

A. Carnevali, A. Munger, D. Krum, G. Menezes, J. Olson, L. Fu, M. Abdullah, M. Talcott, R. Vogel,
T. Tatina

ABSENT

T. Bettcher

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Avramchuk convened the meeting at 1:48 p.m.

Chair Avramchuk read the Tongva land acknowledgement.

1. 1.1 Chair's announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1.1 The President's Distinguished Professor's lecture and reception will take place on Tuesday, March 5th. Please refer to the email announcements and RSVP again if you plan to attend.

1.1.2 Welcome to Black History Month. There are numerous events being held on and off campus. Thank you to all who attend, remember, and honor!

1.1.3 Heads up for February 20, 2024: Quasi meeting of the Whole, 1:45pm on Zoom (see information and Zoom link in your email). Please inform any interested campus community members – all are welcome to attend any Senate meetings.

1.2 Senator Bezdecny announced: At the January CSU Board of Trustees meeting (Jan 31st), the Board voted to advance Title V changes that would align CSU GE breadth with the new transfer pathway, Cal-GETC as an action item in March. A reminder: Cal-GETC is the new transfer GE that merges the UC and CSU requirements for community college students looking to transfer to either system after completing their Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) or associate's degree (replacing the old IGETC). We approved this change to the transfer pattern last year; the UC and CCC boards approved the new transfer pattern last fall. The CSU board has yet to formally approve the new Cal-GETC AS Cal-GETC, as required by state law (AB 928).

The Board chose to fuse their approval of Cal-GETC (required by law) with changing CSU GE breadth to align with the transfer pattern. This means that, after the March Board meeting approving the Title V changes for Cal-GETC, our general education pattern will now be changed to mirror the new transfer pattern in time for the 2025-2026 catalog.

Those changes include: removing 3 units from Block C; removing Block E entirely from GE; and reconfiguring Blocks B1-B3 so that labs become standalone 1 unit courses, and lectures become 3 units. This will impact all baccalaureate roadmaps, and for many majors will require additional changes to their degree plan (e.g. a B1 course that adds an additional unit to the major).

We can make the decision, as a campus, to continue to require Intro to Higher Ed as a campus graduation requirement, and/or make other decisions about the 5 units at the lower-division that this removes from GE.

More to follow as more information is available, and once the final changes have been approved by the Board of Trustees in March.

1.3 Senator Ramos announced: The College of Ethnic Studies and the Association for Joteria Arts, Activism, and Scholarship is having its 2024 5th National Conference at Cal State LA on Thursday, February 15 and Friday, February 16, and in the community on Saturday, February 17. Our conference aims to provide a platform for dialogue, belonging and community building with a focus on queer and trans Latinx, Chicanx, and Indigenous scholarship art and organizing across the country. I would like to invite all faculty, staff and students.

QUESTIONS FROM THE
FLOOR

2. The following questions/concerns were raised:

- Can the loss of one seat in the Academic Senate for 2024-25 in the College of Education be reconsidered?
- How will the quasi meeting of the whole on February 20 be structured, designed, and coordinated with the work that Andre Ellis is working on? What is your plan to make sure this is a meaningful event?
- Do we have any plans to hire someone to replace Rob Yonemoto who has recently retired and worked with the CARE team? Who do we connect with if we as faculty or staff have questions about who to best connect students with?
- Can we have an updated report shared in the Academic Senate with the progress for the MLK building renovations and/or demolition?

Chair Avramchuk, Dr. Margaret Garcia, and Queen King responded from the floor to the questions raised.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS

3. 3.1 There were no new intent to raise questions.

3.2 Chair Avramchuk presented the following response from Academic Senate Executive Committee and the administration to Senator Joseph's intent to raise questions from the meeting of December 5, 2023 (ASM 23-8):
Response from the Executive Committee: The Academic Senate (Senate) and Cal State LA's administration (Administration) have distinct yet complementary roles in helping all voices to be heard on our campus. These roles stem from the responsibilities each body has, the founding basis for its existence, and the rules for its order. The core purpose of the Senate is to participate in shared governance and recommend policies to the university President. The Senate's founding and rules of order provide for each Senator's equal right to be recognized and speak on the Senate floor. That right is foundational to the Senate's existence and is necessarily unabridged, as long as the decorum is observed. No Senate officer, including the Chair, is empowered to stop a recognized Senator from speaking within the confines of rules of order. The Senate allows all members of the campus community to speak on the Senate floor by providing opportunities for their concerns or questions to be raised, either by their elected representatives or directly—should a Senator yield their time to a visitor.
Our Senate is governed by the Robert's Rules of Order to foster a deliberative process free from undue silencing. On the Senate floor, one person's speech or belief—no matter how respectfully articulated or deeply held—may be distressing to another or evoke an equally passionate dissent. As members of a representative policy-making body, we must all strive to be collegial towards, and mindful of, each other and all community members. However, the rules preventing undue silencing also protect freedom of speech in the Senate. Senators are empowered and privileged to speak on behalf of their constituents, ask clarifying questions, engage in respectful debates and participate in Senate processes, as fully as our rules allow. The choice not to speak does not equate to silencing, but if specific changes could be made to encourage participation, the Senate Executive Committee welcomes any suggestions at AcademicSenate@calstatela.edu on how to better engage all Senate members.
Any time approval of the Senate agenda is pending on the floor, a Senator can motion to include a committee-of-the-whole meeting, where certain rules of order are suspended, and issues can be discussed with fewer constraints. When in session, committee-of-the-whole meetings do not require or assume preparation but are intended to foster the exchange of views and ideas. There was no committee-of-the-whole meeting on November 7, 2023. Most comments unrelated to policy debates in the 11/7/23 meeting were made during the Announcements and Questions-From-The-Floor agenda items, when Senators are free to rise and speak when recognized; such remarks are not reviewed in advance by Senate staff. We rely on Senators to observe the rules of order, be cognizant of decorum, and speak respectfully and with care for each other at all times.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS (continued)

