

M. Abed, A. Laouyene, S. Meyer, R. Vogel

ABSENT

V. Prabhu

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 Chair Bettcher announced on behalf of Senator Franklin: This is an announcement from the University Library. Please save the date! There will be an Open Access Mini-Conference on October 23, 2020, 10:00 a.m. – 12 p.m. The theme is “Open Educational Resources for Teaching, Learning, and Student Success”. You can RSVP at oer2020.eventbrite.com.

ANNOUNCEMENT

1.2 Chair Bettcher announced on behalf of Senator Fernando: There will be a Psychology PhD Program Information meeting on Tuesday, October 20, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. for grad students who are applying to the PhD program at UC Riverside. Students can come talk with psychology professors and graduate students from UC Riverside who will answer questions about the program. This meeting will be held virtually and any questions can be sent to jimmy.calanchini@ucr.edu.

1.3 Senator Shim announced: Hi, I was at a CFA meeting today and wanted to share with Senate that a lot of departments do not have CFA representatives. With the budget crunch, lecturer positions being threatened, and a 10% cut across the board, it's really worth it for all departments to have a representative in CFA to act as conduits for information and possible actions of the union. If your department happens to not have a CFA representative or if you were not aware that departments can have representatives, this might be something to share with your colleagues to try to get more departments involved in the CFA. This can be done by lot, voluntarily, or department elections – however you want to do it as there is no real rule for this.

2. Senator Hanan raised the following concern: Last week I brought forward the idea of reaffirming the Cal State LA commitment to critical students and the humanities based on what happened on September 17 with President Trump and his announcement. Talia, you had mentioned that this should be in the form of a resolution and I was just wondering what the process is for that to take place? Can it be from the floor or does it come from committee?
Chair Bettcher responded from the floor.

CONCERNS FROM THE FLOOR

3. 3.1 Chair Bettcher provided the following response to Senator Talcott's Intent to Raise Question from the meeting of September 22, 2020 (ASM 20-3):
I thank Senator Talcott for raising the question. My response to the question raised at Senate is as follows:
The Division of Academic Affairs understands and is committed to meeting the provision of the CBA related to new faculty release time. Academic Affairs will continue to comply with the CBA and will ensure that the Colleges have the funds necessary to cover the cost of new faculty release. The issue raised is unfortunately based on a misunderstanding that seems to have stemmed from conversations among Deans and Academic Affairs about available funding sources for this release time.

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

3.2 Senator Fernando announced her intent to raise the following questions: CSULA is a public university with a fiduciary responsibility to tax payers as well as to students and faculty. Where can the faculty, students, and public find a transparent accounting of the ways that CSULA spent the \$39 million of the CARES Act COVID relief funds? Can the CFO provide a link to that information? We know that half of the \$39 million went directly to students and that some of the funds went to the CETL Alt-Instruction program, but I estimate that there must be at least another \$15 million that is not accounted for.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS
(continued)

My questions are:

1. There is a rumor that the administration used these funds to pay the debt on the new dorms. Is this true?
2. What was the total cost of the CETL Alt-Instruction program, and did all of it go towards paying faculty or did some of it go to administrators?
3. Can you please provide a full accounting for all of the \$39 million?

3.3

Senator Krug announced his intent to raise the following questions:

Question 1: 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, 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?

Question 2: Last week, Provost Alvarado stated that L.A. County public health guidelines were a major restriction on our campus reopening compared to sister campuses. However, current guidelines from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health for higher education state, "Faculty and other staff may come to campus for the purpose of providing distance learning, and other activities related to the purposes above, as well as maintaining minimum basic operations." Many faculty have repeatedly asked for access to single-occupancy offices to facilitate remote instruction for the past six months and have been denied access, including in formal reopening plans. Why are faculty denied limited but regular access to our offices to facilitate remote instruction, despite County guidelines permitting such use when safety protocols are in place?

3.4

Senator Wells announced his intent to raise the following questions:

The university declared impaction for Fall 2020 admissions. What were the goals of declaring impaction, and were those goals met? What data were gathered to assess the results of declaring impaction for Fall 2020 admissions? Will the university continue to declare impaction for Fall 2021 admissions? What is the university's current process for deciding whether to continue a declaration of impaction? What are the roles of faculty, students, and community members in that process?

3.5

Senator Hernandez announced his intent to raise the following questions:

In the last Senate meeting, a question was raised as to whether President Covino, and other administrators will take a salary cut given the projected financial forecast? Furthermore, given the recent appointment of the CSU Chancellor will he, other CSU administrators take a salary cut as well?

What has happened to the CARES Act funding? Our campus received \$39 million in CARES Act funding. There has been no transparency in how this funding has been spend. How has this money been spent?

APPROVAL OF THE
MINUTES

4. It was m/s/p (Hanan) to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 22, 2020 (ASM 20-3).

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

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

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

6. Chair Bettcher presented her report.

7. Senator Baaske presented the Academic Senate CSU report from the meetings of September 17-18, 2020.
8.
 - 8.1 It was m/s/ (Charles Flores) to approve the recommendation.
 - 8.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
9.
 - 9.1 It was m/s/ (Charles Flores) to approve the recommendation.
 - 9.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
 - 9.3 It was m/s/p (Larkins) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes.
10. It was m/s/ (Hernandez) to approve the recommendation.
11.
 - 11.1 Chair Bettcher reminded the body of the Warter-Perez motion that was on the floor from the last meeting and debate ensued.
 - 11.2 It was m/s/ (Avramchuk) to amend the Warter-Perez motion in line 7 to delete SCHOOLS, AND DEPARTMENTS .
 - 11.3 Debate ensued and Senator Riggio called the question.
 - 11.4 The Avramchuk motion passed. (V: 31/20).
 - 11.5 The Warter-Perez motion passed as amended. (V: 37/6/4)
 - 11.6 It was m/s/p (Flint) to continue this as a Second-Reading Item.
12. It was m/s/p (Flint) to adjourn at 3:44 p.m.

REPORT OF STATEWIDE
SENATE MEETING

STUDENT EVALUATIONS
FOR 2020-21AY (20-5)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY
DELETION: CHARACTER-
ISTICS OF MASTER'S
DEGREES POLICY,
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER IV (20-6)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY
DELETION: CHARACTER-
ISTICS OF BACHELOR'S
DEGREE POLICY,
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER IV (20-7)
First-Reading Item

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