California State University Dominguez Hills  
Academic Senate Minutes  
November 17, 2010


Voting Members Absent: Chavez, Fitzsimmons, Gasco, Hancock, Heinze-Balcazar, Katzenstein, Kulikov, and Moore.

Executive Committee Members 2010/11: Chair, Irene Vasquez; Vice Chair, Mike White; EPC Chair, Jan Gasco; FPC Chair, Thomas Norman; Parliamentarian, Ericka Verba; Statewide Senators, Pat Kalayjian and Kate Fawver.

Ex Officio Members Present: Vogel, Borrego, Rodriguez, Saks, Bergmann, Bersi, Franklin, Maki, Robles, Bragg, Zitelli for Gordon, Parham, Ortiz, Tubbs, and Bradfield.

Guests: No one signed in.

Recorder: M. Brooks

Call to Order 2:30 p.m.

Approval of Agenda MSP

Approval of Minutes from 10/20/10 and 11/03/10 MSP

Vasquez asked if we could add an enrollment report from Sue Borrego under the provost’s report. MSP. Gould said that we had another request to add an item on the women’s resource center. Pawar said that she was going to ask if we could add this item under new business. There is a student here who has asked for a sense of the senate regarding the women’s resource center. Gould asked if we could add the item under new business entitled Women’s Resource Center. MSP.

Reports

Provost’s Report-Ron Vogel-Vogel reported that the grade appeal document moved along up through the cabinet and it was noticed there was no provision for the provost to act in situations on appeals where it really hurts a student. For instance, a student may have fallen below the grade point average for being disenrolled because they fell below probation. Students would not be able to enroll in this institution. They would have to wait for SAPAC to come back in the fall. There is no provision at all for the provost to do anything in the summer.
So looking at it in the past what would have happened is this proposal would have just stayed on somebody’s desk. "Carvalho mentioned that there was a California Superior Court precedent barring administrators from arbitrarily changing grades of students without faculty approval for that specific course." Vogel urged the senate again for a policy. Vogel was not sure what to do with this. It is an issue that came up through the cabinet and Vogel does not know if it should go to the senate or the senate executive committee. Vogel said that he is not sure when you have a conflict over language in a policy how to proceed. Vogel said he had mentioned this a couple meetings ago and that he would like direction from the senate. How do we proceed when there is language from a resolution that has been established by the senate? How do we change that? Gould said that this should go back to the executive committee. If it is a minor change they could do it themselves or refer it to one of the standing committees. Whetmore said that with respect to the content that the chair of the grade appeal committee used to be available during the summer and got release time. Maybe something like this could be set up again. Malamud said that he has never understood this whole PM thing but he always thought that the presidents could do what they wanted. It didn’t have to come from us. You can change it if you don’t like what we do. Malamud is not sure why Vogel can’t just make the changes if it is just a couple of words. If it’s something major you want to change that is a different story, but if you want to make a little change just do it. You could tell us what you want to change, get our approval and then just do it. Cauthen brought up the electronic resources. He suggested that we send the changes proposed over the email and set a deadline and wait to see responses. Monty wanted to ask Vogel how many students we are talking about, how many cases. Vogel said that there were several this past summer, around 10. Vogel said that there could be more now because of the new policy on probation that is out that could raise that number. Vanterpool said that it does not seem to be a big controversy. Whetmore said that the grade appeal committee and process is a joint faculty and administration. Having served on that committee as chair your hand starts to shake when you overturn a faculty member’s grade because you are the only person on this campus including the president who is authorized to do that as the chair of the grade appeal committee. Whetmore said that he believes the chair in consultation with the provost in consultation with others would be a better choice. Whetmore said that it was important that the faculty retained control of this.

Vogel said that there was a difference between a PM and an AM. Academic affairs policies are issues that are related to academic affairs only. The PM is a broader kind of policy that deals with the entire university. This is an AAP. Vogel wants to have a process in place for circumstances such as this. Malamud suggested that if it’s minor let it come to the senate and if it is major let it go to executive committee or EPC/FPC. White suggested that the provost submit suggested language on this issue to the senate executive committee for discussion at their next meeting. Vasquez said that we have a couple of suggestions. When there is a suggested change in policy if it is minor it comes to the senate and if it is major it goes through the processes for putting forward resolutions and we have another suggestion for vetting this through the senate executive committee. Vasquez asked how we should proceed. White moved that the provost submit suggested language on this issue to the senate executive committee for discussion at their next meeting, with respect to the one issue he has raised.
Malamud asked why we are making a big deal out of this let’s just move forward Malamud said that we don’t have to go crazy on each issue. Jacobs said that we do need to have a policy in place. It may be difficult to tell if something is major or minor. Gould said that the motion on the floor will take care of this particular situation. Vasquez asked that the motion be restated: White said that the provost submits language to the senate executive committee on the issue with respect to the committee on grade changes for further discussion.  

