

L. Zhao

ABSENT

O. Bernal, C. Restrepo, C. Rodriguez

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:48 p.m.

Chair Bettcher reviewed updates and reminders to participating in Senate meetings and reminded the body of iClicker cloud use.

1. 1.1 Senator Talcott announced: Hi colleagues. Today, the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) published its latest issue of The Journal of Academic Freedom. Our colleague, Professor and Chair of Anthropology, Beth Baker, published an article about Cal State LA that has direct bearing on our work as Senators and as guardians of shared governance. It will provide especially useful context for Senators who are newer to Cal State LA and to Senate, but it is an informative analysis for all. It is titled, "Gentrifying the University and Disempowering the Professoriate: Professionalizing Academic Administration for Neoliberal Governance." It is available online, with no paywall. Here is the link: https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Beth_Baker.pdf

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.2 Senator Avramchuk requested that the body take a moment to reflect on the passing of Justice Ginsburg.

2. 2.1 Chair Bettcher responded to the concern raised by Senator Hayes at the meeting of September 1, 2020 (ASM 20-1).

CONCERNS FROM THE FLOOR

2.2 Senator Hanan raised the following concern: On September 17, Trump declared war on what he considers anti-American curriculum which in the reportage looks like he was specifically targeting critical studies and the humanities in particular. I wanted to see whether or not if we can reaffirm this campus' commitment to critical thinking, critical studies, and the humanities at large.
Chair Bettcher responded from the floor.

2.3 Senator Cristian Flores raised the following concern: ASI Senators received an email this past week about students who were concerned about conducting research and the halt to their research due to Covid-19; and how it is affecting them in regards to grants and scholarships that they have received. The concern is how the campus is approaching this situation and how might these students, particularly first-year graduate students or graduating undergraduate students, be assisted since they are not allowed to come to campus to conduct their research?
Provost Alvarado responded from the floor.

2.4 Senator Nelson raised the following concern: Some of us who have parking deductions from payroll are still getting these deductions and it might be hard to notice since we are not getting our paystubs. It was a long and complicated process for me to get the deduction removed and I would like to suggest that payroll or whomever is in charge of this make sure that faculty are aware that they have the option to opt out of parking right now and that they make the process a little easier.
There was no response from the floor. Chair Bettcher reported that she will try to provide a response at the next Senate meeting.

2.5 Senator Larkins raised the following concern: I'm bringing a concern on behalf of my colleague in the Charter College of Education and it's concerning faculty review that faculty members conduct for adjunct faculty. She is asked to conduct a peer observation for each adjunct faculty (over 150) in her program each year and it's becoming a burden in terms of time. She would like to encourage us as the Senate to help think of alternatives for peer review and a less stressful review process for adjuncts.
Senator Riggio responded from the floor.

CONCERNS FROM THE
FLOOR
(continued)

2.6 Senator Villa raised the following concern: Students are being asked to refund some of their financial aid awards, some of which totals to thousands of dollars, within 13 days and that there is a threat of placing a hold on their records. So I wanted to see if anyone has any information on that?
Margaret Garcia responded from the floor and advised will provide additional information at the next meeting.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS

3. 3.1 Senator Krug announced his intent to raise the following questions:
Question 1: Per California Labor Code § 2802, employers must reimburse employees for a reasonable portion of home internet and personal cell phone costs under mandatory work-from-home orders. The University must also provide necessary office equipment and suitable chairs if employees are denied access to offices. (A) What is the university doing to notify all faculty and staff that we are entitled to university-provided wifi hotspots, cell phones, computers, printers and office chairs; or to reimbursement for a reasonable portion of home internet, cell phone and equipment costs needed to perform our jobs during remote instruction? (B) What are the procedures for requesting reimbursement for personal electronics and data plans, including requests retroactive to March 2020, and for needed office equipment? Administrative Plan 510 is narrowly tailored to Cellular-Capable Mobile Devices and does not address the broader needs of work-from-home.
Question 2: What is the University doing to address the frustrations communicated by numerous graduate student researchers, and the similar concerns of undergraduates engaged in honors thesis and independent mentored research, who have been denied access to campus laboratories for 6 months and counting? Graduate students emailed numerous administrators decrying the lack of communication regarding reopening procedures, and current forms do not even allow for senior undergraduates to be included in reopening plans. Our students' counterparts on sister campuses (Northridge, Long Beach, Fullerton) have been back in laboratories and engaged in field work for months, following recommended safety protocols. Meanwhile, the achievement gap grows for our students, who continue to pay tuition for mentored research credits, yet remain indefinitely denied those career-defining training opportunities. In the reopening process, why is our campus priority to keep laboratories empty the majority of the time rather than to allow more students access through shifted schedules, minimizing overlap in personnel while restoring the opportunities for advancement that are the hallmark of our student training programs?

3.2 Senator Talcott announced her intent to raise the following questions:
Question 1: First, how is reassigned time for new probationary faculty funded? We are hearing that Colleges have been told that the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs will no longer fund this reassigned time which is a contractual right under article 20.36 of our collective bargaining agreement, and that the Colleges must now find the resources out of their already strained budgets to secure this right for newly hired tenure-line faculty.
Question 2: And my second question is: If your office (either under your direction or that of former Provost Gomez) has not already withdrawn such funding, are you, in fact, planning to withdraw your office's funding of article 20.36 reassigned time (next term or next year), and to instead make the Colleges and Departments fund this reassigned time?
For reference: Article 20.36 in the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that "the CSU agrees to fund the following reductions in instructional assignments during the first two years of a faculty member's probationary period.... During the first two years of the probationary period, probationary faculty employee hires ... shall be assigned a maximum of eighteen (18) direct weighted teaching units on a semester campus."

