

B. Cerqueira, C. Chatterjee, G. Fried-Amilivia, A. Khodayari, R. Vogel

ABSENT

L. Essig, M. Talcott

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:47 p.m.

Chair Bettcher began with a Tongva land acknowledgement, expressed condolences on the passing of Tongva Elder Ms. Julia Bogany, and reviewed the protocols for participating in Senate meetings and iCloud clicker use.

1. 1.1 Chair's announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1.1 I would like to share the following election results and congratulate our colleagues:
Academic Senate CSU – one seat, term ending Spring 2024: Kris Bezdecny, Geosciences and Environment
Intercollegiate Athletics Board – one male member, term ending Spring 2025: Stefan Keslacy, Kinesiology and Nutritional Science
University Academic Appeals Board – one member-at-large, term ending Spring 2023: Heidi Riggio, Psychology.

Additionally, elections for two positions for Senator-at-large seats will begin this evening and close on April 20.

1.1.2 There is a possibility that we will need to add an additional Senate meeting due to the amount of business we currently have. If we do, the meeting will be on Tuesday, May 4th and we will notify you as soon as possible.

2. 2.1 Senator Esparza raised the following concern: I would like to move to rescind the IRQ I raised dated February 2, 2021. The motion was seconded.
The Chair consulted with the Parliamentarian regarding the motion.
The Chair refused to take the motion at the present time due to lack of sufficient parliamentary information and advised that the Executive Committee would discuss this at their next meeting.

CONCERNS FROM THE FLOOR

2.2 Senator Krug raised the following concerns: There was an announcement today about undergraduate students being allowed to be included in revised applications for returning to campus for Research and Creative activities and there were points that were confusing to faculty: 1. This concerns only undergraduates, but the University hasn't clearly indicated whether all first-year graduate students can be included in the re-opening plan. 2. This new process states that faculty can request additional personnel up to EH&S space limitations in our research labs and studio spaces. We have not been given the information on what those space limitations are so we are unable to determine the capacity. 3. In the document sent today, it states undergraduates can work up to 20 hours per week, but in my college, our rooms have been capped at 15 hours per week. We do not know how to reconcile those hours.
Jeffrey Underwood, Associate Vice President for Research, responded from the floor.

2.3 Senator Ramos raised the following concern: I'm noticing a pattern in administration and a way that they are divvying up labor. I would like there to be transparency, and perhaps presentations, by these administrators about how they will do two herculean spaces of work and do them effectively. I am very concerned about the administrative strategy in labor.
Chair Bettcher advised that she will follow up on the concern.

2.4 Senator Porter raised the following concern: Regarding the protocols for research on campus, it stated that we can swap students, but not add students. My concern is that we primarily have second-year graduate students in our research labs who must stay in the lab. Can we add undergraduate students until we reach our limit for capacity?
Jeffrey Underwood, Associate Vice President for Research, responded from the floor.

CONCERNS FROM THE
FLOOR
(continued)

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS

- 2.5 Senator Hanan raised the following concern: I would like to thank President Covino for attending today and wanted to know if he would be taking questions after this presentation.
Chair Bettcher responded from the floor.
- 2.6 Senator Esparza raised the following concern: I wish to appeal the chair's ruling (item 2.1) on the motion to rescind the IRQ dated February 2, 2021 so the body can hear both sides of the discussion. The motion was seconded.
The Esparza motion failed. (V: 12/35/4)
3. 3.1 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Margaret Garcia, Executive Director, Enrollment Services to Senator Cristian Flores' intent to raise question from the meeting of March 16, 2021 (ASM 20-16):
Funding for all students was allocated based strictly on need and the number of units in which students were enrolled, regardless of level. However, as Senator Flores has indicated, the website refers to academic load (full-time, three-quarter time, and half-time) rather than number of units. For this reason, we have identified those graduate students who would have received more funds based on this distinction and will disburse those funds this week. Thank you, Senator Flores for your close attention to this issue on behalf of graduate students.
- 3.2 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Michelle Hawley, AVP and Dean of UGS and Karin Elliott-Brown, AVP and Dean of GS to Senator Bezdecny's intent to raise question from the meeting of March 16, 2021 (ASM 20-16):
COVID-19 has created exceptional circumstances for students who had planned to establish residency during the prior year. Non-resident tuition fee waivers are available to a limited number of students. While there is no "funding source" for non-resident fee waivers, as the university forgoes the fees by reducing tuition, the University will be increasing the number of fee waivers for this review cycle; all qualified applicants that would have been able to establish residency, that met the stated criteria, and that were recommended by the colleges will receive fee waivers.
- 3.3 Chair Bettcher provided the following responses from Lisa Chavez, VP and CFO and Amy Bippus, Vice Provost for Planning and Budget to Senator Krug's intent to raise questions from the meeting of March 16, 2021 (ASM 20-16):
Question 1 response: The University has now posted three required quarterly reports detailing expenditures of the institutional CARES Act funding we received, nearly \$22 million. The 2nd quarter report originally posted on 12/18/2020 indicated over \$4.2 million was spent in the "other uses" category between 9/30 and 12/18, and specified those uses as:
["Campus services for student health and safety. Campus services that were modified due to COVID-19 and to comply with State and local mandatory safer-at-home orders"](#)
This form was subsequently replaced on the website with a revision, inaccurately dated 12/18/20, which states that the \$4.2 million was instead spent on:
["Salary, benefits other costs for parking, housing campus programs modified to comply with local/state mandatory safer at home order and to reimburse for COVID related PPE"](#)
(A) Why was the original 2nd quarter form replaced with a different form providing a very different list of expenditures? Why was the replacement back-dated to 12/18/20, which was not the date this version of the form was made public? The original form was a general description of expenditures submitted that aligned with categories published by the DOE in October. However, as the Department of Education reporting guidelines were broad and continuously changing, campuses reached out to the Chancellor's Office for clarity. Following discussions with the Chancellor's Office on January 4th, and after receiving feedback from the Chancellor's Office, the form was updated to reflect, more specifically, the use of funds. The modification of the form and wording was to help bring clarity by itemizing the allocation of expenses and net losses incurred to comply with health