**Enrollment Report - Sue Borrego**

Borrego said that the numbers are good. We opened for spring and have currently admitted 1686 students for spring. If we yield 600 from that it will be great. Since we got word we never really stopped recruiting, our president did not want us to turn off anything. We were quietly and softly recruiting. We opened up with transfers, upper division and lower division and new freshmen. We put about 25,000 postcards out to our community college partners. Those community college partners are providing us with their student names, their mailing lists. We have been sent 75,000 email messages to contact lists that include freshman and transfer. We are up for spring and for fall. We have two CSU’s that have more undergraduate applications than they did last year. All qualified students who did not make Fall 2010 application deadlines and applied for Fall 2011 were invited to move their applications to Spring; approximately 200 have done so already. Communication with fall applicants is also underway and we are focusing on heavy communications as the overlap of admission cycles is a bit confusing. An additional 40,000 postcards have been sent to freshman prospects for Fall 2011. Spring 2011 priority admissions is open until November 30 (we will likely continue to take applications after that date). Fall 2011-12 admissions is currently open with priority dates being October 1- November 30. Important Dates:

- November 8, 2010 to Spring 2011 Registration Begins
- April 25, 2011 to Fall 2011 Registration Begins

2011 Spring Applications-3744 total/2729 undergrad  
2011 Spring Admits – 1686 total/ 1431 undergrad. (1319 transfers)  
2011 Fall Applications-8221 total/7979 undergrad. (up 321 or 4% from last year)  
2011 Fall Admits – 3977 total/ 1646 transfers, 2325 Full Time Freshmen

Borrego said that our target is 9520. We will get marginal costs for all students this spring. "Miller stated that she understood this was why the president was encouraging us to open sections in the spring, yet a potential new section offering in her Department had been denied on the basis of being told that the Provost would not approve any overloads for spring. The Provost said that he had given no such directive and that decisions are made at the dean's level."

Maki said that full time faculty cannot be paid overload. Bradfield said that there is a 125% rule. Vogel said that the extra 25% pay must come from another source other than state budget. For instance--faculty who have grants. The extra 25% they can work must come from the grant money. Vogel said that they look at waitlists every day. We open up classes from waitlists. Right now there are only 389 students on waitlist. We project what we are having
next semester. 9520 has been our target the last 2 semesters. We create a schedule to get us to that target. The schedule can absorb 9520.

Borrego said that we are still recruiting from all the community colleges. Fawver asked Borrego about the enrollment target. She said that we are up from last year and hope to grow. What kind of penalty or alternative plan do we have if we do not make our target? Also, are we using our waitlist to recruit? Borrego said that we did go back to waitlist we have. Mary Ann Rodriguez said that there is no penalty either way. Malamud asked if the funds from summer extended ed were being brought back to stateside, since we have opened so many courses. Mary Ann Rodriguez said that if summer is paid for by extended education then the funds stay with extended education. She said that in the past when our summer has been stateside we have ended up going over and losing money. Malamud asked what we are doing with next summer, will it be stateside or extended ed? Vogel said that it is up in the air for right now. Vasquez said that maybe we can ask for a follow up report at our next meeting if the figures are available.

Chairs Report-Irene Vasquez-Vasquez reported that on Monday, November 8 the senate executive committee was asked to meet with trustee Lou Monville. A summary of the meeting is included in the packet. You can review that.

Vasquez reported that she will be convening the meeting for csu senate chairs on December 2, 2010. The 4 items of discussion are online evaluations, faculty control of curriculum, online instruction and assessment. If anybody has any thoughts on any of these topics please email them to her before December 2, 2010.

