

S. Nelson

ABSENT

P. Scott-Johnson

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:50 p.m.

1. 1.1 Chair Bettcher announced: The Chancellor's Office has sent out a revision to Executive Order 1100 (General Education policy) and they are seeking feedback on this draft. You are invited to review the draft and provide feedback here: https://calstatela.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3fOGVUbdM18wVBX
Responses are due by Monday, October 26, 2020 in order to submit the collective feedback to the Chancellor's Office by their deadline date.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.2 Chair Bettcher announced on behalf of Senator Prabhu: The Educational Effectiveness Council (EEAC) has been working since last fall on creating a rubric for diversity to assist faculty teaching GE diversity courses. We would greatly appreciate your input/feedback. Please join us for any one of the three focus groups offered via Zoom. Tuesday, October 27, 10:00 – 11:00 a.m. Zoom link: <https://calstatela.zoom.us/j/8679100767>; Wednesday, October 28, 12:00 – 1:00 p.m. Zoom link: <https://calstatela.zoom.us/j/88108973093>; Thursday, October 29, 3:00 – 4:00 p.m. Zoom link: <https://calstatela.zoom.us/j/89888400444>.
If you are unable to join but would like to provide feedback, please email your feedback to Veena Prabhu vprabhu@calstatela.edu.

1.3 Chair Bettcher announced on behalf of the University Library: A friendly reminder of the Open-Access Mini-Conference: Open Educational Resources for Teaching, Learning, and Student Success. The event will be held Friday, October 23, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

2. 2.1 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Provost Alvarado to Senator Bezdecny's concern from the floor from the meeting of October 6, 2020 (ASM 20-5):
The university strives to be in compliance with labor policies and all paperwork is Processed when received in as timely a manner as possible. There are multiple involved in the processing of payment, starting with the department, college, and central Academic Affairs, before moving on to the Division of Administration and Finance. There are several issues that may result in return of documentation and delays of payment, including:
· The paperwork is incomplete or completed incorrectly;
· The start date of the assignment and the date of the deliverables do not coincide, and payment generally will not/cannot take place without completion of the scope of work;
· The faculty has exceeded the additional 25% work allowed by the CBA for the Academic year; the payment is then held until the next fiscal period when it will not exceed this threshold.
Faculty are encouraged to work closely with their department staff and College Resource Manager to submit accurate and timely document submission.

CONCERNS FROM THE FLOOR

2.2 Senator Krug raised the following concern: Departments in NSS were informed today that faculty and departments have one day to request access for campus resources including anything from software and equipment needs, access to make recordings, and anything else needed with delivering spring instruction. How can we be given one day advanced notice when the campus has had eight months to plan for this, spring is three months away from starting and when we are sitting on \$19M in federal funds that is expressly appropriated to deal with the changes in instruction that we are facing? There was no response from the floor.

2.3 Senator Hanan raised the following concern: Senator Abed and I were contacted this week by two professors about the credit/no credit option for this semester and any forthcoming information there might be regarding that. The concerns are centered on the issue of us still being in the midst of a pandemic and the ways in which students are reporting concerns. So the question is does anyone have any information about the credit/no credit option?

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS

Arash Jamehbozorg (chair of EPC) responded from the floor.

3. 3.1 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Provost Alvarado to Senator Seal's intent to raise question from the meeting of September 22, 2020 (ASM 20-3): Academic Deans are expected to deliver their programs within the College's available resources. In doing so, it requires Department Chairs to plan course offerings for subsequent semesters in consultation with the Dean's Office. This consultation will ensure that course offerings align with expected demand and available resources.
It is imperative that the schedule be planned in consideration of the historical demand and enrollments for courses. When course sections are kept on the schedule that exceed historical demand, it frequently leads to too many sections with low enrollments. Because every college's resources are limited, the Dean's office must ensure that courses that remain open serve the greatest number of students. Therefore, if courses have low enrollment, Deans make the determination using historical data that these low enrolled courses should be cancelled, allowing faculty and students adequate time to adjust. A well-planned course schedule leads to minimal disruption in the cancellation of courses.
Conversely, publishing a schedule that includes course sections that far exceed historical demand will undoubtedly lead to a slew of cancelled courses. It is essential that the course schedule be based on careful planning and consultation to ensure that course offerings match expected demand to minimize disruption to faculty and students.
Wait lists are not a true reflection of demand for additional sections before the start of the semester. Wait lists are more a reflection of students' preference for popular courses, popular professors, or popular class times that happen to be full. Wait lists do not account for the fact that there are many course sections with open seats that could accommodate students' needs. Most often a wait list is a reflection of wants versus needs.
During the initial enrollment period of the current Fall 2020 semester, students were encouraged by some departments to contact the President and Provost demanding that additional course sections be opened. Each student who contacted our office received individualized advising support. In the end, it was determined that the vast majority of students were requesting courses that were either (a) not required to make progress toward their degree objective, or (b) had other course options available to them that both met major requirements and had open seats. In some instances, students' needs were met by allowing students to enroll in existing course sections.
- 3.2 Senator Hanan announced her intent to raise the following question: What specific steps need to occur to amend the historic exclusion of lecturer representatives from serving on senate subcommittees?
Background: Chapter II Governance of the University acknowledges: "Faculty members and students have a major role in the governance of the University through the Academic Senate, which is the official representative body of the faculty.
At present, 57% of our faculty are comprised of adjunct lecturers. (collegefactual.com)
Appendix C of our Constitution of the Faculty of California State University Los Angeles defines lecturers in the following manner:
"Lecturer faculty (this includes coaches, counselors, librarians and any other faculty who are not tenured or in tenure-track positions) are members of the faculty, but can only vote in election of lecturers to serve in the Academic Senate and as otherwise specified in the Cal State LA Faculty Handbook". Thus, while lecturers constitute the majority of instructional workers that our senate represents, currently they are excluded from participating in senate subcommittees where the bulk of representing faculty interests take place.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS
(continued)