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS (continued)

and safety and mandatory safer-at-home orders. When updating the form, the date was mistakenly not changed.

The itemized expenses recorded on the updated form were not very different from the broad categories, however, we further delineated the expenses to reflect the use of funds. The net losses of parking and housing resulted from compliance with state and local mandatory safer-at-home orders. The purchases of PPE is categorized as expenditures for campus services for student health and safety in the Department of Education guidelines.

(B) Please clarify the actual nature of the expenditures for the \$4.2 million spent from October to December 2020. The list on the form is unintelligible, and two alternate explanations were provided to the community for a large amount of funding.

As a result of campus closure due to safer at-home orders, CARES funding was used to reimburse for the net loss of salary, benefits, and other costs to support ongoing parking and housing operations and services. For example, Parking Service's salaries and expenses needed to be paid despite a steep drop in parking fees received. Housing Services' salaries and expenses needed to be paid despite a severe drop in housing license fees received.

As a result of the public health and safety guidelines, the campus was required to incur expenditures to ensure physical safety while servicing and supporting students on campus. The CARES funding was used to reimburse the campus for these expenditures. Those expenditures included items such as plexiglass, masks, sanitizers, sanitizing foggers, and other related PPE.

(C) As stated on the form, **Institutional Portion funds may only be used "to cover any costs associated with significant changes to the delivery of instruction due to the coronavirus."** Please clarify for the Senate how these expenditures related to changes in the delivery of instruction given our sustained campus closure.

Clarification for reporting parking and housing net lost revenue to comply with safer at home.

Per the DOE guidelines, lost revenue is a permissible use of funds. Following up with the DOE, the Chancellor's office confirmed that the campuses were permitted to use (a) (1) institutional relief funds to reimburse for lost revenue.

Lost revenue resulted from expenses, including parking and housing payroll, benefits, and other expenditures, that continued despite lower revenue collection. Lost revenue was also allowed to include refunds to students or faculty/staff, such as refunds issued for housing and parking. These lost revenues were calculated to determine the appropriate amount to draw from the grant.

Clarification for expenditures to support student health and safety, per the department of education guidelines:

Purchases to ensure the physical safety of students on campus is an allowable use of a grantee's Institutional Portion of its allocation under section 18004(a) (1) of the CARES Act when these costs are new or added and needed to implement "significant changes to the delivery of instruction due to the coronavirus." This may include the reasonable costs of cleaning supplies, facility cleaning, or the purchase of items to help detect or prevent the spread of COVID-19 (e.g., thermometers, plastic barriers, or face masks). Grantees may also use these funds to make non-permanent changes to existing facilities to ensure social distancing.

This campus purchased cleaning supplies, facility cleaning equipment, thermometers, plastic barriers, and face masks. In addition, this campus incurred the following expenses for changes to ensure social distancing: purchases of plexiglass, additional signage, and modification to close off restroom stalls.

(D) The form asks that institutions "post additional documentation as appropriate" to substantiate their expenditures. Please provide such documentation to the Senate, given that conflicting reports generated uncertainty over the use of these funds.

The additional documentation to substantiate expenditures supports the comments in the updated report to itemize the purpose of the funds.

Campus services modified to comply with a mandatory stay at home orders:

Housing lost revenue: \$1,285, 987

Parking lost revenue: \$1,661,298

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS (continued)

PPE & COVID-related expenditures to comply with public and safety guidelines for servicing students: \$1,265,515.

Question 2 response: The University has spent \$22 million in institutional CARES Act funding, and received an additional \$47 million in institutional HEERF II funds. These funds were awarded to cover changes in the delivery of instruction due to COVID-19.

(A) What is the procedure for academic departments to request resources from HEERF II funds needed to return safely to in-person instruction?

(B) What is the procedure for academic departments to request resources needed to enhance remote instruction from HEERF II funds?

