

M. Abed, O. Bernal, C. Chatterjee, E. Drost, C. Ney

ABSENT

D. Hazra, E. Porter, C. Restrepo

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:46 p.m.

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

1. None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

2. 2.1 Senator Riggio raised the following concern:

CONCERNS FROM THE  
FLOOR

Dear Senators,

I have a concern to bring to all of you and to the faculty colleagues whom we represent. Our salaries are likely being cut by 10% next year, at least temporarily. In addition to this salary cut, the University is also intent on increasing our workload. The administration plans to do this by eliminating units of reassigned time. Reassigned time is just that, it is units assigned for other work. Administrators like to call it “release time,” as in release from teaching. Yes it is release from teaching, for other work, including s-factor (supervision of student research, scholarly, and creative activities), units for extensive committee work, and other duties on campus (program coordinators and so on). Reducing or eliminating these units is a quadruple-whammy for faculty, cutting our salary and increasing workload, while effectively undermining graduate programs (especially those involving thesis research rather than comprehensive exams) and undermining faculty governance. Units assigned for supervision and for committee work have been established, agreed upon, and paid for over many, many years at Cal State LA, because there is actual work involved in those activities. It is our job to contribute to shared governance in a meaningful way, and to supervise students in our Masters programs. Now suddenly, the costs of these reassigned units are prohibitive and the units are somehow not necessary for the work required in these activities. I am arguing very strongly that the units are necessary for the work, and without the units, faculty will be overworked, their scholarly work will suffer, students won’t be supervised, graduate programs will fail, and committee work and faculty campus leadership is undermined.

The administration essentially expects us to work more for less. Most faculty understand the budget crisis and the need for a 10% furlough; but to simultaneously increase workload is grossly unfair and exploitative of faculty. And I am fairly certain that anything they get away with cutting next year from Academic Affairs will never ever return to us, resulting in a collapse of graduate programs and lack of genuine faculty participation in shared governance. It’s almost as if the CSU administrators are using the pandemic and the economic crisis to kill ten birds with one stone; increase our workload, eliminate grad programs, and bring an end to any kind of involved shared governance with faculty. There are other ways to cut costs that don’t involve increases in faculty workload. If there is less funding, we cannot do the same work, and we certainly should not be expected to work even more. We have been doing this is it feels like forever, constantly defending a fair workload. Faculty working conditions are student learning conditions and an exploited faculty is not good for the students.

There is still a lot of money in this system. The new Chancellor’s salary is \$625,000; \$150,000 more than that of the departing Chancellor. They came up with that money, didn’t they? That’s a lot of s-factor that benefits our students and their social mobility, and grows knowledge, the entire purpose of the University. The faculty need to resist this attempt to increase our workload and undermine our graduate programs and faculty governance. We cannot stand idly by and allow the Administration to permanently eliminate systems that have been in place for decades. It doesn’t do any one of us any good to willingly give up these reassigned units, to agree to overenrolled classes, or any increase in workload. We are our own worst enemies if we allow the University to do this to us. We work hard, we work really hard. Why do we always have to do more for less? Why do they keep asking for that?

Please be prepared to file workload grievances if you lose reassigned time. If you are

CONCERNS FROM THE  
FLOOR  
(continued)

currently receiving reassigned units for any work activity, you should continue to receive those units, and any change in those units is an unfair increase in workload that is inconsistent with previous practices of the University (see Article 20.3 of The Contract). Senator Talcott is our campus Faculty Rights representative and I know she will help us defend a fair workload. Each of us individually responsible for defending a fair workload for faculty in the CSU and at Cal State LA. I also appeal to any concern for faculty morale and well-being that the University Administration might have. Thank you.  
Senator Riggio advised that no response was needed.

