
Voting Members Not Present: Carvalho, Claybrook, Dellacioppa, Ernst, Ferris, Fitzsimmons, Graham, Han, Jenkins, Kalayjian, Kravchak, Leonard, Moore, Murrey, Navarrete, Oesterheld, and Rodriguez.

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Bersi, Bradfield, Bradfield, Furusa, Gordon, Joshi, Maki, Manriquez, Parham, Rodriguez, Wilkins


Guests: Richard Malamud, Laura Robles, Ben Zhou.

2012-2013 Academic Senate Executive Committee: Jim Hill, Chair; John Davis, Vice Chair; Matt Jones, Parliamentarian; Jan Gasco, EPC Chair; Hamoud Salhi, FPC Chair; Kate Fawver and Pat Kalayjian, Statewide Senators.

Meeting Called to Order 2:30 p.m.

Approval of Agenda MSP

Approval of Minutes from 02/06/13 MSP

Action Items

- FAC 13-02 Resolution Institutionalizing Budget Transparency and Shared governance Practices at CSUDH as restored by Interim-President Willie J. Hagan (First Reading Item): Fawver moved the resolution to the floor. After her introduction, she asked for suggestions for improvement. Kaplan suggested removal of the word “honest” because it might imply “dishonesty”. Gould noted that “Willie J. Hagan” was listed 7 times in the document. He suggested that we keep it in the title and in the first sentence but then change Willie J. Hagan
to Dr. Hagan. Hagan suggested that in the title to leave out “as restored by Interim-President Willie J. Hagan”. Hagan also said that he is not sure we need the details in the first footnote. Monty said that with President Hagan’s arrival there is a new standard for what is expected. Gasco said that maybe we can leave out the money values and put in that money is being made available for faculty research etc. Gould moved that the resolution be reviewed by EPC before coming back to the senate. Fawver said that if EPC wants to look at the resolution that is fine but the resolution is a Faculty Resolution and cannot be changed to EPC resolution once it has been moved to the floor. Blackaller asked why send it to EPC? Gould said that he felt it should be reviewed by a committee rather than an individual. Fawver said she could not think of a better body of review than the university at large and the senate in particular. Fawver emphasized that the “Whereas” clauses gave the context of the “Resolved” clause which would set up budget meetings in the fall. Gould failed to receive support and withdrew his motion.

**Academic Senate Instructional Technology Committee**-Jones went over the charge with the senate. Malamud did not think having this committee was a good idea. He said that with other similar committees nothing ever gets done and why have 1 rep from each college who may or may not know anything about IT. Malamud suggested that we just send our concerns via email to the IT staff. Fawver said that she thought it was refreshing that the senate is front and center in the IT issues. We have a body that is responsible to the senate. Hagan said that shared governance is needed in big issues and IT is a big issue. It is a place where administrators and faculty and staff gather and without it you can drift away from shared governance. Gould likes that the senate is involved and at least 1 faculty from each college is good. Monty asked if we should have a staff representative. There was a motion to add 1 staff member and there was a vote. MSP with one abstention. There was a vote to approve the charge along with the addition of 1 staff representative. MSP.

**Time Certain**

2:45 p.m. President’s Report-Dr. Hagan-Hagan said that he did not report at the last meeting because he thought the discussion on College of Professional Studies was more important. He had about 4 or 5 things he wanted to go through. Hagan said that he believed that the full senate received from Gail Brooks a copy of the letter regarding the faculty equity program. Hagan said that if anyone had not received the letter he had extra copies with him. Hagan wanted to reinforce what Gail Brooks said in her letter. The presidents brought this issue to the table in our discussion with Chancellor White. We felt that this was an issue that was long overdue and we wanted to address it. Chancellor White endorsed it. Hagan said that they talked about the funds. Right now the intent is that the system would fund about 1/3 of it and the campuses would fund the remaining 2/3. For our campus it is a relatively small number 125,000 at most. This is long overdue
and Hagan felt it was very important. It is a bigger hit for the larger campuses that have a larger portion of tenure and tenure track faculty. If you have questions David Bradfield can probably answer them far better than I can.

Someone asked about the CPS given the action at the last senate meeting. Hagan did not want to do anything formally with that until we had a chance to have our meet and confer with CFA. We have our meeting scheduled for tomorrow. After those meetings tomorrow we will probably move forward with separating the two colleges. Hagan said that he did not send out a letter yet because he wanted to make sure there were no other issues that needed to be taken care of first. Hagan said that the main searches would be for the Deans and they would occur in the fall.