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS (continued)

- 3.3 Senator Wells announced his intent to raise the following question:
Top administrators at public universities around the country have voluntarily taken pay cuts to help fund university operations during the COVID crisis, including in the University of California system and at the Universities of Michigan, Kansas, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin. What is the position of our own campus leaders on reducing top administrators' compensation packages in order to limit the impact of this crisis on the most vulnerable employees at Cal State LA, and to support university operations on behalf of our students?
- 3.4 Senator Porter announced her intent to raise the following question:
The university prides itself for being recognized as # 1 in upward mobility; includes scholarship and research as a means to amplify students' talents, life experiences and intellect in its mission statement; and has a vision that refers to cutting edge academic programs and a community of scholars engaged in research and creative accomplishments. Why then has University stopped promoting student engagement through the 4990 course mechanism, "Undergraduate Directed Study"?
The University accepts multimillion-dollar grants that yield millions in indirect costs and support faculty-mentored student research, credited to the student through 4990 courses; however, the University has stopped making 4990 courses generally available to all undergraduates. Compared to Fall 2019, 4990 enrollment in Fall 2020 dropped by about 40% in AL, ET, and HHS, and by 70% in NSS, bringing in particular undergraduate student research almost to a halt in many departments due to the unavailability of 4990 courses. University wide, 188 fewer students were given the opportunity to engage in high-impact experiential learning, essential for pathways to doctoral studies and career-defining opportunities.
How does the University intend to maintain our capacity for student upward mobility, to fulfill promises made in its mission and vision, as well as to continue to attract extramural funding with substantial indirect cost rates, without a uniform commitment across colleges to continue offering undergraduate directed study?
- 3.5 Senator Laouyene announced his intent to raise the following questions:
Question 1: What is the university doing to increase funding for ITS to ensure our student and faculty needs are met, even on weekends?
Question 2: What plan does the university have to deliver mail to faculty and staff?
- 3.6 Senator Seals announced his intent to raise the following question:
This is a question about section opening and closing policy not for this semester but for the Spring. This is on how decisions are made about when to open new sections given the size of wait list, and when to close sections unlikely to "make". We've heard from multiple department chairs that they felt pressured to close sections that they felt were likely to fill - and not to open sections even for courses with very long wait lists. This was a big part of the devastating impact on Lecturers this semester, many of whom lost jobs or health insurance when they were denied sections that would ultimately fill - and of course a lot of students were left scrambling to find courses. It seems like this same disaster might be averted for the Spring semester if we can lay out clear guidance on how these kind of decisions should be made. The question is: what guidance will be given to Deans and ultimately to chairs about section opening and closing policy for the Spring? Ultimately we'd love a response in writing.
4. It was m/s/p (Porter) to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 8, 2020 (ASM 20-2).
5. It was m/s/p (Baaske) to approve the agenda.
6. Chair Bettcher presented her report.
7. Provost Alvarado presented his report.

APPROVAL OF THE
MINUTES

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

PROVOST'S REPORT

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: FULL-TIME UNIT LOAD FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS POLICY, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (19-16)
Second-Reading Item
Forward to the president

PROPOSED POLICY DELETION: DEFINITION OF A GRADUATE STUDY LOAD FOR PURPOSES OF ASSIGNING VETERAN BENEFITS, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (19-17)
Second-Reading Item
Forward to the president

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: STUDENT INPUT IN ACADEMIC PERSONNEL PROCESSES, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (19-9.1)
Second-Reading Item

ADJOURNMENT

8. 8.1 It was m/s/p (Avramchuk) in line 3 to insert IN A GIVEN SEMESTER, and delete AND FOR ASSIGNING VETERAN BENEFITS after “STATUS” and in new lines 12-13 insert GRADUATE STUDENT STUDY LOAD FOR THE PURPOSES OF ASSIGNING VETERAN BENEFITS OR FOR THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT STATUS MAY HAVE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS OR RESTRICTIONS. (V: 47/1/2)
- 8.2 It was m/s/ (Avramchuk) in lines 5-6 to delete approved prerequisite, corequisite, or before “graduate program” and insert OR OTHER COURSES APPROVED BY THEIR GRADUATE ADVISOR after “courses”.
- 8.3 Debate ensued and the Avramchuk motion passed. (V: 49/2)
- 8.4 It was m/s/ (Avramchuk) in lines 8-10 to modify the language as follows: 5960, 5970, 5990, 5995, 6990, OR 5960 (NOTE: FOR FINANCIAL AID PURPOSED, STUDENTS MUSTBE REGISTERED IN AT LEAST ONE UNIT-BEARING COURSE IN ADDITION TO 5960 TO BE CONSIDERED FULL-TIME).
- 8.5 Debate ensued and the Avramchuk motion passed unanimously.
- 8.6 The recommendation was APPROVED as amended. (V: 49/1)
9. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 45/0/2)
10. 10.1 It was m/s/ (Warter-Perez) in line 7 to insert COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, AND DEPARTMENTS MAY ESTABLISH ADDITIONAL POLICY REGARDING HOW THIS RIGHT IS COMMUNICATED TO STUDENTS WITHIN THEIR PROGRAMS. after “CHANNELS” and start a new paragraph beginning with “These statements...”.
10.2 Debate ensued.
10.3 It was m/s/ (Flint) to continue this as a second-reading item at the next meeting. No objections were raised.
11. It was m/s/p (Pitt) to adjourn at 3:45 p.m.