and not seeing it as an increase but as an extension. There are other states that are having similar problems, not just California. The chancellor of the University of Texas system shared with García that they are looking at about an $800 million cut next year. Thirty-five states are reporting that they are anticipating revenue shortfall for 11/12. The year 11/12 is expected to be worse than previous years nationwide. There is an increase in accountability for higher education. Federal and state legislatures are looking at how we are managing our resources. While these are hard times, García truly believes we are in a much better place than we have been in the past. Let’s remember that we still do not have a finalized budget, or the proposed allocation from the chancellor’s office, nor our enrollment target for 11/12. We must at least begin to plan for what has been proposed. We will be presenting a PowerPoint presentation of the budget situation with MaryAnn Rodriguez in a few minutes. García said that she had already met with her cabinet and the executive committee, and the chair of the university budget committee, John Thomlinson about the fiscal situation. García said that she would like to start with the effect on our campus and where we stand currently. García said that times are tough but that she believed that if we work together civilly and openly we will withstand this crisis in our nation. Governor Brown said we must “tackle our budget deficit head on and deal with it honestly and without procrastination.”

PowerPoint Presentation on Budget.

Bradfield asked if he heard García say that current planning was for a 10% reduction. García said that it was about $10 million or about a 10% reduction. Malamud said that he thought if we went over target
we would not get any more money from the chancellor’s office so late census shouldn’t matter. García said no, in 9/10 we were told to go down and we went over. When the 10/11 budget came in the legislature and the former governor put money in the CSU budget in order to bring more students. The Chancellor’s Office will hold onto that money until spring 2011 census. At that time the campuses will receive an allocation of their share of those monies. If we reach our share of the FTE target we will receive $1.8 million of one-time funds which will help us a lot. Malamud said that he thought we only had to make our 9520 target to get our money. Malamud asked if we were going to use the $2.1 million we got back to backfill. García said that we are going to look and see how we are going to manage the new budget reality. We have not received our instructions yet. Whetmore said that this parallels the college discussion we were having today. He said that the president should be commended for being able to hang onto enough of those funds to cushion the blow. This would be gigantic if it were not for the withholding of the funds previously. Let’s assume that the governor’s tax vote does not pass, Whetmore’s understanding is that we would be looking at double the current deficit. Kalayjian asked how we were going to handle summer. García said that we will be on self-support. Vogel will have a report at the next meeting to go over how faculty salaries will be funded.

4:15 p.m. Dave Karber-Emeritus Faculty Association Faculty Legacy Grant Program-Karber is the president of the Emeritus Faculty Association and said that there are over 200 members. Karber introduced the Faculty Legacy Fund Awards program which is an on campus professional development grant program. It is funded through the generosity of CSUDH faculty who have retired and contribute funds to further the academic excellence that has become a hallmark of CSUDH faculty. Karber went over 10 grants totaling $14,935 that have been awarded since the inception of the awards program. He encouraged faculty to apply and to share the information with their colleagues.

3:30 p.m. Naomi Moy-Affordable Learning Solutions-Moy came and presented on the Affordable Learning Solutions program at CSU Dominguez Hills. She gave a PowerPoint presentation to go over the program. Open Education Resources (OER) available free and online for you and your students: E-textbooks; course materials, instructional modules, simulations, animations; Courseware, materials available from entire online courses. Library resources: E book collections; E-journal and magazine articles; E-Reserves-materials available via your course LMS! (e.g. Blackboard, Moodle). Other Options: Textbook Rental Programs; used books; licensed digital books for all students at a discounted rate; publisher’s e-textbooks.

Vanterpool asked if he would have to go through the library for aid to get access. Moy said that he did not and that he should be able to use his current username and password for the campus. Prado asked if this was free. Moy said that some of the financing has come from the university and some has come from the chancellor’s office. Moy said that if anyone had any further questions to forward them to her via email.