- 3.3 Senator Talcott announced her intent to raise the following questions: On September 22, 2020, Senator Porter offered her intent to raise the following questions: “Why ... has University stopped promoting student engagement through the 4990 course mechanism, “Undergraduate Directed Study”? The University accepts multimillion-dollar grants that yield millions in indirect costs and support faculty-mentored student research, credited to the student through 4990 courses; however, the University has stopped making 4990 courses generally available to all undergraduates. Compared to Fall 2019, 4990 enrollment in Fall 2020 dropped by about 40% in AL, ET, and HHS, and by 70% in NSS, bringing in particular undergraduate student research almost to a halt in many departments due to the unavailability of 4990 courses. University wide, 188 fewer students were given the opportunity to engage in high-impact experiential learning, essential for pathways to doctoral studies and career-defining opportunities. [and it continues]”
- On October 6, Chair Bettcher offered this response from Provost Alvarado, and I will quote the portion for which my intent to raise two questions applies: Provost Alvarado, I quote your response, “Academic Affairs expects each college to embed opportunities for students to develop their capacity for research and creativity across the curriculum to ensure these experiences are plentiful and equitable. In fact, there are many excellent models of this on our own campus that show how this can be accomplished in an equitable way. It is important to clarify that questions regarding curricular offerings should be directed to the appropriate Academic Dean as the Provost’s Office does not make those decisions. Academic Affairs does, however, expect for each Academic Dean to deliver its academic programs within the College’s available resources.”
1. My first question is as follows: You say that there are “many excellent models of offering undergraduate student research opportunities being offered in an equitable way.” Please precisely list these “many excellent models,” as they actually exist this term, and given the concern with equity, please offer examples of these “many excellent models” which are “plentiful and equitable” in each of the Colleges. If my question needs to be referred to each College Dean to ascertain those many excellent and plentiful examples, please do so.
 2. My second question is: Do you contest Senator Porter’s data, cited on September 22, 2020, that “Compared to Fall 2019, 4990 enrollment in Fall 2020 dropped by about 40% in AL, ET, and HHS, and by 70% in NSS.... 188 fewer students were given the opportunity to engage in high-impact experiential learning [via 4990]”? If so, please offer us the correct data reflecting the change in 4990 enrollments from Fall 2019 to Fall 2020. Thank you.
- 3.4 Senator Krug announced his intent to raise the following questions: Question #1: I am asking this question again, as the response provided did not address the question, which solely concerns faculty offices: Why are faculty not allowed to use their private offices for remote instruction, which is explicitly allowed under L.A. County Public Health guidelines, is routine on area sister campuses, and poses no apparent health or safety risk? Provost Alvarado’s response to this question was nearly identical to a prior response given to a question regarding lab reopening; those responses referenced in-person classroom instruction; RSCA guidelines for lab and studio reopening; student health and safety; and a dormitory outbreak at Long Beach. None of those are relevant to address why faculty cannot use private offices for campus internet and a quiet space while teaching online. As an equity issue, this directly impacts the quality of education we are providing to tens of thousands of students paying full tuition and fees. Question #2: In response to my question from 9/22/20 (ASM 20-3), Provost Alvarado reported that “Dr. Underwood surveyed peer campuses in the LA basin and all are at different stages of RSCA reopening, reporting anywhere from 0 to 70 PIs with approved proposals”. Please state the date by which those data were collected, and whether current data are available. Also, please present these data so the senate can ascertain how our campus compares to peer institutions.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS
(continued)

Question #3: In response to Senator Fernando's intent to raise question from the meeting of September 29, 2020 (ASM 20-4), VP Chavez stated "All the uses of the CARES Act funding will be posted on the website ... once the funds are fully spent." Per the U.S. Department of Education, "First reports [on HEERF Institution Portion, 18004(a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3)] are due to be publicly posted on an institutions' website by October 30, 2020, covering the period from the date of the first HEERF grant award through September 30, 2020." Quarterly public reporting on the same website as the student portion of the CARES act fund is also required. (A) Why was this public reporting obligation and impending deadline not shared with the Senate in response to Senator's Fernando's question?

(B) The first report on Institutional funds must be posted publicly in 10 days. Please share with the Senate the HEERF quarterly budget and expenditure reporting form detailing our CARES act funding, including the Institutional Relief Funds provided under sections 18004(a)(1), 18004(a)(2), and/or 18004(a)(3) as applicable. Please provide the Senate with additional detail on subcategories within each area if available, and any specific governmental programs or offices with oversight responsibilities.