Vasquez reported that we have a status report on the Early Start Program. The report was made available to you. It was finalized last night. The five main parts of the proposal involve the use of developmental courses; a bridge program EAP; community college courses; and an intensive math program in order for this campus to fulfill the early start mandate from the chancellor’s office. The Early Start committee includes the chair of English, Helen Oesterheld, The chair of Math, John Wilkins, and two additional faculty members as well as the Chair of the Senate, the other important thing to highlight here would be the communications plan, and the last section on exceptions is underdeveloped right now and will be fleshed out once the chancellor’s office responds to the first round of proposals from Early Start. There will be a section dealing with the exceptions policy. Bradfield said that Helen Oesterheld has been in touch in the past 24 hours about this report. Bradfield realizes that this is a preliminary report but Helen has some grave concerns. There are two really big things that are glaring at Bradshaw and could have a huge impact on our students. There is no statement in here that talks about the huge challenge--Mandatory Early Start —our campus is very different from Early Start at SLO. At SLO they have about 14% that require remediation. At DH it is 91%. Mandatory Early Start is a big deal for DH. One size does not fit all and we need this report to reflect that. The other concern is the last page “we anticipated a system wide policy on exceptions and will abide by the stated policy and/or practices.” Bradfield said that this was just insufficient and did not cut it. Again, 14% are going to need it at SLO and 91% are going to need
it DH. We need to be advising the chancellor’s office about this and this report needs to reflect how different we are. Bradfield talked about Access to Equity and it is CFA, ATC, and others throughout the system. Primarily unit 3 and unit 4. That group developed 7 recommendations and the number one recommendation “exemptions must be made broadly available to students who have work, or have family responsibilities during the summer, or have health or transportation problems” Bradfield said that something like this should be included in the report. Bradfield said that he was really unhappy. Vasquez thanked Bradfield for his comments. There was an agreement on the email that Tom Giannotti would draft an introductory statement that deals with the unique challenge we face as a campus, and it wasn’t finished but we are anticipating that would be included. Vasquez said that there might be several additions. The entire faculty on the committee felt strongly about the exceptions policy. Bradfield asked Vogel if this was a draft and Vogel said that it was and there may be changes to it. Vogel said that they emailed back and forth what to add to the report and the emails started at 11:54. Vogel said that the chancellor’s office will be looking at what the policies are and not statements of our need. Vogel said that we can put the information in the report. The exceptions policy is so fraught with conflicts. There are going to be 23 different exceptions. We don’t how it is going to play out. We could decide if a student is going to come here or not. We give them an exception and there are so many things we just don’t know. There are so many avenues when we think about exceptions. We will spend weeks thinking about the process and then it goes to the chancellor’s office and winds up collecting dust. We are required to submit something by the 19th. Bradfield said that we owe the chancellor the situation here at DH. Fawver asked why this is being brought to the floor of the senate? Is this for senate approval? Or is it for senate information? If it is not for senate approval why are we having this discussion about what the chair of English says? If the chair of English isn’t sitting on this committee why isn’t he sitting on this committee? Vasquez said that the chair of English is sitting on this committee. Fawver asked if this information and not Helen Oesterheld? What is it in front of the senate for? Vasquez said that it was information sharing. The senate has requested reports on the early start process. This is the document that the committee has been working on, but it is not yet at a point where we would ask for approval. Fawver asked if it is true that the chancellor’s office is going to look at these plans and give feedback. Fawver asked why we are putting in all these different caveats about exceptions and things like that, if we are not at that stage yet. Vogel said that there have been many drafts and there are many holes like articulation, and exceptions and what they are looking for specifically. Vasquez said that after attending the statewide meeting the instructions have changed a couple of times. Pawar asked if this document will be submitted to the senate for our approval in the future. Vasquez said that she did not know. Pawar talked about the second paragraph where it said an exception plan is included and at the very least she doesn’t see on the last page what it says about exception. Bradfield said that he is concerned that there is a rush to get this through and it is important to not come up with something bad. He is also concerned that it might appear that the document is representative of the senate when it is not. Vasquez said that she would take the comments back to the committee. The comments have been included in the minutes. We will make sure to include that it was shared but not indorsed by the senate.
Vice Chair’s Report and Charge-Michael White-White reported that the vice chair’s charge was included in the packet of materials. There is no action, this is strictly information.

FPC Chair-Thomas Norman-Norman reported on the draft he provided on the RTP proposal. He asked the senators to please review and give him any feedback via email. Norman reported that the Faculty Policy Committee would be meeting at 9:00 a.m. 11/18/10 in WH A420. A copy of the draft is at the end of the minutes. Vogel said that there would be no changes in process for WPAF the only change would be the number of reviews and who reviews and how the letters should be written. Bradfield asked if the document could be posted on line and Norman said yes.

