

O. Bernal, D. Czypinski, E. Drost, G. Fried-Amilivia, M. Hernandez, J. Lopez, J. Malveaux,  
A. Ravichandran, K. Schaff, E. Velazquez, A. Villa, R. Vogel

ABSENT

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:46 p.m.

Chair Bettcher began with a Tongva land acknowledgement, requested a moment of silence for the loss of lives, destruction, and suffering related to COVID-19, welcomed the body back to the new academic year, and reviewed protocols and reminders about participating in Senate meetings and iClicker cloud use.

1. 1.1 Chair Bettcher announced: We will be meeting alternate Tuesdays this AY and the dates can be found on the Academic Senate website. All Senate and Senate committees/subcommittees will meet virtually this semester. In spring 2022 we will be meeting face to face if all goes well.
- 1.2 Senator Ramos announced: I have an announcement from the California Faculty Association. We have a general membership bargaining town hall tomorrow night, September 1, 6:00-7:30 p.m. You should have received an email today with the link to make a reservation. Please join us as our labor union is bargaining and fighting to protect our contract rights and advocating for fair wages that are currently threatened by the CSU Chancellor. You can read about our bargaining demands at CFAbargaining.org.
2. Senator Hanan raised the following concern: Some staff and faculty are unable to take the vaccinations due to conditions of autoimmunity, some forms of heart disease, pre-surgery, etc., and doctors are reluctant to put this in writing – however, staff and faculty can provide a health report from the doctor about their medical condition. I have the following questions:
  1. Self-reporting: How is this to be handled by the September 30 deadline with regard to the vaccination and the medical/religious exemptions? Will self-reporting be allowed by submitting your diagnosis or how will this be done?
  2. A survey keeps repeatedly being sent to folks who have not responded about being vaccinated and one of the reasons is that there is no where to check and report that you have not had the vaccine. By default, it is saying that you have had the vaccine even if you don't qualify for it. Is this something that is being addressed?
  3. Will the vaccination mandate apply to faculty teaching exclusively online?There were no responses from the floor. Chair Bettcher advised that she will follow up.
3. Senator Riggio announced her intent to raise the following questions:

I have several related questions for the College Deans. I asked this question in February this year, and received a rather vague answer from the Provost. I am asking for specific responses to these specific questions from the College Deans, not from the Provost:

  - 1) Are faculty in your College compensated for supervision of student research, scholarly, and creative activities according to the EP&R 76-36 document enshrined in the Contract (Appendix H, page 215)?
  - 2) Is so-called "pooling" of s-factor units occurring in any Departments in your College (pooling involves all students enrolled in s-factor courses being listed on the Department Chair's or some other person's academic schedule, with someone then deciding how s-factor units are distributed to faculty)? Pooling involves using money earned by one person to compensate another person, which constitutes wage theft.
  - 3) Are faculty being encouraged, pressured, or required to voluntarily teach students enrolled in s-factor courses (e.g., 4990, 5970, 5990)? Faculty cannot volunteer for their own work as per the Fair Labor Standards Act; faculty must be compensated for teaching or supervising any student enrolled in a CSU course where that faculty person is the instructor of record.
  - 4) Are Departments in your College telling faculty that supervision of student scholarly activities is a service activity that is included in SETU units? SETU units are also defined in EP&R 76-36 as "indirect instructional activity," while supervision of student research, creative, and scholarly activities are counted in our 12 teaching units, NOT in SETU units.
  - 5) If pooling or voluntary supervision or use of SETU for supervision of student scholarly activities is occurring in your College, how will you address these exploitative practices and how will you ensure that faculty are not exploited and that the Contract is followed?
  - 6) How many 4990 (Directed Undergraduate Study) applications from students were denied

ANNOUNCEMENTS

CONCERNS FROM THE FLOOR

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

INTENT TO RAISE  
QUESTIONS (continued)

APPROVAL OF THE  
MINUTES

APPROVAL OF THE  
AGENDA

SENATE CHAIR'S  
REPORT

SUSPEND CAMPUS  
REQUIREMENT FOR  
PEER OBSERVATIONS OF  
INSTRUCTION FOR THE  
2021-22AY  
First-Reading Item

CAL STATE LA  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
RESOLUTION CALLING  
FOR THE CALPERS  
FOSSIL FUEL DIVEST-  
MENT (21-1)  
First-Reading Item

RESOLUTION ON THE  
USE OF THIRD-PARTY  
ONLINE PROCTORING  
SYSTEMS (21-2)  
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY  
MODIFICATION: PEER  
OBSERVATIONS OF  
INSTRUCTION,  
FACULTY HANDBOOK,  
CHAPTER VI (21-3)  
First-Reading Item.

ADJOURNMENT

this semester, and how many were approved? Please provide the same information for Fall 2020 and Fall 2019, if possible.  
I would also ask that the College Deans receive this IRQ in writing so they can directly answer these questions. Thank you.

4. It was m/s/p (Hanan) to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 11, 2021(ASM 20-21; ASM 21-1).
5.
  - 5.1 It was m/s/ (Abed) to approve the agenda.
  - 5.2 It was m/s/p (Riggio) to add a new item 7: Suspend Campus Requirement for Peer Observations of Instruction for the 2021-22AY and renumber the remaining items.
  - 5.3 The agenda was approved as amended.
6. Chair Bettcher presented her report and yielded the floor to President Covino who presented campus updates.
7.
  - 7.1 It was m/s/ (Hanan) to approve the recommendation.
  - 7.2 It was m/s/ (Riggio) to waive the First-Reading Item rules. No objections were raised.
  - 7.3 The recommendation was APPROVED (V: 36/5/2)
  - 7.4 It was m/s/ (Wells) to forward the recommendation to the president ahead of the approval of the minutes. No objections were raised.
8. It was m/s/ (Riggio) to approve the recommendation.
9.
  - 9.1 It was m/s/ (Riggio) to approve the recommendation.
  - 9.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
  - 9.3 It was m/s/p (Baaske) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes.
10. It was m/s/ (Hanan) to approve the recommendation.
11. It was m/s/p (Hanan) to adjourn at 3:30 p.m.