- 2.2 Senator Talcott raised the following concern: I want to wholly, fully, and wholeheartedly support Senator Riggio's concern from the floor. A few minutes ago, we received an email from President Covino stating that: "In spite of the pandemic, our overall University enrollment is steady. At census this year we had 26,342 students, compared to 26,361 at census last year." We know from the PIMS data, which comes from the state controller, that we lost over 200 faculty this year. Some of these were our Lecturer colleagues who taught one or two classes, but in any case, 200 of our colleagues lost work, while we had just under 20 fewer students enrolled this year over last. It's a disturbing indicator of the growth in our workloads. If you are interested in joining our workload grievance or you are workload grievance-curious, contact me. We meet for the Level 1 meeting this Friday (10/9).  
Senator Talcott advised that no response was needed.
- 2.3 Senator Bezdecny raised the following concern on behalf of a colleague: When faculty, either TT or non-TT are awarded stipends for participating in various programs, they are often paid thorough stipends. Examples include the Assessment Mini-grants, Campus as a Living Lab grant, Summer Bridge participation and others. These stipends are meant to be paid to the faculty after the work is done. Often times, however faculty go unpaid for six months or more, even though the funds have been disbursed to the college. Often, only after repeatedly demanding pay are the funds finally disbursed. Is there policy stating faculty must be paid in a timely fashion for the work that they do? Is this in compliance with state and federal labor policies? What is the university doing to ensure timely (or timelier) payment of faculty stipends?  
Senator Esparza responded from the floor.
- 2.4 Senator Seals raised the following concern: There have been lots of really important "Intent to Raise Questions" over the course of the past meetings and I fear that it's such an avalanche that many are getting lost along the way. I wanted to provoke us collectively and maybe provoke the Executive Committee and maybe the staff in particular to think about if there are ways that we could make more transparent the ways in which questions are getting answered by administrators and how frequently. It might be as simple as just a list of questions that have been asked so far this academic year and which ones have been answered. This would enable us to see which have been answered and which ones have not. I know we've all got our plate fulls but this would be a great way to establish some sense of transparency and accountability.  
Chair Bettcher responded from the floor and advised that the Executive Committee will discuss this at its next meeting.
- 2.5 Senator Meyer raised the following concern: I don't know why we don't have a "chat" box open during the Senate meeting. I do understand that our all faculty meetings are really communicative and it's also an important means of communication between participants throughout the meeting. I don't understand why we are sort of muted and excluded from that kind of communication and I would like to know why that is.  
Chair Bettcher and Secretary Bezdecny responded from the floor.

INTENT TO RAISE  
QUESTIONS

3. 3.1 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from VP Chavez to Senator Laouyene's intent to raise question from the meeting of September 22, 2020 (ASM 20-3):  
ITS is currently staffed with 4 FTEs on nights and weekends to support students. To support faculty and staff with critical issues, these staff also respond to critical ITS issues via the ITS Help Desk. In addition, ITCs within Academic Affairs that support colleges are encouraged to be on call to support the faculty within their college.
- 3.2 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Provost Alvarado to Senator Krug's intent to raise question from the meeting of September 22, 2020 (ASM 20-3):  
Dear Academic Senate:  
I thank Senator Krug for raising the question. My response to the question raised at Senate is as follows:  
We understand faculty and students' desire to return to normalcy and to resume their research activities. The adaptations we have had to make to our academic experiences and campus operations are frustrating and disappointing for some.  
But it must be said that our top priority is not getting students back to campus – it is keeping them safe from COVID. Our main concern is the health and safety of our students, faculty, and staff, and so we are doing what we can at this point to keep people "Safer at Home."  
To that end, we have asked colleges to create review committees consisting of College peers who can best judge which projects are a College priority, and to get their site safety protocols approved by EH&S. Those processes take time but cannot be avoided. With regard to transparency, the RSCA reopening process and documents have been posted since the consultation process for them was completed in July.  
In the past month, these committees have received 15 proposals which are in various stages of being reviewed, and are expecting more to follow. Of the 15 proposals submitted thus far, a total of 8 have been approved. Researchers are encouraged to engage with their college committees to produce a viable proposal. Academic Affairs does not have information on proposals that may be under review or denied or under review by College-level committees.  
With regards to peer campuses and their level of research activities on campus, Dr. Underwood surveyed peer campuses in the LA basin and all are at different stages of RSCA reopening, reporting anywhere from 0 to 70 PIs with approved proposals. It is important to note that our campus is among neighborhoods reporting some of the highest COVID -19 case numbers in LA County and so we must exercise extreme care in resuming campus activities. It should be noted that other CSU campuses in Southern California that had established on-campus activities have pulled back their on-campus activities due to recent surges of COVID infections on campus. Long Beach State, which had a fair number of on-campus activities has reverted to virtual instruction. This latest development points to the dangers of opening the campus for activities that increase the number of persons on campus.  
Our plans remain in line with Chancellor White's twin pole stars of safeguarding the health, safety, and well-being of our faculty, staff, students, and communities, as well as enabling degree progression for the largest number of students. We will continue to follow the LA County Department of Public Health's advice to minimize the number of individuals on campus.
- 3.3 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Provost Alvarado to Senator Porter's intent to raise question from the meeting of September 22, 2020 (ASM 20-3):  
Dear Academic Senate:  
I thank Senator Porter for raising the question. My response to the question raised at Senate is as follows:  
The University remains committed to the success of all of our students. As such, our commitment remains on cultivating and amplifying our students' unique talents, diverse life experiences, and intellect through engaged teaching, learning, scholarship, research, and public service that support their overall success, well-being, and the greater good.