EPC Report-Janine Gasco-There was no EPC report.

Statewide Senate Report-Pat Kalayjian-Kalayjian reported A Brief Report from Statewide Academic Affairs Committee

COLD

We had a visit from Alice Kawakami (CSULA), representing COLD, the Council of Library Directors; Ms Kawakami came to seek support for increased funding for our system libraries. Members of COLD are concerned that people think that libraries as brick and mortar facilities are no longer necessary and that internet access to academic data bases is free. Some of the points she brought to our attention include

- Inter-library loans have a hidden cost of about $17 per request
- Average data base cost is $30,000 and rising
- Number of library visits is going up
- Group study areas are gaining in popularity
- Libraries provide safe zones for students
- Needs are not for specific but general support

SB 1440 Implementation

Our chair, Andrea Boyle of CSUSF, reported on the progress of the SB 1440 (Student Transfer Reform Act) implementation committee, to which she is a CSU representative. This committee is working to review and clarify the bill’s provisions as well as to begin implementing it. As you know, the intention of this state senate bill is to make transfer easier from California Community Colleges to the CSU by creating lower division majors of 18 units that will fulfill the lower division major requirements at the CSU.

There are two approaches to this: one is to have each of the 122 community colleges in the state make individual agreements with each of the 23 CSUs for each major. I’ll leave the mathematics of that option to you. The other approach is to create model curricula for each major; this will be accomplished by the CCCs working in collaboration with the CSUs, using
earlier efforts by these two systems, including something called C-ID (Course Identification Numbers System). So far, the group has developed six transfer model curriculum degrees that await feedback from the appropriate disciplines. If you are in Sociology, Communication Studies, Psychology, Geology, Math or Criminal Justice, I urge you to go online to http://www.c-id.net/ to provide your comments.

If you are interested in serving on an advisory committee for your discipline, please let me know. I did forward a couple of names of people who already expressed an interest, but I can forward more.

Unfinished Business:
Second Reading Item-Exec 10-13-Sense of the Senate Resolution on Shared Governance in Allocating Restored Funding and in Future Planning for the Academic Affairs Division.
Kalayjian went over the resolution and she indicated that it has a new title. Kaplan said that he does not see a problem but that it is very optimistic. Vasquez asked for a sense of the senate and all were in favor. MSP.

New Business:
First Reading Item FAC 10-15-Resolution on Emeritus Status-Gould went over the resolution. Gould said that the first draft of this resolution was circulated to the executive committee of the emeritus association. There were several more drafts and it was improved considerably. The committee never took a formal vote on it, but the majority of the executive committee said yes, fine, go ahead with it. Since this has gone to press he has had some comments from outside the EFA and will incorporate some changes into the document you have. The first whereas clause begins, “there has recently been a painful misunderstanding.” Gould said that this sounds judgmental and is not specific to explain what is going on. Gould substituted “whereas there has been a denial of emeritus status which has been reversed’ this is specific and non judgmental without going into too much detail. Item number 3 is newly added and specifically addresses the event that we are no longer calling a painful misunderstanding which was the denial of emeritus status. Number 3 says that participation in FERP shall in no way hinder or delay the award of Emeritus status. The next change number 4, all recommendations etc. --talking about the responsibilities of the faculty leaves and honors committee--it adds the clause that says “an appeals committee for negative recommendation from a department.” This is something that the EFA recommended years ago when this policy was first adopted. We felt at the time that even though denial of emeritus status is extremely rare there should be some process for a possible appeal, and it should go to a faculty group rather than an administrator and we thought that the Leaves and Honors would be the appropriate place for this to go. This scenario occurs rarely and there is no point in going through a big procedure for it, and we don’t want to suggest to anybody that this is something that comes up often. We want to include this as a possible responsibility of the Leaves and Honors Committee. In number 5 Gould received an objection to the part that says “his (or her).” This is not in accordance with the resolution the senate passed many years ago when it degenderized the faculty handbook. The language we voted to put in back then would say hers/his. Gould said that he was changing his (or hers) in number 5 to read hers/his. The main change in 5 is put in
to serve as a road block for any future administrator who might want to model the emeritus status process on. We think that this should be a faculty decision and should not be overruled by an administrator. If the administrator is going to overrule this for any reason they are going to have to explain this. We hope it will not be “I don’t like that faculty member” which Gould is sure is grievable. He also wanted to add to this resolution that it is directed to the provost and requests amendments to existing policy. So with those amendments Gould presented this for our consideration.

