CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES September 8, 2020			ASM 20-2 DRAFT
O. Bernal, D. Hanan, J. Hatfield, B. Hoffman, N. Hunt, S. Meyer, S. Nelson, K. Schaff, M. Talcott, Z. Ye, L. Zhao			ABSENT
Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:48 p.m.			
Chair Bettcher reviewed the Cal State LA Academic Senate Virtual Participation Guide and advised the			
participants that the meetings will be recorded for archival purposes only.			
1.	Chair's announcements: I am announcing this on behalf of Senator Prabhu: There are ten \$2,000 2020-21 Assessment Mini Grants available for teams of two or more faculty. Proposals are due by October 1, 2020. If you are interested, please join us for any of one of the Mini Grant Information Sessions: Monday, September 14, 3-4 p.m.; Thursday, September 17, 10 -11 a.m.; Tuesday, September 22, 12-1 p.m.; Friday, September 25, 10 -11 a.m. If you have any queries, please contact Director of Assessment, Veena Prabhu, at <u>vprabhu@calstatela.edu</u> .		ANNOUNCEMENTS
2.	2.1	Chair Bettcher responded the concern raised by Senator Esparza at the meeting of September 1, 2020 (ASM 20-1).	CONCERNS FROM THE FLOOR
	2.2	There were no Concerns from the Floor.	
3.	3.1	Chair Bettcher presented the following response to the Intent to Raise Question from Senator Hernandez at the meeting of September 1, 2020 (ASM 20-1): Dear Academic Senate: I thank Senator Anthony Hernandez for raising the question. My response to the question raised at Senate is as follows: All department chairs received communication about the updated GET security model. Associate Deans for each of the colleges reviewed all the roles and provided recommendations. GET users in the College of Arts and Letters piloted the new templates in March 2020, using them through the summer/fall registration and advising period, and end of term grading. The security templates were applied to user profiles after incorporating feedback received from our pilot college. The immediate goal of this security reimplementation was to standardize access, providing consistency, and matching user needs. Long term, we aim to deliver expedited provisioning of appropriate access when faculty and staff are hired or change positions. With a standard palette of user templates and optional add-ons, requesting an access change is simplified. Faculty Advisors, faculty were assigned the Faculty template. If an individual faculty member would like to gain access to the Faculty Advisor role, they can request from the Registrar the Faculty/Advisor role with the approval of their department chair.	INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS
	3.2	There were no Intent to Raise Questions.	
4.	It was a	m/s/p (Baaske) to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 1, 2020 (ASM 20-1).	APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
5.	It was a	m/s/p (Porter) to approve the agenda.	APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
6.	None.		SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT
7.	7.1	It was m/s/ (Taing) to approve the recommendation.	PROPOSED POLICY DELETION: THE STUDENT EDUCATIONAL EQUITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, FACULTY HANDBOOK CHAPTER II (<u>20-1</u>)

ASM 20-2 September 8, 2020 Page 2

PROPOSED POLICY DELETION: THE STUDENT EDUCATIONAL EQUITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, <u>FACULTY HANDBOOK</u>, CHAPTER II (<u>20-1</u>) *First-Reading Item* (continued)

PROPOSED POLICY MODI-FICATION: EVALUATION OF PERMANENT INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY, <u>FACULTY HANDBOOK</u>, CHAPTER VI (<u>20-2</u>) *First-Reading Item* 8.

9.

PEER OBSERVATON OF INSTRUCTION FOR AY 2020-21 (<u>20-3</u>) *First-Reading Item* 7.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.

- 8.1 It was m/s/ (Riggio) to approve the recommendation.
- 8.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
- 8.3 It was m/s/p (Villa) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes.
- 8.4 It was m/s/p (Villa) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes.
- 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 (Porter) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes.
- 9.4 It was m/s/p (Flint) to waive the First-Reading Item rules. (V: 49/3)
- 9.5 It was m/s/ (Krug) to amend the following line as follows: Peer observation evaluations would thus not be required for RTP processes during 2020-2021, but faculty members may request an observation and . IF A PEER EVALUATION HAS ALREADY BEEN PERFORMED PRIOR TO THE ADOPTION OF THIS WAIVER, A FACULTY MEMBER MAY decide on the inclusion of any evaluation report in the Personnel Action File (PAF).
- 9.6 Debate ensued and it was m/s/ (Porter) to amend the Krug motion by inserting IN FALL 2020 after "PERFORMED".
- 9.7 Debate ensued and the Porter motion passed. (V: 32/13/4)
- 9.8 It was m/s/ (Pitt) modify the Krug motion as follows: ... any THE REPORT OF THAT evaluation report in the Personnel Action File (PAF).
- 9.9 Debate ensued and the Pitt motion passed. (V: 30/8/7)
- 9.10 Debate ensued.
- 9.11 The Krug motion as amended failed. (V: 14/29/4)
- 9.12 Senator Baaske called the question.
- 9.13 The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 38/10)
- 9.14 It was m/s/p (Baaske) to forward to this document to the President ahead of the approval of the minutes.

- ADJOURNMENT
- 10.
- It was m/s/p (Chim) to adjourn at 3:51 p.m.