The Senate provides a forum for all voices in our academic community to be heard, while the Administration is responsible for ensuring everyone can safely learn, work and express themselves on campus. To that end, the Interim Provost—at the invitation of the Senate Chair during the November 7, 2023, Senate meeting—described several venues the Administration provided for our campus community members to come together and express themselves in the increased safety of professionally facilitated discussions. Some of these venues were virtual and some in person, to accommodate more people who wished to participate in a preferred communication modality. These and other efforts will continue to provide opportunities for the campus community to address some of the concerns raised in this IRQ and are intended to put our campus on a sustainable path of dialog, mutual respect and compassion.

Response from the Administration:

As mentioned in the recent message from the Provost, as an academic institution we value free speech and academic freedom, while also condemning in the strongest terms all forms of hatred, bigotry and violence. Last fall, the university community received a message sharing [resources](#) for faculty, staff, and students experiencing challenging times, and we are working to create a companion resource on the DEIB website to provide a framework for difficult conversations with resources on freedom of speech, academic freedom, campus policies, and other tools as recommended by faculty and staff. To facilitate the connection of campus members over the past year or so, we also provide intentional support to employee affinity groups. Since then, four new affinity groups, the Asian American and Pacific Islander Faculty and Staff Affinity Group, the LGBTQ+ Staff and Faculty Group, the American Indian and Indigenous Alliance, and the Disability Affinity Group, have formed to complement the two existing groups. We welcome input on other helpful events or opportunities that we may provide to the community to better prepare us to confront difficult and divisive topics now and in the future. Questions and suggestions may be directed to Dr. Andre Ellis, AVP of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

- 3.3 Chair Avramchuk presented the following response from Dr. Isis Stansberry and Dr. Andre Ellis to Senator Ramos' intent to raise questions from the meeting of December 5, 2023 (ASM 23-8): As an educational institution, we respect and promote academic freedom and the right to have conversations, including those related to DEIB. We concur that we need to create a culture of dialogue with brave spaces to have conversations around the terms to build community. As is the case with most issues related to DEIB, terms and definitions are fluid, and it is essential to have a shared understanding of the terms. When working on the DEIB Guiding Principles, the Senate DEIB task force deliberated on whether creating definitions was appropriate and chose to use "shared understanding" instead of definitions for the above reason.

It is not appropriate for the administration of any educational institution to provide definitions for the following reasons:

- 1) Definitions may be construed as the true and only understanding of the terms or how they can be taught, which would not align with the academic freedom we all share.
- 2) The definition will never be comprehensive enough to cover all possible ways the isms or phobias can manifest themselves.
- 3) The isms and phobias are also about how those targeted feel, irrespective of the definitions.

While we will not provide definitions, we support engagement and forums within the campus community to develop a shared understanding of these topics.

4. It was m/s/p (DeShazo) to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 30, 2024 (ASM 23-9).

APPROVAL OF THE
MINUTES

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

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

CHAIR'S REPORT

PRESIDENT EANES
INTRODUCTION AND
REMARKS

BUDGET PRESENTATION
PRESENTED BY: CARLOS
BELTRAN AND AMY
BIPPUS

PROPOSED NEW POLICY:
STUDENT MENTAL
HEALTH, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER III
(22-5.2)

First Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: ELECTRONIC
RECORDING OF CLASS-
ROOM LECTURES AND
CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES,
FACULTY HANDBOOK
CHAPTER V (22-18.1)

First Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: RECOGNITION
OF STUDENTS AT THE
UNIVERSITY HONORS
CONVOCATION, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV
(22-21.1)

First Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: OFFICE HOURS,
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER VI (22-17.2)

First Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: ASSIGNED TIME
FOR FACULTY
GOVERNANCE, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER II
(23-1.1)

First Reading Item

ADJOURNMENT

6. Chair Avramchuk presented his report.
7. President Johnson Eanes did an introduction and presented information for upcoming plans. A question and answer period followed.
8. AVP Beltran and Provost Bippus presented on the campus budget.
9. It was m/s/ (Fisher) to approve the recommendation.
10.
 - 10.1 It was m/s/ (Meyerott) to approve the recommendation.
 - 10.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
11. It was m/s/ (Abed) to approve the recommendation.
12.
 - 12.1 It was m/s/ (Abed) to approve the recommendation.
 - 12.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
 - 12.3 It was m/s/p (Bezdecny) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes.
 - 12.4 It was m/s/p (Bezdecny) that standing committee chairs and subcommittee chairs be invited to the next Academic Senate meeting to discuss the policies on the floor.
13. It was m/s/ (Abed) to approve the recommendation.
14. It was m/s/p (Abed) to adjourn at 3:43pm.