Fawver had a few questions. Fawver wanted to recommend to the senate and senator Gould that instead of Faculty Resolution 10-15 it be given the designation EFA 10-15 to distinguish these kinds of resolutions from Faculty Resolutions. Fawver asked if there was any plan from EFA to poll its members with regard to this resolution, and if not why not? Gould said that the answer is no and it would require a lot of beaurocracy to go through a process of polling the entire EFA. It did not go to a formal vote it went to an email consensus. There is no provision in the constitution and bylaws for a resolution on the senate floor coming from a committee other than a standing committee of the senate. There has never been such a thing as an EFA resolution.

Pawar asked about number 4. She said that if her department is recommending faculty what department would give a negative recommendation. Isn’t it the department that generates the list of faculty being put forward for Emeritus status? Gould said that normal procedure is that the department receives from somewhere notification that a certain faculty member is retired. Normally then they will recommend emeritus status during the month of the semester following retirement. Pawar then said that the department recommends but is it okay for the department to give a negative recommendation. Gould said that this is entirely up to the individual department. Gould said that in 99.99% of the cases the department says yes to Emeritus status. Gould said that he had heard that there was one faculty member who was denied emeritus status but there is no way to verify this or deny this because it is not on official record anywhere. Pawar said that if that were the case who recommended this person for Emeritus status to begin with? Gould said that a person or faculty member should be considered for Emeritus status when the department is notified of their retirement. If the department does not vote in favor of Emeritus status the rejected faculty member could appeal to the Leaves and Honors committee. Pawar then asked about number 5 again. Number 5 states “Emeritus status shall normally be granted to any eligible faculty member who receives a favorable faculty recommendation”. Pawar asked if this is a recommendation from any faculty member, or one faculty member from their department. Is this separate from the department recommendation? Gould said that it was not. He said that normally it would be a departmental recommendation and in some instances a faculty member may not be a part of a department. In these cases the recommendation would come from the Leaves and Honors committee which would take the first level approach toward recommending this person for Emeritus status. Gould said that the recommendation can only come from the department or in rare occasions from the Leaves and Honors committee. Pawar said that in number 5 it says that emeritus status will be granted to any faculty member who receives a favorable faculty recommendation. Pawar said that she might be wrong but her understanding is that Emeritus
status was not just granted to any faculty, but it was something that was given to faculty who had been exceptional. Gould said that Pawar’s impression is mistaken. White said that there is also a process in which a retiring person can request emeritus status. In those cases there are times when it can be denied by the department. Fawver said that she would like to know how senator Pawar is incorrect because that is also the impression that she received that emeritus status meant the faculty member was exceptional and that status was not automatic otherwise why would we be going through this. If it is automatic why even bother with the department. Gould said that speaking to past practice it has been the practice on this campus and other campuses as well that any faculty who has survived all the way to retirement and has behaved honorable and well on the campus should be given the title of Emeritus. Fawver said that was different from saying that Pawar was mistaken. Fawver said that Gould was not citing policy or even evidence here; Gould is citing what past practices have alluded to. Technically the handbook says that emeritus status has these criteria that should be, is it not in the handbook? Fawver said that she would like to know exactly. Gould said that he would have to look through all of his papers; he said that it does say that if faculty members have served honorably and well, the custom has been that every faculty member who reaches retirement is deemed to have served honorably and well. Fawver said “Just because they did not die?” Fawver said she was sorry but that she was trying to understand the evidence that is moving something like this. Fawver said that Gould was talking about a faculty Leaves and Honors committee--is this in their purview? To overturn a negative recommendation from a department. Gould said EFA approved that it will be in the purview of Leaves and Honors to act on appeals of a negative recommendation. Fawver said that this is not in their original charge. Gould said that this was something that the emeritus faculty association wanted to put in when this policy was adopted, but somehow it never got adopted, he said they are trying again to put this in. Gould said that you can of course move to strike this when it comes up for second reading. What we are doing here when we write “The Emeritus Faculty status shall be granted to anyone who receives a favorable faculty recommendation” is to codify what has been the practice on campus. Vasquez said that she just wanted to remind everyone that it is a first reading item. There can be some follow-up to some of the questions that have been raised and cannot be fully answered on the floor. Pawar said that she had looked up the term Emeritus and it said that it was a position of honor. That is a little bit ambiguous but Pawar did not think that it just meant anybody who retired. If just anybody gets it and the department just says yay or nay why don’t we just make it for everybody and make it automatic. Pawar said that she didn’t think this would make sense and she didn’t think it was something that was automatic. Gould said that he has the statement for the criteria on emeritus faculty status. This is article I item 3 under criteria for emeritus faculty status: A department/division estimation that the retiree has served honorably and well. This is what it currently says in the policy which is now an Academic Affairs Policy.

