

B. Cerqueira, M. Hernandez, D Seals

ABSENT

D. Pitt

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:56 p.m.

Chair Bettcher began with addressing democracy in action (including congratulating President elect, Joe Biden, and Vice-President elect, Kamala Harris), land acknowledgement, and reviewed the protocols for participating in Senate meetings and iCloud clicker use.

1. 1.1 Chair Bettcher announced: Two of the assessment workshops are over but I did want to bring to your attention the final Fall 2020 Assessment Workshop – “Let’s Get it Started: Adapting VALUE Rubrics to Assess Almost Any Program Outcome”. It will be held on Friday, November 14, 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.2 Chair Bettcher announced: President Covino has approved the following policies and the Faculty Handbook is currently being updated to reflect these changes:

Policies effective immediately:

- New: Timely Progress to Degree Completion for Undergraduate Studies
- Deletion: Characteristics of Bachelor’s Degrees
- Deletion: Characteristics of Master’s Degrees
- Deletion: Definition of a Graduate Study Load for Purposing of Assigning Veteran Benefits
- Deletion: The Student Educational Equity Advisory Committee to the Vice President for Student Affairs
- Deletion: Timing of Undergraduate Advisement
- Modification: Policy on Changing a Major or Declaring a Dual Major or Minor
- Modification: Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty
- Modification: Full-Time Unit Load for Graduate Students Policy (editorial amendment: replace semester (line 3) with TERM (SEE UNIVERSITY CATALOG REGARDING SPECIAL SESSIONS))

Policy effective Spring 2021:

- Modification: Student Input on Academic Personnel Processes

Returned unsigned:

- Recommendation for Optional Inclusion of Student Evaluation Reports in PAFs for the 2020-21AY.

President Covino sent along the following explanation for returning the recommendation unsigned: The quality of teaching and learning at Cal State LA has been recognized and applauded nationally, signaling what I know to be true: the dedication of our faculty to student success is exemplary. Changing pedagogical circumstances brought on by the pandemic have brought new challenges to faculty and students, and both groups have stepped up with their characteristic dedication to adapt to the innovation that is crucial to preserving health and safety, while staying focused on progress toward a Cal State LA degree. With all this in mind, I cannot in good conscience approve a policy that implies that the faculty may not be teaching well in some cases, and which gives the students no input into the review process.

As usual, faculty undergoing review may comment in their review materials on their challenges and successes in this new environment, and the ways in which they have approached this unusual year as an opportunity to try out innovative approaches and assess their effectiveness. That said, I know that times are tough, deeply appreciate everyone’s struggle to navigate this year’s trials and tribulations, and thank you for your generous forbearance as we look forward to welcoming everyone back to campus.

ANNOUNCEMENTS  
(continued)

1.3 Provost Alvarado announced: I received a letter yesterday from University Counsel at the Chancellor's Office. In the spirit of transparency, I'm informing the Senate that due to certain legal issues that have arisen, University Counsel has requested that we preserve instructional Zoom recordings. Even though the system is attempting to resolve these legal issues as quickly as possible, they are directing all CSU campuses, including Cal State LA, to take steps to preserve all instructional Zoom content for spring 2020 and any term forward. This includes anything that is stored on the Zoom cloud and specifically for the time being, Cal State LA will be removing the delete key capability for users in the Zoom cloud beginning next Monday.