INTENT TO RAISE  
QUESTIONS  
(continued)

Academic Affairs expects each college to embed opportunities for students to develop their capacity for research and creativity across the curriculum to ensure these experiences are plentiful and equitable. In fact, there are many excellent models of this on our own campus that show how this can be accomplished in an equitable way.

It is important to clarify that questions regarding curricular offerings should be directed to the appropriate Academic Dean as the Provost's Office does not make those decisions. Academic Affairs does, however, expect for each Academic Dean to deliver its academic programs within the College's available resources.

APPROVAL OF THE  
MINUTES

- 3.4 Senator Hernandez announced his intent to raise the following question: This question is being raised on behalf of some faculty in the Charter College of Education: What's the purpose of curricular committees convened at every level of governance— department/college/ university— if the staffing formula is ultimately set by an administrator?

APPROVAL OF THE  
AGENDA

4. It was m/s/p (Baaske) to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 29, 2020 (ASM 20-4).

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

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

PROVOST'S REPORT

6. Chair Bettcher presented her report.

EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND  
INCLUSION TASKFORCE  
(20-4.1)

7. Provost Alvarado presented his report.

*First-Reading Item*

8. It was m/s/ (Charles Flores) to approve the recommendation.

EMERGENCY EXPANSION  
OF SENATE REPRESENTA-  
TION (20-8) (waiver)

9. 9.1 It was m/s/ (Flint) to approve the recommendation.

*First-Reading Item/  
Second-Reading Item*

Forwarded to the President

- 9.2 Chair Bettcher asked the body to waive the First-Reading Item rules and reminded the body that the only justification for waiving the rules is that the manner is so pressing that to delay voting until the next meeting would be detrimental to the welfare of the University; and that the motion to suspend the rules to waive this requirement shall be debatable.

- 9.3 It was m/s/ (Flint) to waive the First-Reading Item rules.

- 9.4 Debate ensued and the Flint motion passed. (V: 42/4/1)

- 9.5 Debate ensued and the recommendation was APPROVED. (V 45/2/1/)

- 9.6 It was m/s/p (Flint) to forward the document to the president ahead of the approval of the minutes.

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

*Second-Reading Item*

10. 10.1 It was m/s/ (Warter-Perez) in line 43 to insert INDIVIDUAL after "SOLICIT".

- 10.2 Debate ensued and the Warter-Perez motion failed. (V: 19/19/13)

- 10.3 It was m/s/ (Riggio) in line 9 to insert COMMUNICATIONS TO STUDENTS REGARDING THIS RIGHT SHALL NOT IDENTIFY ANY FACULTY PERSON BY NAME. after "PROGRAMS."

- 10.4 Debate ensued.

- 10.5 It was m/s/p (Bezdecny) to continue this as a Second-Reading Item.

ADJOURNMENT

11. It was m/s/p (Villalpando) to adjourn at 3:46 p.m.