Hagan said that if you see me, MaryAnn and others drive around campus in a bus and people dressed in dark suits looking like FBI agents (which we did last week), these are developers and one of the things we are looking at is are there ways we can begin to execute the vision of our campus facilities master plan and leverage that to help and benefit the university in other ways. Hagan said that he always says “give me money or give me land”. Are there possibilities of engaging in public and private partnerships that would have the end result of letting us accomplish some of our big academic goals? For example, we probably need the new science building. LaCorte needs to be renovated and there are those who believe we need to build a new business building. We have begun a series of discussions with developers asking them to come out and give us their ideas on what could be possible. This is all preliminary, but he wanted to let us know because we already had one and will have several more visits on campus. The goal of all of this is “how can we use a new science building as an example”. It won’t happen through the state capital budget process for many years. I will be retired before that happens and many of you will be retired as well. That is simply because the state has not provided bond funds for any capital projects of any significance for the last 4 or 5 years. They usually give about $330 million dollars a year for all 23 schools. Over the last 4 or 5 years the need for renovation, seismic retrofit, those issues have gotten bigger. If we get the next round of money it is going to go to those things and there will be no new buildings. So we are several years down the line before we probably even get our building funded and when they do take care of those issues we are still not the top priority in terms of funding for new construction. The issue was “can we leverage some of the issues that this campus has in its master plan?” We have in our master plan additional student housing provided there is a need for it. We have in our master plan the desire to construct faculty and staff housing if there is a need for it. We have in our master plan the desire to construct a parking garage. There is some sense that if we built additional dorms we ought to build a dining facility to help build a stronger presence of students on campus. We wanted to find out what was possible with the developers. President Hagan showed us slides of property currently involved with the HD lease. He said that property is tied up for some time. From my perspective that is simply a public/private
partnership. Where you are utilizing private land and developers put together a plan and engage this campus in a partnership. Any set of developments that is what we are talking about. So if you go to the next slide, you’ve heard discussion about if AEG acquired the rights to an NFL team in LA that they would want to come back and negotiate with us to put NFL practice facilities on the campus, an administrative building potentially a hotel. Hagan showed the senate the space that has been discussed by them with us. This is all kind of on hold now and there has been no contact with us. Hagan has checked with the Chancellor’s office and there is no contact with AEG. I have no idea if this is going to go forward. Mary Ann Rodriguez and Hagan met with the Chancellor and some of his staff and we made it clear that there is no need or value for this campus to become an NFL practice facility. It would have to come with something that is so outrageously good for this campus that the faculty and the students would be saying “my god, take that deal!” Hagan doubts that will happen. We let them know that we would like to build a science building, we would like a minimum of 10 endowed professorships at $2 million each, we put together a fairly robust list and Chancellor Reed just sort of pushed it in front of me one day. The bottom line is if we cannot demonstrate significant academic benefit of any private public partnership then it is not in our best interest to pursue it. Hagan said that is the land that is under discussion with them. Hagan showed the last slide. He said that this property here that we have been saying to developers we are going to bring on board…. This is our student housing and our master plan called for adding additional student housing and called for adding faculty and staff housing, called for building a structured garage. The point that we made to developers is we have about $65 million dollars roughly worth of land value and that if you came in and built out those things that we have in our master plan and the land was made free which is usually one of the biggest things a developer has to acquire you should be able to build that and either build our science building while you are out there building or spin off enough money that you can give to us to amortize debt if we built it ourselves or you could build it cheaply enough and rent it to us at a low enough rate that would be easily affordable. These are the kinds of discussions we are talking to developers about. There is no guarantee any of this would come about but there are people who are doing these things around the country and there are people very interested about having these kinds of conversations with us because there is not a lot of land. A developer who builds faculty, staff and student housing, most of them only need to get 5 to 7 percent rate of return. That would be a great investment for anybody. They would sell that to the back debt market and then they would move on. It’s possible that there may be some win win scenarios out there for us and maybe there aren’t. All we are doing right now is inviting developers in to say “this is what we have here”. At the end of the day we would have to discuss any decisions and then it would have to go back to the Chancellors office for approval. Hagan said that on a monetary level he is convinced that the state is only going to get DH so far. If we want to get further we have to take some steps on our own. We have a lot of land that is not being utilized.
We are hoping to sign next month a memorandum of understanding with the federal office of personnel management jointly between us and Cal State Fullerton. It will be for what we call Careers and Public Service Initiative. Hagan said that he mentioned several meetings ago that we were trying to put together a pilot program with the federal government so that all the agencies around here would provide opportunities for DH students to have paid or unpaid internships, job shadowing opportunities, training or whatever. We have reached the point where we are ready to sign that agreement with them. It is being coordinated through the careers program and it would involve the federal government and lots of federal agencies in the Orange County and Los Angeles area. It would involve them bringing a job fair here with federal job opportunities for our students to explore. It would involve them setting up partnerships. It would involve training and mentoring. It gets back to conversations we have had early about student success. It gives us more ways to help our students and the Feds have a number of opportunities in the area. Plus there will be additional things for students like workshops on resume writing, business etiquette etc.