CONCERNS FROM THE  
FLOOR

2. 2.1 Senator Hernandez raised the following concern: My question is in regards to impaction. What is the status of impaction given the current budget for admissions for fall 2021.  
Provost Alvarado responded from the floor.
- 2.2 Senator Hanan raised the following concern: I wanted to inquire about the status of the Intent to Raise question I raised regarding lecturer representation on Senate committees.  
Chair Bettcher responded from the floor that she will present the formal response when we get to that item on the agenda.
- 2.3 Senator Abdullah raised the following concern: I'm concerned about the admission of black students in particular, most of whom reside outside of our service area. I would like for the Provost to speak about what plans and steps have been taken in regards to specific outreach to black students and what can be done in order for members of the Black Faculty and Staff Caucus and the Pan-African Studies Department to recruit black students to Cal State LA – who remain dramatically underrepresented as a portion of the student body. How can the black faculty and staff and the department of Pan-African Studies, in particular, be included and empowered in the outreach recruitment and admissions effort beyond your team and how are we, that share identity with the students we are targeting, being utilized?  
Provost Alvarado responded from the floor and advised that he would need some time to provide additional details.  
Chair Bettcher also advised that Senator Abdullah could raise her concerns formally as an Intent to Raise Question in order to receive a more detailed response to her questions.
- 2.4 Senator Porter raised the following concern: I wanted to follow up on Provost Alvarado's statement about impaction does not affect enrollment and that enrollment is expected to increase. Can you please clarify if this is correct despite the anticipated budget cut by 10% or is that not related to the total number of students we serve in the budget?  
Provost Alvarado advised that he will respond at the next meeting during his report.

INTENT TO RAISE  
QUESTIONS

3. 3.1 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Provost Alvarado to Senator Riggio's intent to raise question from the meeting of October 20, 2020 (ASM 20-7): The question posed is grounded on the assumption that, "resources determine Faculty workload." In fact, my response does not use those terms. The response I provided offers a more complex set of variables that must be considered when making such determinations. In a similar response to Senator Seals dated 10/20/2020, regarding a question on wait lists and opening and closing course sections, I clarified that available resources are an important factor that must be considered but it is not the only one. Additionally, those decisions rest within the academic colleges, not the Provost's Office. I have previously provided responses on the issue of course benchmarks. Given that there is an ongoing grievance on this issue, I will make no further comments on this topic. However, I must be clear in our institutional commitment to honor the CBA.

3.2 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Provost Alvarado to Senator Krug’s intent to raise question from the meeting of October 20, 2020 (ASM 20-7): Our campus continues to follow our “Safer at Home” approach. We remain concerned over the fact that increased density on campus likely increases potential spread of COVID. Just yesterday, the LA Times ran a story on the most recent surge in COVID infections in LA County. Even so, we realize that there are some functions, instructional and otherwise, that are deemed essential and must be held on campus. This is a complex issue that layers essential university operations, RSCA activities, campus materials pick up events, approved intermittent on-campus visits to pick up instructional materials/supplies, and on-campus instructional activities. For example, we recently submitted to the Chancellor’s Office our plan for the Spring semester. This plan includes 22 virtual courses, with a total of 62 separate course sections, that will have limited on-campus activities. A total of over 500 students, 29 faculty, and 9 staff will spend some portion of the semester on campus. Students involved in these courses will spend an average of around two hours per week on campus. Additionally, we have 14 RSCA-approved labs involving an additional 21 senior and graduate students working in labs. During the last senate meeting a Senator Krug asked a question about the possibility of faculty working in their private offices. My initial response was that the question seemed reasonable but that I would check to determine if this was a possible option. According to Environmental Health and Safety, faculty working in their private offices is not allowed. Additionally, on the issue of student supervision, EH&S defines student supervision as the faculty being in the same lab space as students at all times. Therefore, we want to have the minimum number of people on campus necessary to carry out instruction and to conduct critical research, scholarly, and creative activities, and to facilitate the essential operations of the campus. While some faculty and staff may find it challenging to work away from campus, this does outweigh the health and safety concerns that their presence on campus would pose not just to themselves, but to the essential faculty and staff who must work on campus.

3.3 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from the Academic Senate Executive Committee to Senator Hanan’s intent to raise question from the meeting of October 20, 2020 (ASM 20-7): It is accurate to state that lecturers are faculty. They are defined as such as the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement. Appendix C of the Cal State LA Academic Senate also makes this clear. Appendix C however also indicates that lecturer faculty can only vote for lecturer representatives, they are not empowered to vote for the other members of the Academic Senate nor are they empowered to serve on the Academic Senate except as lecturer representatives. Lecturers do not have designated seats on standing committees and, under the constitution, are not eligible to serve on standing committees instead of tenure/tenure-track faculty. This differentiation was clear when the Constitution was amended by adding lecturer and staff representatives to the Senate in 2018. There are differentiations between temporary (i.e., lecturer) and permanent (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) faculty in many areas of the University. Temporary faculty are not compensated for service like permanent faculty who receive SETUs. Nor is service expected of temporary faculty. Lecturers who serve on the Senate do so voluntarily. Temporary faculty do not serve on RTP committees, are separately tallied on Chair preference balloting, do not serve on department or college curriculum committees, and so on. Searches and contract decisions are also very different. Whether these differentiations are wise may be subject to debate, but the differentiations exist. That is also true for the Academic Senate. If the Senate desires to permit lecturers to serve on standing committees, the constitution would need to be changed. The process for amending the constitution is detailed in the constitution and provided below.