Academic Affair leadership, including the Provost, Office of Planning and Budget, and the College Deans, Associate Deans, and Resource Managers have been engaging with multiple standing Academic Senate committees and advisory groups (Virtual Instruction and Academic Planning Advisory Group and Resuming On-Campus Research Advisory Group) since the onset of COVID to help plan and implement instructional, RSCA, and other essential operations. We will continue to seek input to return safely to in-person instruction and enhance remote instruction. Deans have been asked to work with their departments to identify the PPE, technology, and equipment needed by faculty who are teaching in-person, and to identify specific technology or supplies needed to meet specific learning outcomes by students taking courses remotely (e.g., engineering kits, photography equipment for check-out). These requests in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 were submitted for CARES funding.

In Spring 2021, all faculty teaching in-person classes participated in a site assessment with the Office of Environmental Health and Safety to establish the maximum room capacity. Any necessary protective barriers were installed and Personal Protective Equipment was identified. College Resource Managers then coordinated with faculty teaching in-person classes to ensure that all of the required PPE was provided for their classes. For Fall 2021, all of the classroom spaces will have been inspected in advance, and PPE will be provided to faculty. In addition, Associate Deans are coordinating with EH&S to install appropriate signage, protective barriers, and hand sanitizer stations in all College office areas.

With regard to technology enhancements, CETL conducted a survey of faculty in March to assess their needs for instructional support and technology during COVID and beyond, and solicited input from Academic Information Resources Subcommittee (AIRS) and the Scheduling Working Group (SWG). Consultation will continue in these and other forums as we implement the recommendations. We will continue to gather information and solicit inputs about how we can safely and productively navigate mixed teaching and learning modalities. Faculty may share their recommendations with these committees, their department chairs, and their College leadership teams.

- 3.4 Senator Krug announced his intent to raise the following questions: The University is not waiving the fees for graduate students who need to delay graduation until summer term due to the prolonged campus closure (\$325 for UNIV 9000 + \$25 to change their graduation term). Graduate students have been charged full tuition and fees while denied access to campus resources, including research laboratories, for over a year. Students are being told to submit burdensome individual petitions for delayed graduation that will require individual approval, as if we do not understand the year-long campus closure is why students need more time to graduate. In some colleges, the RSCA reopening process took two to five months for most approvals due to administrative problems that have been falsely blamed on faculty, and approved students were still severely limited in hours of access (<15 hr/week for part of fall and spring, no access during summer or winter intercession).
- (1) The University has received over \$69 million in institutional CARES and HEERF funding to offset costs to instruction due to COVID-19. Since instruction includes mentoring and training of graduate students, **why won't our campus commit to waiving fees for all graduate students who need to extend into summer to complete their thesis research and writing?**

(2) To which administrator(s) should aggrieved students, family members, faculty mentors, and their elected representatives call and write to express their outrage over the treatment of students in our graduate programs, given the national impact of our programs in diversifying fields such as STEM, and the massive investment of taxpayer dollars in our campus available to help graduate students complete their degrees without incurring a financial penalty?

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS (continued)

4. It was m/s/p (Abed) to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 23, 3031 (ASM 20-17).

APPROVAL OF THE
MINUTES

5. 5.1 It was m/s/ (Heubach) to approve the agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

5.2 It was m/s/ (Krug) to move all of the Second-Reading Items ahead of the First-Reading Items.

5.3 Debate ensued and the Krug motion failed. (V: 15/28/7)

5.4 The agenda was approved.

6. Chair Bettcher ceded her time to President Covino. President Covino provided campus updates followed by a Q&A.

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

7. Senator Riggio provided an overview of the Statewide Senate report.

REPORT OF THE STATE-
WIDE SENATE MEETING:
MARCH 18-19, 2021

8. 8.1 It was m/s/ (Heubach) to approve the recommendation.

ASCSU RESOLUTION ON
FAIR WORKLOAD (20-24)
First-Reading Item

8.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.

9. 9.1 It was m/s/ (Nelson) to approve the recommendation.

ASI RESOLUTION ON
TRANSPARENCY AND
REFORMING UNIVERSITY
POLICE AT CAL STATE
LA (20-25)
First-Reading Item

9.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.

9.3 It was m/s/p (Bezdecny) to continue the debate and discussion period for an additional five minutes.

10. 10.1 Chair Bettcher advised the body that they would resume with the speaker's list from the last meeting.

PROPOSED NEW POLICY:
GRADING AND STUDENT
FEEDBACK, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI
(20-14)
Second-Reading Item

10.2 It was m/s/ (Hanan) to replace in line 4 ONE-THIRD OF THE WAY INTO with MIDWAY THROUGH.

10.3 Debate ensued and the Hanan motion failed. (V: 11/35/3)

10.4 It was m/s/ (Baaske) to insert in line 9 NORMALLY after "THAT".

10.5 Debate ensued and it was m/s/ (Ramos) to call the question. Objections were raised. The Ramos motion passed. (V: 44/7/1)

10.6 The Baaske motion passed. (V: 33/12/3)

10.7 It was m/s/ (Krug) to continue this as a Second-Reading Item. No objections were raised.

10.8 It was m/s/ (Bezdecny) that the body not consider any new business at its next meeting. No objections were raised.

ADJOURNMENT

11. It was m/s/p (Cristian Flores) to adjourn at 3:46 p.m.