

M. Abdullah, M. Abed, O. Bernal, B. Cerqueira, G. Fried-Amilivia, L. Fu, M. Hayes, T. Jackson,
C. Larkins, G. Menezes, O. Rodriguez, E. Velazquez, H. Walukonde

ABSENT

A. Avramchuk

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:49 p.m.

Senator Villalpando read the Tongva land acknowledgement. Chair Bettcher reviewed protocols and reminders about participating in Senate meetings and advised iClicker cloud was unavailable.

1. 1.1 Chair Bettcher announced: The spring dates for the President's Distinguished Professor lectures have been confirmed: February 22, 2022 – John Kennedy and April 19, 2022 – Choi Chatterjee. Please save the dates.
- 1.2 Chair Bettcher announced: As you know we are beginning dean's searches for the colleges of A&L and NSS and forming Ad Hoc Advisory Committees for both. The Academic Senate provides one member for these advisory committees. The Academic Senate has elected Gauthri Fernando, Psychology (NSS) to serve on the committee for College of Arts and Letters and Arturo Pacheco-Vega, Mechanical Engineering (ECST) to serve on the committee for the College of Natural and Social Sciences.
- 1.3 Chair Bettcher announced: The proposal for Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies to become a department was supported by EPC, FPC, and FiPC and approved by President Covino. Congratulations on this achievement.
I'm also happy to announce the proposal to make Nutrition and Food Science a department has been supported by EPC, FPC, and FiPC and is pending approval from President Covino.
- 1.4 Chair Bettcher announced: Regarding the meeting schedule for spring term, we will aim to meet alternate Tuesdays (first meeting February 1), but if necessary, we will schedule additional meetings. Additionally, it's important to know that we will continue to meet remotely.
- 1.5 Visitor Vice Provost Bippus announced: I wanted to give an update on contingency planning for spring 2022. We've been meeting with VIAPAG (the group that has been advising us on the planning for Covid) and the colleges have submitted their plans for the spring – all information that will help guide us if we need to convert to a remote format based on advice from public health officials. The dean and associate deans are working with department chairs to identify just under 500 courses that should remain in a face-to-face format (and to clarify, these are courses that are currently in a face-to-face format and would stay that way). The scheduling office is prepared to put these classes in spaces considering the distance mandates in place at the time.
We are continuing to meet with the County Health department to make sure we are following all of the safety requirements.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

2. Senator Bezdecny raised the following concern: NSS EPC is concerned with the following issues surrounding the curriculum process:
 - (1) The curriculum process, from start to finish, has extended since the adoption of Curriculog. What used to take 1 year to approve from start to finish has now become a 1 ½ to 2 year process.
 - (2) With our current curriculum process, there has been an increase in curricular decisions being made by staff and administrators, rather than by faculty, who have purview over the curriculum. These decisions are often opaque to the faculty.
 - (3) The current curriculum schedules and deadlines are not aligned with the academic calendar, creating difficulties for department and college level development and review.
 - (4) This is creating both a compressing of curriculum reviews, particularly at the college level, while a delay in the implementation of curriculum.

CONCERNS FROM
THE FLOOR

Margaret Garcia, Associate Dean of UGS/Exec. Director of Enrollment Services responded from the floor.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS

3. 3.1 Senator Krug announced his intent to raise the following questions:
In response to my IRQ submitted 9/28/21, the University replied: “[There seems to be a misunderstanding concerning the IDC amount collected by UAS, and how its \[sic\] allocated. UAS does not retain any IDC funds to pay the lease on the Golden Eagle.](#)”
According to the annual UAS budget, Indirect Cost Revenue is one of the two major sources of UAS revenue, just under Food & Catering less costs; conversely, “interest on capital lease” is generally the largest UAS expense after salaries and benefits.
Question 1: Are recovered indirect costs not commingled with other revenue sources by UAS? What accounting mechanism ensures that no IDC revenue is used to pay interest on capital lease or other Golden Eagle-associated costs, as this response implies?
- Question 2: If IDC is not being used to pay the interest on the capital lease, why isn’t a meaningful percentage of IDC generated by faculty returned to colleges, departments or PIs, as other CSU campuses do?
As noted, the rules of corporate governance for UAS require three Directors each from the faculty, student and community stakeholder groups (a voting majority). According to the Board membership reported at the last meeting, there are currently three faculty Directors, one community director, and no student directors.
- Question 3: I asked, “When was the **last time** the UAS Board had three directors representing each of these key stakeholder groups: faculty, students, and community?” This question went unanswered; the response stated the process for appointing different stakeholders. I am asking how long the majority of the Board has inappropriately comprised administrative Directors, instead of representatives of the three groups mentioned.
- Question 4: I asked, “What is the University’s **plan and timeline** to appoint the required representatives of these stakeholder groups to ensure oversight and accountability for UAS?” The response did not address what is being done to ensure the appropriate number of student and community Directors. The ASI president was not listed on the current Board membership. What outreach to ASI is being done, and how are community members being recruited?
- Question 5: I asked, “How can interested campus and community stakeholders attend [Board meetings]?” The response gave a broken hyperlink, but the correct website does not contain any information about how the public can attend virtual meetings. Please provide this information.
- 3.2 Senator Riggio announced her intent to raise the following questions:
1. Directed to the Provost and College Deans:
How are Colleges funding supervision units for faculty (aka s-factor)? Are Departments being required to pay for supervision units with monies earned from summer classes? If Colleges are requiring Departments to use summer revenue to pay for s-factor, those Departments are being discriminated against by the University and penalized for engaging in this high-impact practice with students. Why will central administration not provide sufficient College budgets to fully fund teaching activities in the Departments?
2. Directed to President Covino:
Regarding your return of the policy modification of Direction of Graduate Theses and Projects, why do you object to referring to the Collective Bargaining Agreement as the Governing Documents and within the policy itself? Article 20 of the CBA and the document EP&R 76-36 both pertain directly to faculty workload and compensation for such supervision activities.