We have a program set up with Northrup Grumman and it is called Toro’s Internship Program. They want to set up a series of internship programs for our students also. Because of budget constraints they could not set up the full blown program. They are setting up a series of workshops about 9 to 12 workshops that will be offered 1 per month for DH students. What will happen is that Northrup Gruman and HR people and some of our own folks will have different workshops. We will bus students to their headquarters and there will be a lunch and they will provide the speakers and so forth. The workshops will be on what employers are looking for; they will have mock interviews, resume writing workshops. Northrup Gruman staff will let our students practice interviewing with them. They will do presentations on presentation skills, how to project confidence, public speaking when you are interviewing. Their engineering folks are going to do a workshop on engineering and computer technology in the real world. Northrup Grumman is looking for leadership. They are going to do a workshop on “I have my degree”.

Chancellor White met with the presidents. This was the first meeting where he was running it with the presidents all together. White feels that the CSU is doing a lot of great things but we are not telling our story as well as we should particularly to the legislature and others. We need to find a way to really get out there and find a way to get ahead of the conversation with some of the folks that are out there. He will run the president’s council by sending out preliminary agendas to us in advance of the meetings. He encouraged us to share the draft agenda with cabinet and the senate, and to ask if you see any item on the agenda that you think I should have information on--you should ask and get that to me. Knowing what the campus thinks helps when I am in these meetings. Chancellor White is putting together a presidential taskforce to look at how budgets are done in the CSU. This is an important thing for Hagan and he wants to try and get on this taskforce. We fund primarily through enrollments and there is a general sense that enrollments don’t
necessarily encourage innovation. He feels that on any one issue each campus is different. That one campus should improve access for growth, for another campus they may need to reduce time to degree. Each campus should have the opportunity to determine which direction fits them, and then make that presentation as opposed to getting a budget where one size fits all. Hagan thinks this is important and thinks that DH has a mission that is sometimes different from the others. As someone said we educate some of the most expensive students with the least amount of money. Chancellor White did not say this (I’m putting words in his mouth perhaps) but in Hagan’s conversations with him they talked a lot about DH and the success we have in getting our students to succeed and do well. The resource allocation factor does not take that uniqueness into account. In Hagan’s conversation with Chancellor White, UCR where White came from was the DH of the UC system. He really understood the points that Hagan was making about this campus and our students and our ability to provide an education as good as anyone. The funding models need to take into account the uniqueness of the campuses.

Chancellor White asked for a list of goals and why you think they are important, no more than 2 pages.

1. Time to Degree
2. Increase the number of tenure and tenure track faculty
3. Improve technology infrastructure
4. Improve key campus facilities with initial focus on the sciences
5. Implement additional revenue enhancement strategies
6. Improve external/internal communication
7. Eliminate reliance of interim positions at the senior management level.

**Reports**

**Senate Chair’s Report-Jim Hill**

- Campus senate chairs met last Thursday (*Long version; I will abbreviate in report, but enter all for minutes.*)
  - ASCSU chair report:
    - See "call for service" in the "Faculty to faculty Newsletter." Statewide is looking for people involved with Open Educational Resources. Assign time is part of this.
    - ASCSU has a task force to study MOOCs. It has 6 "providers," 6 senators, and two students.
    - A 'larger theme' that ASCSU has been wrestling with is the CSU identity crisis; are we a system or 23 independent campuses? "Advocacy will be critical."
  - CSO update:
Webinars! Of interest to those who might run a CSO course or want to learn more about the system. Next is March 7th (Th), 2pm. Document with link can be distributed separately.

Pearson HE contracts another company (Inside Track) for marketing. They gather a LOT of data per student which should help not only marketing, but also academic understanding of who the CSO audience is.

Finally a real "business plan" is emerging. There have been some issues regarding the metrics in common use: faculty are used to dealing with FTES, which companies (and some CSO people) generally deal with "seats."

The presenter (Jodie Ullman from San Bernadino) is gaining confidence that CSO is finally really becoming a "set of services."

SJSU & Udacity, an experiment...

Neither part of, nor (they claim) competing with CSO.

Came together really quickly; uses existing courses with only a "mode change."

Developmental math, College Algebra, Introductory Statistics.

These courses are advertised on Udacity's front page.

Udacity wants data to understand this process better; SJSU wants to see if it can work for them.

Cost is low, $150 per course, and includes tutoring & credit. [Q: Is this an introductory price, or the real final price; A: The whole thing is an experiment, therefor temporary.]

"Delivery" is not solely by their regular faculty.

Note: We articulate with the stats course in this set of offerings.

120 units (presented by Russ Mills of Chico)

He notes a "change of tone" from the CO and some campus autonomy.

Engineering programs are a special issue.

He proposes that resolutions be adopted to get engineering onto the list of exempt programs (like BFA & BMA)

CSUS has asked for a "partial extension" of the timeline; SJSU has temporarily suspended some GE requirements for some majors!

ASCSU has a resolution asking for more data.

One datum: (Systemwide) graduation rates rose during the same period when the total number of high unit majors rose.

EO 1083 (Mandatory reporting of child abuse)

a lot of history and context from the CO people charged with getting this together.
• Relation to "Penn State incident"...
• This EO is a conservative approach to implementation of an updated law.
• Yes, there are lots of grey areas. Training should be available imminently.
• I would like to raise the topic of our campus having no "Outstanding Professor" for two years in a row now. Perhaps Senate might suggest some ways for the Faculty Leaves & Honors committee to improve this process, or appoint a small body (task force?) to look at this.
• Online PTEs: Chris Manriquez talked to exec last week about ideas for boosting the response rates for online PTEs. In short, he has real ideas.
  ◦ A pop-up as a "front-end" to PeopleSoft could be installed without the long and winding road of review through LB and to the company.
  ◦ "Reasonably timed" and reasonably frequent reminders to students to do them could be tuned.
  ◦ Some disaggregated data on response rates has voluntarily been shared with him so that he can understand the problem better.

Parliamentarian Report-Matt Jones-We have six elections today:
Search Committee for Director, Academic Technology (Admin III)-Wei Ma (Library) and George Jennings (Math) were nominated and elected. MSP
Search Committee Project Manager (Admin III) Vivian Price (IDS/Pace) and Jim Hill (Physics) were nominated and elected. MSP.
Search Committee CMS enterprise applications (Admin III)-Wai Yan Pong (Math) and Leena Furtado (Graduate Ed) were nominated and elected. MSP.
Symposium on Student Success-Irene Osisioma (Teacher Ed) and Caroline Bordinaro (Library) and Angel Pu (Chemistry) were nominated and elected. MSP.
Search Committee Extended Education and International Education-Ann S. Choi (IDS/Pace) Carol Dales (Library), Ivonne Heinze-Balcazar (Mod Lang), Pam Krochalk (Health Sci), Laura Talamante (History) were nominated and Pam Krochalk was elected. MSP.
Search Committee of Facilities Planning (Admin III)-Ann Choi (IDS/Pace) was nominated and elected. We need 1 more faculty to serve.

EPC Chair-Janine Gasco-Gasco reported that she does not have anything new to report since last meeting. We are having a meeting to get rolling the revisions for the online guidelines for the campus. We are meeting Tuesday morning at 8:30 a.m. Fawver asked if there was any news on the FTEs being returned to the departments. Gasco said nothing new but that it is plodding along trying to iron out the issues on confrontation and how they get recorded. There are IT issues and there are a couple of other issues that still need work. Maki said that we do have a plan that will be forthcoming and hopefully we will address everyone’s concern.
FPC Chair-Hamoud Salhi-No Report, his committee will be meeting on Monday at 1:00 p.m.

CFA-David Bradfield-Bradfield said that the union met with Dr. Hagan and discussed the year 2 equity issue.

Open Forum-Fawver asked EPC to pay attention to the MOOC model and in particular the issue concerning intercampus reciprocity.

Adjournment