(C) The prior response indicated that the University intends to use CARES act funds to back-fill \$12.4 million in budget cuts for the 20/21 fiscal year, but the CARES act specifies that the instructional portion of (a)(1) funds are to cover "costs associated with the significant changes to the delivery of instruction due to the coronavirus." I see \$2.83 million in (a)(2) funds allocated to Cal State L.A., suggesting the bulk of our HEERS funds are in area (a)(1). What amount of our (a)(1) funds are instructional portion?

(D) One category for reporting the use of CARES act funds to the federal government is "Providing or subsidizing the costs of highspeed internet to students or faculty to transition to an online environment." Does Cal State L.A. intend to subsidize ongoing faculty costs of providing high-speed internet while we are denied any campus access, as intended by congressional appropriators and spelled out on the reporting forms for CARES act funds?

- 3.5 Senator Riggio announced her intent to raise the following question: In an answer to Senate last week, the Provost indicated that resources determine course enrollments (apparently meaning that resources determine faculty workload). That is not accurate; faculty workload is determined by the Contract (specifically Article 20 and Appendix H, in an MOU titled "Article 20 changes"), not by resources. My question is: is Cal State LA going to honor the Contract, the agreement between the faculty and the University? Will the Provost and the President commit to honoring the CBA and stop the forced increasing of course benchmark enrollments that is currently occurring in several Colleges?

APPROVAL OF THE
MINUTES

4. It was m/s/p (Wells) to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 13, 2020 (ASM 20-6).

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

5. 5.1 It was m/s/ (Hernandez) to approve the agenda.
5.2 It was m/s/p (Talcott) to add Resolution in Opposition to CSU AB 1460 Resolution as a new item 9 under "First-Reading Items" and renumber the remaining items.
5.3 The agenda was approved as amended.

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

6. Chair Bettcher presented her report.

PROVOST'S REPORT

7. Chair Bettcher reported that the Provost did not have a report.

8. It was m/s/ (Abed) to approve the recommendation.
9. 9.1 It was m/s/ (Talcott) to approve the recommendation.
9.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
9.3 It was m/s/p (Bezdecny) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes.
10. 10.1 It was m/s/ (Warter-Perez) to delete in lines 29-35: THE FACULTY MEMBER OBSERVED MAY SUBMIT A REBUTTAL STATEMENT IN WRITING. A COPY OF THE REBUTTAL STATEMENT SHALL BE PLACED IN THE PERSONNEL ACTION FILE. THE FACULTY MEMBER OBSERVED MAY REQUEST A MEETING TO DISCUSS THE OBSERVATION REPORT WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF THE FINAL OBSERVATION REPORT. ANY REQUESTED MEETING SHALL TAKE PLACE WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS OF THAT REQUEST.
10.2 Debate ensued.
10.3 It was m/s/p (Krug) to table the debate until clarification about the CBA can be provided. (V: 50/3/1)
10.4 Senator's Riggio and Talcott will consult with the AVP for Faculty Affairs and the contract. The item will continue as a Second-Reading Item.
11. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 40/2/8)
12. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 43/2/8)
13. 13.1 It was m/s/ (Baaske) to insert in line 19: IF STUDENTS IN THE MAJOR ARE PERMITTED TO EARN THE MINOR after "units."
13.2 Debate ensued and the Baaske motion failed. (V: 12/27/7)
13.3 The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 34/6/6)
- PROPOSE POLICY DELETION: ENTRY LEVEL PROFICIENCY IN MATH AND ENGLISH POLICY, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (20-11)
First-Reading Item
- CSU AB1460 RESOLUTION
First-Reading Item
- PROPOS D POLICY MODIFICATION: PEER OBSERVATION OF INSTRUCTION, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (19-18)
Second-Reading Item
- PROPOSED NEW POLICY: TIMELY PROGRESS TO DEGREE COMPLETION FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES – MILESTONES AND ADVISING GUIDELINES, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (19-19)
Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President
- PROPOSED POLICY DELETION: TIMING OF UNDERGRADUATE ADVISEMENT, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (19-20)
Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President
- PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: POLICY ON CHANGING A MAJOR OR DECLARING A DUAL MAJOR OR A MINOR, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (19-21)
Second-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY DELETION: THE STUDENT EDUCATIONAL EQUITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER 11 (20-1)
Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

14. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 39/4/5)

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: EVALUATION OF PERMANENT INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (20-2)
Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

15. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 42/2/6)

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FOR 2020-21AY (20-5)
Second-Reading Item

16. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 43/5/2)

PROPOSED POLICY DELETION: CHARACTERISTICS OF MASTER'S DEGREES POLICY, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (20-6)
Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

17. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 46/3/2)

PROPOSED POLICY DELETION: CHARACTERISTICS OF BACHELOR'S DEGREES POLICY, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (20-7)
Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

18. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 48/1/2)

ADJOURNMENT

19. It was m/s/p (Baaske) to adjourn at 3:44 p.m.