

O. Bernal, L. Fu, J. Garrison, T. Gershberg, M. Hernandez, J. Lopez, C. Ney, L. Ramos, A. Ravichandran, C. Restrepo, E. Velazquez, A. Villa

ABSENT

A. Avramchuk, A. Dobry, M. Talcott

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Chair Bettcher began with a Tongva land acknowledgement and reviewed protocols and reminders about participating in Senate meetings and iClicker cloud use.

1. 1.1 Chair Bettcher (re) announced: President Covino approved the following recommendations:
Recommendation for optional “Peer Observations of Instruction for the 2021/22AY” New Policy: Faculty Teaching and Supervision Records, Faculty Handbook, Chapter VI – effective immediately
Policy Modification: Personnel Accomplishments Report (PAR), Faculty Handbook, Chapter VI – effective immediately
Policy Modification: Preferred Name Policy, Faculty Handbook, Chapter V – effective immediately

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Faculty Handbook and Senate website has been updated to reflect these changes.

- 1.2 Chair Bettcher announced: Please “Save the Date(s)”. As you know we have two awardees for the President’s Distinguished Professor award this year and they will present their lectures on November 2 and November 30. They will be held during the same time that the Academic Senate meets.

2. 2.1 Chair Bettcher responded to additional concerns raised by Senator Hanan from the meeting of August 31, 2021 (ASM 21-2) that were not answered previously.

CONCERNS FROM THE FLOOR

- 2.2 Senator Baaske raised the following concern: It is my understanding that effective next week, academic staff must report to work five days per week. Some staff have been working remotely very effectively for many months. Their supervisors know whether or not this is the case. We are still in a pandemic. Some staff have young, unvaccinated children who are put at heightened risk if the staff member is forced to come to campus during the fall semester.

There are very few students and faculty on campus. The needs of students and faculty are being met and have been met since the semester began some six weeks ago. Couldn’t academic supervisors and staff be given the discretion to decide what constitutes a reasonable presence on-campus? I am thinking specifically of department chairs and their department staff. The Dean’s Office could require that each department submit a plan if the department desires to do something other than 100% attendance. Then the Dean’s Office could monitor the departments. The Dean’s Office knows if the department staff member is not getting the department work done prior to deadlines and could be a second level of review.

Alternatively, couldn’t the University say, “as long as the work is getting done” a departmental staff member need only come to campus twice or three-times per week? Then hold the supervisors accountable for ensuring that the work is done?

Finally, the CSU and the CSUEU have come to an agreement that permits each campus to “opt in” to a telecommuting program. So, some variant other than 100% attendance is permitted. Is that being considered for our campus?

There are many worried academic staff members. Their needs should be fully considered. Staff are some of the least well-paid individuals on our campus and truly represent our campus community. I think social justice demands that their needs to be taken into consideration.

There was no response from the floor. Chair Bettcher advised that she will follow up.

3. 3.1 Chair Bettcher reported an update on the two outstanding Intent to Raise Questions from previous meetings.

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS (continued)

3.2 Senator Krug announced his intent to raise the following questions:
University Auxiliary Services (UAS) manages faculty extramural research funding for our campus, and takes up to 46% of grants as indirect cost (IDC) recovery. Most institutions return some IDC to the college, department and grant PI. However, as Provost Mahoney reported, UAS retains most of our IDC to pay the lease on the Golden Eagle building (~\$1.7 million/year). Colleges now claim insufficient funds to allow undergraduates to register for independent research through credit-earning courses, which IDC and other revenue should cover. Meanwhile, scholarship of faculty and students is crippled by inadequate pre- and post-award services by UAS, highlighting the need for oversight and accountability.
The rules of corporate governance of UAS (<https://www.calstatela.edu/uas/corporate-governance>) state a 17-member Board of Directors shall be appointed, of which there shall be three faculty directors, three student directors, and three community directors as voting members. The University website lists only 12 Board members (four no longer at Cal State L.A.), and only two faculty, one student and one community director (<https://www.calstatela.edu/uas/uas-board-directors>). Only two (Dec 2020) or three (Mar, May 2019) of the nine required faculty, student and community directors were present as voting members at recent Board meetings.

Please answer each of the following or the IRQ will have to be re-submitted:

1: What is the **current make-up** of the UAS Board of Directors?

2: When was the **last time** the UAS Board had three directors representing each of these key stakeholder groups: faculty, students, and community?

3: Why are members of some stakeholder groups listed as “**ex officio**” (non-voting) in recent Board meeting minutes, when they could be serving as designees with voting rights or approved to Director positions?

4: What is the University’s **plan and timeline** to appoint the required representatives of these stakeholder groups to ensure oversight and accountability for UAS?

5: Board meetings are open to the public. When is the next Board meeting, how will it be announced, and how can interested campus and community stakeholders attend?

APPROVAL OF THE
MINUTES

4. It was m/s/p (Riggio) to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 14, 2021 (ASM 21-3).

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

5. It was m/s/p (Riggio) to approve the agenda.

SENATE CHAIR’S
REPORT

6. Chair Bettcher presented her report.

SUPPORT OF FLEXIBILITY
FOR FACULTY AND
STUDENTS IN MODE OF
INSTRUCTION FOR SPRING,
2022 (21-4)

7. 7.1 It was m/s/ (Flores) to approve the recommendation.

7.2 It was m/s/ (Riggio) to waive the First-Reading Item rules. Chair Bettcher advised the body of the policy related to waiving this rule.

7.3 Debate ensued. The Riggio motion passed (V: 38/4/1).

First-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

7.4 It was m/s/ (Riggio) to modify the request as follows: To formally request that SCHEDULING AT Cal State LA FOR SPRING 2022 ALLOW VIRTUAL/ REMOTE INSTRUCTION BY REQUEST FROM FACULTY; AND THAT CAL STATE LA faculty have BE GIVEN the flexibility to change to face-to-face

instruction to remote/virtual instruction as needed in Spring, 2022.

SUPPORT OF FLEXIBILITY
FOR FACULTY AND
STUDENTS IN MODE OF
INSTRUCTION FOR
SPRING, 2022 (21-4)
(continued)

- 7.5 Debate ensued. It was m/s/ (Hanan) to amend the Riggio motion to insert WHEN COVID-19 CONCERNS ARE PRESENT, before “SCHEDULING”.
- 7.6 Debate ensued. The Hanan motion failed (V: 16/24/5).
- 7.7 The Riggio motion passed (V: 36/4/2).
- 7.8 Debate ensued. It was m/s/p (Warter-Perez) to insert IN CONSULTATION WITH THEIR DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR PROGRAM DIRECTOR after “faculty”. (V: 34/7/2)
- 7.9 The recommendation was APPROVED (V: 33/4/2).
- 7.10 It was m/s/ (Hanan) to forward the recommendation 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.
10. It was m/s/p (Nelson) to adjourn at 3:31 p.m.

PROPOSED POLICY
MODIFICATION:
EVALUATION OF
PERMANENT
INSTRUCTIONAL
FACULTY, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI
(21-5)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED NEW POLICY:
WORKLOAD OF
PERMANENT
INSTRUCTIONAL
FACULTY, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI
(21-6)
First-Reading Item

ADJOURNMENT