4:45 p.m. David Bradfield-CFA Report-Bradfield passed out a packet of information. The first document is a one page summary of the change in the size of the CSU faculty, all campuses combined. As everyone knows, the number of faculty employed by CSU has been dropping since 2007. In November 2010, there were about 3,200 fewer faculty members working at the CSU than there were in November 2007. In 2008 and 2009, virtually all of the faculty losses were lecturers who were not reappointed or who were laid off. What is particularly significant about the 2010 data is the reduction of over 500 tenure line faculty members. This does not reflect mass layoffs of tenured faculty last year but it illustrates the result of not replacing professors who retire. These data are based on CFA membership reports and are expressed as both headcount and full time equivalent positions, as per usual reporting practice. The
The series begins with the trend for all faculty (i.e., all ranks and classifications combined). For each campus, the total number of faculty employed for the past six years is shown first as a thumbnail graphic and then in raw numbers. The change between 2007 and 2010 is shown in the final columns, as a percent and graphically as a bar that reflects each campus compared to the others. Viewed like this, the variation from campus to campus is very obvious. When considering the system wide statistics, it is always helpful to understand how your campus compares. Which administrations have made the deepest cuts to faculty? Pay attention especially to similarly sized campuses. The rest of this series shows the same information for different classifications and in terms of both headcount and full time equivalent positions. There was an article in the Times that the CSU would consider reducing enrollment, eliminating classes, laying off staff, furloughing employees, increasing class sizes to address the proposed $500 million loss. In Governor Brown’s proposal on the top there is a cut of $500 million in the state allocation… but what no one has talked about is that in that same proposal there is a backfill to cover the recovery act funds we received this year. So the net cut is really $394 million. He said that on February 10 there will be a CFA luncheon and on April 13, 2011 there will be a Teach Out.

Reports:
Provost’s Report-Ron Vogel-Vogel welcomed everyone back to a new semester. He is waiting to see what happens with the budget and that is all that he has. Kravchak asked Vogel if he had any idea how the budget may or may not affect sabbaticals. Vogel said he did not know at this time. Vasquez asked if we could expect a follow-up at the next meeting and Vogel said yes.

Chair’s Report-Irene Vasquez-Vasquez said that last week she attended with representatives of UCC and GE and some statewide representatives the annual meeting of the Association of Colleges and Universities whose theme was essential student learning and success. On February 17 Vasquez will be convening a meeting of the CSU Council of Senate Chairs. We have 4 items on our agenda dealing with online evaluations, online teaching, accreditation, and assessment. You can review the minutes which are quite lengthy on our senate website. There will be an EPC report looking at one of these items. Cauthen asked what the relationship was of the statewide senate to the council of senate chairs. The statewide senate is a policy recommending body and they interact directly with the chancellor’s office and the council of senate chairs is a group of elected senate chairs. At our last meeting we did vote to have the convener be present to make reports at the statewide senate. This is the first time that there has been that sort of an interaction. We do get together on a quarterly basis to discuss key topics and issues that have arisen.

Vice Chair’s Report-Michael White-White has been working with FPC on the resolution we will be talking about a little bit later.

FPC Report-Thomas Norman-3 Things-We have a resolution on RTP process being presented today; The next meeting we will have recommendations for minimum standards, how departments should go about setting minimum standards, and online PTEs...there is no resolution pending right now. We want to get a clear answer about opting out and will ask Dr. Martin to respond. Martin said that he had just sent an email to all the professors explaining the outcomes needed. The regular PTE form was sent out and what Martin said in the email was if you wish to opt out just mark it on the form. Malamud said that he did not get his choice for classes and was told it was in the mailbox. Martin said that they were delivered and Malamud should have received his. Miller asked about the option for faculty to add questions to the rating scale. Martin said that when you send the PTE request form back write in the question that you would like. Miller asked if that was available for faculty to do at any point, is there a
cutoff date? Martin said that we have not determined a cutoff date. The forms themselves will be available in the 12th week so it should be before then. Norman recommended that a notice be sent out a week before as a reminder. Moore asked if full professors have the option to opt out. Martin said that you may if you wish to,

**EPC Report-Jose Prado for Janine Gasco-**
1. A Senate resolution from 2009, EPC 09-02, provided guidelines for Academic Technology and Distance Learning. We have been collecting information from the several offices on campus that deal with this issue, IT, the Library, and Extended Ed. We also have been researching any system-wide initiatives as well as any WASC requirements. We are currently looking at how other CSU campuses deal with these issues. We will have a more concrete report for the next Senate meeting.

2. We are also working on another resolution from 2009, EPC 09-04, which recommended a computer/information literacy requirement for our students. We are looking at how other campuses deal with this issue to determine the best way to proceed given our current budgetary constraints.

3. A third issue that has come to our attention is efforts to make the curriculum review process more efficient. Currently the forms and the guidelines for filling out the forms are being modified to clarify some common problems that many of us have when filling them out. We will be convening a meeting in the next few weeks to discuss these issues that will include college curriculum committee chairs, GE and UCC chairs, Tracey, and others.

Faculty with an interest in any of these three issues should contact me (Jan) or any of the EPC members (Jose, Jill Aguilar, Kirti Celly, or Vivian Price).

**Statewide Senate-Pat Kalayjian**- Kalayjian said that the ASCSU have started the process of nominating faculty to be faculty trustee. We were contacted to see if we had anyone to nominate from our campus. The four finalists have been chosen and they are:

Bernadette Cheyne, CSU Humboldt  
Jacqueline Kegley, Bakersfield  
Steven Stepanek, Northridge  
Darlene Yee-Melichar, San Francisco

All but Dr. Kegley are current senators on the ASCSU; Jackie is a former ASCSU senator and chair.

These candidates for faculty trustee on the CSU BOT were chosen from a larger group of nominees (campuses or individuals could propose candidates) by an ad hoc committee elected by the ASCSU and chaired by Harold Goldwhite (Professor Emeritus of Chemistry at CSULA, Retiree Member of the Senate, and former Faculty Trustee to the BOT). That committee
advanced these four names, and the ASCSU will decide to send as few as two or as many as all four for consideration by the governor, who ultimately chooses.

One of the main focuses at ASCSU is the implementation of SB 1440. They are creating what are called transfer model curriculum. If you are in a discipline where that curriculum is still being developed you can go to a website and comment on it.

Vanterpool asked if the 4 individuals are recommended by the statewide senate. Kalayjian said yes and there is a committee that is chosen by the statewide senate to vet the applications and the campuses were asked to nominate people. The ASCSU office then forwards the final names to the governor’s office and it is the governor who will decide.

There was a question about the clickers and Ron Bergmann said that there are different clickers and they do different things. Some clickers work infrared like your remote control on your TV, and others work on UHF. There are differences as to how they integrate with software. We have demonstrated a couple of different clickers on the campus and the TAK committee will hear those tomorrow and we will try to standardize on one system. Malamud said that it appeared the ASCSU had nothing better to do than micromanage clickers. Vanterpool said that it is perhaps because we have student representation at the statewide level.

**New Business:**
FPC 11-01-Resolution on RTP Process-Norman introduced the resolution. Norman asked if there were any questions or discussion. This is the first reading. Gould said that retention doesn’t really belong at the 6th year review. Vanterpool had a question about the very first line under the first probationary appointment. Vanterpool is worried about what it means defacto employment for 3 years once you get appointed. It looks like we are locking ourselves into telling a new faculty member that they will be here for 3 years. Vanterpool could think of the legal consequences here. What if the faculty member in the first year has performed so badly, teaching comes out lousy and no progress made the first year? The second year we have a persistent pattern of the same thing. Would it be in the purview of the department chair or dean even up to the first year to not recommend reappointment? Vanterpool worries about the permanence of 3 years.

Malamud said that he sent an email to Bradfield a couple days ago because he is not sure in the contract what is required as far as annual reviews. Malamud said that it is not a 3 year contract it is a 4 year contract because we are not reviewing them until the 3rd year and then they get 1 more terminal year. Malamud agrees with Vanterpool that would be worse than 3 years because it would actually be 4. Why can’t we do the review spring semester of the second year so that they will have a year and one half of classes. They could use winter break to write their file. We need to think about when the reviews are coming. This whole thing with the 2 year contract--what happens if someone wants early tenure? It does not seem to be addressed. Norman said that the existing process would apply since the document does not speak to that. Norman said that he would take this back to the committee.
Carvalho asked if the college RTP committee precedes the dean and the answer was yes. Right now it’s the dean prior to the committee and the answer was yes. Carvalho asked what was meant in the document by “together or separately”. Vasquez said that it depends on the size of the committee, sometimes the chair will write a letter and sometimes they won’t. Carvalho asked if the last paragraph on page 3 should be part of the resolve and White said that it is an effort to bring clarity to what the resolution is about as opposed to being the resolution and to whom it is directed. White said that this is part of the resolution in a sense of identifying to whom it is directed. It is not part of a policy language that is being proposed. It is part of the resolution.

Whetmore thanked Senator Norman and his committee for all their work on this document. Whetmore said that he would support the resolution and said that it gives a greater degree of security for tenure track faculty.

Cauthen wanted to address Vanterpool’s remark about insufficient protection for the university. Cauthen thinks that point in some ways is largely moot. We are in such a buyers’ market right now. If we do our job in terms of hiring in any way legitimately he does not think it is a problem given the fact that tenure track appointments are not going to be tremendously available. Cauthen is also concerned about the year following year 3 that there seems to be an opt out that someone can get cut off at the end of their 3rd year. That concerns Cauthen and it is a contract concern as well.

Norman said that the terminal year is part of the contract and that cannot be changed.

Pawar asked about the relation from the college to the dean’s review. Her understanding was that those two were separate reviews. There are places in the document where it makes it sound like the college review is submitted to the dean. Pawar would like to see that clarified. Pawar asked what the brief written report is to look like. It states throughout this document that such report does not require the extensive supporting documents as would be contained in an SIF. Her understanding of the documentation is that it is evidence for what you claim in your narrative. Are we no longer asking for evidence? If we are not going to ask for evidence any more we need to question why? If it is evidence they should give it. If it is not evidence why do we give it in any year of review? If you are not documenting that with evidence what are the legal ramifications. It doesn’t seem like this is going to be a big reduction in work load. It might make more sense to do a mandatory full review in years 2, 3 and 6.

Miller said that she was involved in some earlier versions of this. She also had concern about the lack of clarity with regard to the brief written report. She was supportive of language saying brief written report in the form of a SIF without the index material. She had advocated for this early as a junior faculty member because of how onerous it is on a yearly basis having to create the minutia of the documentation in the index. Miller thinks it is wise to still have the brief written report still be in the form of the SIF so that there is not confusion because we already have a new professional plan and we have the regular SIF in year 3. It would be helpful not to have an additional third form of documentation. If it is understood to be an SIF without
an index that is less confusing to participants in the process. On page 2 at the bottom of the paragraph--first probationary appointment--the last sentence says the evaluations shall be forwarded to personnel services. Miller thinks it would be good to say... the professional plan and the evaluations shall be forwarded to academic affairs. Miller does not think there should be any evaluations without the professional plan being side by side with it in a faculty member’s file. Lastly, why are we putting the college review prior to the dean? This seems to be setting up a hierarchy. The current process is that the college review happens parallel to the dean’s. It is almost like they are independent reviews.

Casten said that regarding the remarks about the SIF and the evidence and the notebooks, we need evidence. In past years we had indexes with notebook tabs that were easy to use. Casten said that the notebook has gotten unruly and for us as the reviewers it’s too much paper and if the person being reviewed is disorganized it’s a problem. The other thing that is very important is that the timeline of the college review was very unfair for both the person under review and those on the college review committee. We have to wait until the dean’s letter is sent. They are not parallel and the dean’s letter is sent first before we are allowed to review. We had maybe 2 weeks before vacation, and we are entitled to our vacation. The date for the college committee letters to be due was January 11. Most of us were gone. So we basically had 2 weeks to give a fair review to junior faculty when we are also grading term papers, grading finals, grading projects, it really was a disadvantage for both groups. This really needs to be revised and Casten requested they work with faculty who have served on college committees for feedback.

Vanterpool echoed Whetmore’s comments. This was long coming. Vanterpool wanted to take issue with Cauthen’s comments earlier. Vanterpool believes that what he said is a substantive matter. It is not a moot issue and Vanterpool stands on that very strongly.

White wanted to address the first sentence in the document; The intention is not to make a 3 year or 4 year commitment. There is modifying language for example to qualify later in the paragraph that if there is a problem with the individual that the dean or department head would have the ability to request a review.

Gould does not know how extensively SIF and WPAF are spelled out in the faculty handbook. This document doesn’t give any clue about this and it has to be spelled out somewhere in the handbook. Gould can support either a 2 year or 3 year appointment but he would be uncomfortable in basing the policy recommendations on the current state of the job market.

Malamud agreed with Casten and said that the files are outrageous. He would like to see separate files such as syllabus, tests, something that we can tab through quickly. Malamud can’t stand the idea of the CD’s with the articles in them. Malamud would rather see the articles in paper format. He has a much easier time thumbing through articles than trying to find them on a CD, or finding a computer in the faculty personnel office where they don’t have computers.
Verba said that the suggestion of some kind of clause in case something really horrible happens was a good one so there is some way to address it. We hope we are hiring people who will do a good job, it’s about faith. We are trying to make their lives easier. Verba asked what we mean by brief. If we say 10 pages or less everyone is going to submit 10 pages because their job is on the line. Verba is not sure how to get it less of a burden.

Bradfield said that the CFA is looking through the documents to see if there is anything out of compliance. His first thought about it is that it looks okay. There are a couple of things in it that he sees for our unit members. Bradfield’s concern is that there is a balanced peer review process and administrative review process. Bradfield wanted to point out, and this has nothing to do with this proposal, it has to do with the practices creeping up and falling into our laps in our faculty rights meeting. The contract is specific about these peer review committees and they are not appointed they are elected by those being reviewed. If some of your committees are being assembled, appointed and anointed and there is not an election then those are grounds to go in and throw the review out. In your departments will you please elect your peer review committees and be sure these are not appointed committees. Pending review of this proposal as long as the peer review and the administrative review are equal then it’s okay.

Miller followed up on the idea of administrator and peer review being balanced. The suggestion to switch the order of college and dean then takes it out of balance. A peer review with the department level and the department chair then it went to the dean and administrative level and then back to the college which is a peer review level then up to the provost and then if necessary a university review. That provided a series of checks and balances. Miller said that her chair supported unusually meritorious in one category, her department committee supported unusually meritorious in one category, her dean went against their recommendations and gave her satisfactory, the college went against his recommendation and gave her unusually meritorious. Miller appreciated the fact that there is that check and balance. Miller said that she thinks this will cause confusion for faculty who are used to the old system.

Whetmore said that the more peer reviews prior to the administrative is a good thing.

Casten asked why the committee decided to change the order of review and White said that came from the provost’s office.

Vogel said that the further you move up the administrative chain the less you know about faculty members or their faculty research. Each peer review informs the next level. The department chair knows the faculty member the best and next is the dean, who is fairly far removed. To inform the dean appropriately the next level committee would be the college committee, another peer level committee, so that the dean is better informed about all levels of peer review. This is to better inform the next level up.

Vasquez said that this is a first reading item and Thomas Norman is still taking feedback.
Elections—Ericka Verba—Verba announced we have an election for one faculty member to serve on the Student Grade Appeals Committee. Sheela Pawar was nominated. Sheela Pawar was elected by acclamation. MSP.

Open Forum—Prado said that he was confused about a memo he received regarding the roll out of computers. Ron Bergmann said to contact him.

Adjournment—Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.