3.3 Senator Ramos announced her intent to raise the following questions:
Cal State LA is a designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) measured by the population of Latinx students attending. In fact, 21 out of 23 CSU's are currently designated HSI's. My question to President William Covino centers on implementing the structural changes required to promote racial and economic equity at Cal State LA. Cal State LA has one of the highest rates of Pell-eligible students enrolled of all Cal State campuses and the largest population of undocumented students of any Cal State campus. This Academic Senate has voted "Yes" to two very specific student-led resolutions in 2020 and 2021, both the ASI "Resolution of CAPS (Counseling and Psychological Services) Transparency and Service Standards at Cal State LA," and the ASI "Resolution on Transparency and Reforming University Police at Cal State LA." These student resolutions advocate for structural change at Cal State LA to dismantle racial and economic inequity and provide relevant and adequate learning conditions for our students. This body of Senators has repeatedly shared testimonials and concerns in Academic Senate regarding the gaps between Administration and the lived reality experienced by our Latinx, Black and undocumented students, which indicates that public funds allocated for our students' academic success are not being offered to an equitable extent to our students directly e.g., Cal State LA has the second to worst counselor/student ratios of the Cal State system with 1 counselor per 3,800 students and while CSUN (HSI) has 12 tenure track mental health counselors, Cal State LA has "zero" tenure-track counselors.

My questions are centered on the "Resolution on Transparency and Reforming University Police at Cal State LA." The resolution prioritizes student academic support, mental health support, which includes learning accommodations, as a strategy for racial and economic equity rather than investment on "policing" on campus. The resolution includes defunding campus police and investing in the BIPOC and undocumented community of students and the establishment of a Black Student Success Center on campus to address deep-seated racial and economic historic inequities for Black communities on campus and in Los Angeles. As Dr. Theresa Montano, Chicana/o Studies Department, CSU Northridge, clearly articulated as the final speaker in the HSI conference, "Beyond Words: Advancing Equity and Justice in the HSI's" recently held at Cal State LA, "anti-racism and social justice work, including anti-blackness and Indigenous invisibility require structural economic support and are critical to a progressive Hispanic Service Institution. This is in alignment with the roots of Black/Brown solidarity which were found in praxis in the first decade of Chicano and Pan African Studies and should not be forgotten."

The Cal State LA budget for 2019-2020 includes a police department budget of \$4,656,864.21, or 14% of the overall school budget.
(<https://csulauniversitytimes.com/asi-resolution-on-reforming-campus-police-is-passed-by-faculty-senate/>)

President William Covino the following questions are:

- 1) Can you share in detail the 2021 budget breakdown for the Campus Police and how you see the allocation of these funds to support undocumented, Black and Latinx and all students' mental health, safety, and academic success?
- 2) Can you share in detail the 2021 budget breakdown for CAPS?
- 3) Can you share in detail the 2021 budget breakdown for Office of Student Disabilities?
- 4) Can you share in detail the 2021 budget breakdown for the Erika Glazer Dreamers Center?
- 5) Can you share in detail the 2021 budget breakdown for Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)?

4. It was m/s/p (Flores) to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 9, 2021 (ASM 21-7).

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

SENATE CHAIR'S
REPORT

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: EARLY
REGISTRATION POLICY,
EARLY
REGISTRATION POLICY,
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER V (21-11)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: DISCIPLINARY
ACTION PROCEDURES
FOR ACADEMIC
PERSONNEL, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI
(21-12)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: DIRECTION OF
GRADUATE THESES AND
PROJECTS, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI
(20-23.1)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED NEW POLICY:
MAINTAINING
EDUCATIONAL
CONTINUITY IN THE
CONTEXT OF CAMPUS
EMERGENCIES AND
DISASTERS POLICY,
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER V (20-19.1)
(waiver request)
First-Reading Item

ADJOURNMENT

5. 5.1 It was m/s/ (Hanan) to approve the agenda.
- 5.2 It was m/s/ (Bezdecny) to move item 7 to new item 10 and renumber the remaining documents. No objections were raised.
- 5.3 The agenda was approved as amended.
6. Chair Bettcher presented her report.
7. It was m/s/ (Flint) to approve the recommendation.
8. It was m/s/ (Wells) to approve the recommendation.
9. 9.1 It was m/s/ (Talcott) to approve the recommendation.
- 9.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
10. 10.1 It was m/s/ (Baaske) to approve the recommendation.
- 10.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
- 10.3 It was m/s/ (Hanan) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes. No objections were raised.
11. 11.1 Due to a technical issue, the committee could not vote on the Second-Reading Items and Chair Bettcher welcomed a motion to adjourn.
- 11.2 It was m/s/p (Villalpando) to adjourn at 3:15 p.m.