*ARTICLE VI. AMENDMENTS*

Constitutional amendments may be proposed by the Academic Senate in a majority vote, by the tenured and tenure-track faculty at a general meeting of tenured and tenure-track faculty as described in Article III, section 6, or by the President. Petitions

INTENT TO RAISE  
QUESTIONS  
(continued)

INTENT TO RAISE  
QUESTIONS  
(continued)

proposed for constitutional amendments signed by fifty tenured or tenure-track faculty members shall be considered by the Academic Senate at its next regular meeting.

Proposed amendments shall be submitted to a vote of those persons eligible to vote in tenured and tenure-track faculty elections (see Article III, section 8) provided that tenured and tenure-track faculty members are given notification of the proposed amendments at least ten working days in advance, and provided further that the deadline for the balloting is open for not less than ten working days after its distribution. Such ballots shall be accompanied by arguments favoring and opposing the proposed action; the responsibility for preparing the favorable argument shall rest with the mover of the proposal; the responsibility for preparing the adverse argument shall be nominated by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate from among those who opposed the motion and approved by the Senate. Approval of the proposed amendments requires a two-thirds majority of the votes cast by the tenured and tenure-track faculty and approval by the President.

Proposals shall be accompanied by a clause specifying the effective date of implementation.

- 3.4 Senator Riggio announced her intent to raise the following question: This question is for the College Deans and Associate Deans: Benchmark enrollments for various types of courses are enshrined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement in the document EP&R 76-36, referred to in Appendix H of the Contract (p. 215 in an MOU called "Article 20 Changes"). Currently in at least three Colleges, Associate Deans are refusing to approve curricular modifications and new course proposals unless proposers increase the benchmark enrollments in the proposals in Curriculog. My question is: Do the Deans intend to follow the Contract (and thus EP&R 76-36) in approving curricular modifications and new course proposals?

APPROVAL OF THE  
AGENDA

4. It was m/s/p (Hernandez) to approve the agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE  
MINUTES

5. It was m/s/p (Porter) to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 27, 2020 (ASM 20-8).

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

6. Chair Bettcher ceded her time to Provost Alvarado for a question and answer period.

PROPOSED POLICY MODI-  
FICATION: CURRICULAR  
POLICIES, FACULTY HAND  
BOOK, CHAPTER IV (20-13)  
*First-Reading Item*

7. It was m/s/ (Albey) to approve the recommendation.

CSU AB 1460 RESOLUTION  
(20-12)  
*Second-Reading Item*

8. 8.1 Chair Bettcher reminded the body of the Baaske motion on the floor.  
8.2 Debate ensued and it was m/s/ (Villalpando) to amend the Baaske motion by deleting in lunc 48 CONTINUE TO .  
8.3 Debae ensued and it was m/s/p (Talcott) to close the debate. (V: 46/7/4).  
8.4 The Villalpando amendment failed. (V: 20/33/7)  
8.5 It was m/s/p (Anguiano) to close the debate on the Baaske motion. (V: 48/7/2)  
8.6 The Baaske motion failed. (V: 20/32/7)  
8.7 It was m/s/ (Meyer) to close the debate on the entire recommendation. No objections were raised.  
8.8 The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 41/5/9). It was m/s/p (Bezdecny) to distribute the resolution ahead of the approval of the minutes.

9. It was m/s/p (Baaske) to continue to remaining items as Second-Reading Items and adjourn at 3:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT