

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES  
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES  
November 29, 2011

ASM 11-7  
Approved January 17, 2012

M. Abed, T. Bell, C. Frank, J. Goodrich, L. Judson, H. Kim, K. King, R. Land, T. Larkin,  
P. McAllister, V. Villa

ABSENT

K. Baaske, C. Bodinger-de Uriarte, J. Hatfield, N. Pulchritudoff, M. Tufenkjian

EXCUSED ABSENCE

N. Hunt convened the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

1. 1.1 The Chair's Announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND  
QUESTIONS

1.1.1 I am pleased to report that A. Dee Williams (Curriculum and Instruction) has been elected by the Academic Senate to serve on the University Academic Appeals Board for a two-year term ending June, 2013.

1.1.2 In addition, Teresa Omidasalar has been elected by the Academic Senate to serve as the Library and Student Affairs representative on the University Nominations Committee for the Winter and Spring Quarters, 2012.

1.1.3 On November 16<sup>th</sup> Provost Vaidya sent the following memo:

In response to the Intent to Raise Question Memo dated June 2, 2011, from Senator Dumitrescu, who raised the following question regarding procedures for evaluating department/division/schools chairs and directors:

"...Can we find of a way of assuring these people that the confidentiality of their comments will be preserved? In the unlikely case of a lawsuit (if this is the reason the policy has changed), it would be sufficient for the dean to know their identity and disclose it if necessary..."

As pointed out by Dr. Dumitrescu, the current policy in the Faculty Handbook requires the following:

"If a review includes statements and/or opinions about the performance of a department/division chair or school director from individuals other than the author(s) of the report, the source(s) of such statements and opinions shall be identified by name."

The prescribed policy does not provide for redacting names from the report. Changing this policy, as Senator Dumitrescu requests, cannot take place without a change in the Faculty Handbook.

1.1.4 On November 17<sup>th</sup> Vice President Ross sent the following memo:

In response to the Intent to Raise Questions memo dated June 2, 2011, in which Senator Dumitrescu raised the following question:

"The current policy on appeals for obtaining "no record drop" states that the official documentation in support of the appeal should be submitted to the Office of Enrollment Services, which is the sole entity to decide on the matter. There have been numerous cases in which students who get a poor grade with which they do not agree submit dubious documentation that leads to their simply disappearing from the roster, as if they never took the class. I brought to the attention of the Executive Committee several such cases (that I am not going to discuss here), but, to the best of my knowledge, nothing has been done officially to change the policy. So my question is: can we institute an additional level of review, by the instructor of the course, when an appeal for a no record drop is presented? Such an additional level of review, even if more work for the faculty, would prevent further abuses of the system on the part of dishonest students from happening."

ANNOUNCEMENTS (*Continued*)

Executive Order 1037 states, in section 6.d., that withdrawals after the census date and prior to the last 20% of instruction requires approval of the instructor and the department chair and/or dean and, in section 6.e, that withdrawals during the final 20% of instruction also require approval of an academic administrator.

As a result of the Intent to Raise Question, we looked into the process and determined that there has not been full compliance with EO 1037. More precisely, there have been a very small number of exceptions in which the Registrar has permitted withdrawals/no-record drops without instructor, chair, dean, or academic administrator approval.

From this point forward, the processing of withdrawals/no-record drops will be done in full compliance with EO 1037.

I trust this addresses Senator Dumitrescu's question.

1.2 Senator Abdullah announced: The CFA annual party and membership meeting is tomorrow, November 30<sup>th</sup>, 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. in the Los Angeles room of the University-Student Union. We will actually give out dinner, there will be music, great conversation and a bargaining update, and there will be real drinks because we will need them after the bargaining update. I hope you will all be able to make it.

1.3 Senator Ledesma announced: December 6<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 to 7:00 p.m., we will be hosting a retirement celebration for Dean Gonzalez in the Golden Eagle Ballroom. If you want to attend, please RSVP to Barbara Pereida.

1.4 The Vice Chair's Announcements:

Diane Haager (Special Education and Counseling) has accepted appointment by the Nominations Committee to serve as a scientist alternate for Edith Porter on the Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects for Winter Quarter, 2012.

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

2. Senator Baker-Cristales announced her intent to raise the following question:

I sit on the Educational Policy Committee for the College of NSS and we had been told last year that if each department saved funds that they would be able to carry them over to this year. Of \$750,000 saved for this year only half of this money, \$345,000, well less than half, went to the college. So my question to the President and the Provost is where the remainder of that money went and what is it being used for?

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3. 3.1 It was m/s/ (Cleman) to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 15, 2011 (ASM 11-6).

3.2 No objections were raised and the Chair ruled the minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

4. It was m/s/p (Perez-Carballo) to approve the agenda.

REPORT ON INFORMATION  
TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

*Presented by P. Quan, Vice President for  
Information Technology Services and  
Chief Technology Officer*

5. Vice President Quan presented an update on Information Technology Services. A question and answer period followed.

ADJOURNMENT

6. It was m/s/p (Peterson) to adjourn at 2:19 p.m.