Verba said that she thought that our faculty that is retiring deserves our honor and she wonder if there was a minimum number of years. The answer was 10 years. Verba said that Senator Gould was a good example of how tied we are to our faculty even when they have retired, she said that we are grateful to the emeritus faculty. Fawver said that she wanted to stress that she is not talking about honor here she is talking about process. She is concerned if a department
for example, as much as we need to honor, the wishes of our retired faculty, we also need to respect and honor the wishes of our current faculty. If there is a negative recommendation from a department, why would the recommendation be overturned by someone outside the department, when the department may feel that the person retiring did not serve honorably. Fawver also said that she was not sure that she understands the participation in early retirement such as FERP and how it shall in no way shall hinder or delay the award of emeritus faculty status. Fawver said that she thought that was normal. She thought that people in FERP status could be awarded emeritus status but evidently they can’t? Gould said that yes that has been the practice on campus but the recent event occurred when the provost denied emeritus faculty status to a person on the basis that the person had FERPED and this is what he referred to as a misunderstanding, so we are simply putting this into the policy officially, so there will be no further misunderstanding on the questions of whether or not FERP faculty shall be eligible for Emeritus Status. Gould said that what the EFA had in mind under the need for an appeals process is that the decision from a department might be based on bad conduct or bad service but it is also possible that we have a situation where the department is badly split. There is a faction A and a faction B and the retired faculty member happens to be in the faction that is the minority. If this has happened there should be somebody who can view the situation and say that the department acted unfairly. Gould said that he could not give any statistics on this because it has happened so rarely if ever.

Vasquez said that she would like to include one more comment. She said that the main concerns have been put on the floor. Carvalho said that he agreed with Gould and felt that there should be a policy in place for these kinds of situations. Gould said that the senate may decide to refer this to the FPC committee with a vote. Otherwise, it will come up for a second reading. It was decided to bring it up as a second reading item.

Women’s Resource Center-Student Yvonne Golub spoke on behalf of reopening the Women’s Resource Center. She read the senate their mission statement. She said that the center would be run by students and that they were asking for the senate’s blessings and asking for a sense of the senate. She said that they would be working with student affairs. White moved that the senate blessed the women’s resource center. Verba said that she was concerned about supporting a student run center, and that it might make the university think that we don’t need to have one that is funded by the university, with faculty and administrative support as well. Verba said that she thought it was wonderful that Yvonne had this initiative but also Verba thinks that they should get more help. Verba was concerned that by us saying “go for it” that it might look like that is it and we are finished. Gould said that he would not interpret this sense of the senate in this way and Verba said to Gould “you, don’t think that I should be concerned about this?” Gould said that it did not concern him. Gould said that we should support this particular enterprise and would not speak negatively against any other possibility. Kravchak said that he agreed with Gould. He said that it was a step in the right direction. There was a vote for a sense of the senate to bless the Women’s Resource Center. MSP.
**Elections-Ericka Verba**-There was an election for a faculty member to serve on the student grade appeals committee. Miguel Dominguez was nominated. Miguel Dominguez was elected by acclamation.

Vasquez said that she wanted to clarify who asked for a report on Early Start. She said she did because the Senate had asked for status reports on Early Start. As a committee member, she asked as an early start committee member to share the report with the senate and it is part of Vasquez’s belief that everything should be shared.

**Open Forum**-Fawver said that she would like to recommend to the senate that we have an update Dean Bragg on the accreditation process for CBAPP. Bragg said that they were in correspondence with the review panel and we have been asked to go through the standards and submit in a working document of where we are in terms of process to meet those standards September 15. That will be sent to the accreditation body for review. If they approve that we will have a site visit in the spring. We are in the final stage of going through accreditation. Fawver asked how much it cost and Bragg said she did not know because it was paid for before she became the acting dean.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:26