

E. Allen, R. Vogel

ABSENT

A. Dobry, B. Hoffman

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Bettcher convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:47 p.m.

Chair Bettcher began with a Tongva land acknowledgement and reviewed the protocols for participating in Senate meetings and iCloud clicker use.

1. 1.1 Senator Krug announced: I would like to follow up on a response that we got to a question that I had originally raised some weeks ago and share information that I've received from the State of California Labor Commissioner's Office. I had asked about whether the University was going to follow section 2802 of the California Labor Code and reimburse employees, including faculty and staff, for work from home expenses. The answer that I received from VP Lisa Chavez was that California State University is not governed by that part of the labor code and the CSU is subject only to federal standards for reimbursing employees. I inquired with the California State Division of Labor Standards Enforcement about whether that was accurate and whether we could in fact make a claim for reimbursable expenses. I wanted to share the response that I received because it's relevant to everyone in the community. The response I got was this: "We disagree with the information you were provided that the California Labor Code section 2802 does not apply to the employees of the California State Universities. Since your employer refuses to reimburse you for the expenses incurred in the course of working from home, such as telephone use, internet access, electricity, office supplies, etc., you may file a wage claim." They then proceeded to give information on how any employee can file a wage claim with the state, not with Cal State LA. They will then take over and either investigate, mediate, or otherwise arrange to press the claim that we have under state law for these reimbursable expenses that the University denies. I want to use the Senate as a vehicle to share this information with all faculty and staff so that anyone who is interested can make a claim for work from home expenses and to emphasize that it includes a reasonable portion of your regular cell phone bill, your regular home internet bill, your electric bill, and any money you spent teaching and doing your job from home. I will forward this email to Chair Bettcher so that you can have it for the record. CFA has also independently, to my knowledge, confirmed that this is accurate and they have this information. Anyone interested can contact me and I will share this information on how to file a claim with the state and CFA can also give you that information.
- 1.2 Senator Pitt announced: The Philosophy Department is hosting a very interesting talk on the concept of genocide. It is an online talk which will be held on Friday from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m. featuring Dirk Moses from the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. If anyone would like information on that you can email me and I'll send you a flyer.
- 1.3 Senator Fernando announced: The Legislative Analyst Office has published a report called the "2021-22 Budget: California's Fiscal Outlook" and it was sent to me by Dr. Michael McClendon. It says that the annual Fiscal Outlook publication give our office's independent assessment of the California state budget condition. We find that budget situation has improved considerably relative to the June budget act with estimated \$26 billion windfall in 2021-22. There is a link to that budget (In addition to [The 2021-22 Budget: California's Fiscal Outlook](#) report and the accompanying [The 2021-22 Budget: The Fiscal Outlook for Schools and Community Colleges](#) report, several other [posts](#) on health and human services, economics and taxes, and other issues are available at <https://lao.ca.gov>.)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

CONCERNS FROM THE
FLOOR

2. 2.1 Senator Hanan raised the following concern: I was just curious and haven't been able to get a straight answer about whatever happened to the budget audit that was happening with regards to our campus?
Provost Alvarado responded from the floor.
- 2.2 Senator Ramos raised the following concern: My concern is about our dialogue with President Covino. Senators Talcott and Riggio raised the concern that we have not had a faculty townhall with President Covino and given that we're in a COVID crisis, it's been nine months and we have not had a direct dialogue with the president, the leadership, of Cal State LA. That concerns me because I think that it would improve trust and our relationships with administration. There's a big divide and I would really like to urge that we have a faculty townhall before the end of the semester.
Chair Bettcher and Provost Alvarado responded from the floor.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS

3. 3.1 Chair Bettcher provided the following response from Provost Alvarado to Senator Talcott's intent to raise question from the meeting of October 20, 2020 (ASM 20-7):
In response to the first question, I encourage faculty to explore models that integrate research opportunities within the undergraduate curriculum. I am confident faculty can find ways to implement a model within their programs that serve the greatest number of students in a sustainable way. As a majority minority campus, we must implement a model of undergraduate research that democratizes research, is grounded on principles of inclusive excellence, and ensures equity for all students. In short, we must aim to reach the greatest number of students within the confines of our limited resources.
One exemplary program that creates greater access to research experiences for undergraduate students is the Curriculum-Based Undergraduate Research Experiences (CURES). Within our institution, we have programs that embedded some elements into courses but no one program that has fully adopted the CURES approach. Other CSU campuses have embedded CURES into their programs, and have partnered with various labs and governmental agencies to ensure that undergraduate research is a vital component of undergraduate student experiences. Dean Pamela Scott-Johnson has expertise in this area and has expressed an interest in connecting interested faculty with a network of faculty experts from across the nation who have successfully integrated undergraduate research into the undergraduate curriculum.
With regards to the second question, my response offered on October 6, 2020 did not contest or acknowledge the data shared by Senator Porter. Whether particular courses are offered or not, that is a question that should be posed to the appropriate academic dean.
- 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):
December 1, 2020
Dr. Underwood polled colleagues from around the LA basin (CSU Long Beach, CSUN, Cal Poly Pomona, CSU Dominguez Hills, CSU Fullerton, and CSU San Bernardino) on September 7, 2020 and a follow up call on October 23, 2020. The number of faculty and students engaged in oncampus research activities on these dates were as follows:

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS (continued)

Campus	Survey 9/7/20	Survey 10/23/20
Long Beach	15-20 Labs (each lab <= 3 people)	67 faculty and 332 students
Northridge	70 faculty (students unknown but they be under the supervision of faculty PI)	92 faculty and approximately 200-250 students
CPP	40 faculty and 115 students (much is outdoors in agriculture college)	60 faculty and 119 students (mostly off campus ag research)
Dominquez	Zero, just starting the review process	4 faculty 10 students
Fullerton	66 faculty and 283 students (limited to 33% capacity (time and space))	70 faculty and 325 students
San Bernardino	22 faculty projects and 68 students (all are part-time)	32 faculty projects, no report of students
Cal State LA	Zero, just starting the review process	37 = 14 faculty, 2 staff, 21 students

- 3.3 Senator Riggio announced her intent to raise the following questions:
- 1) This question is for the College Deans and Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dr. Nancy McQueen: Why are faculty being denied full access to GET? Advising is an essential part of faculty job duties and is in the Article 20 job description for faculty in the Contract. Faculty members often form relationships with students as advisors, who return to them over the years for academic planning and other advise-ment. Taking away GET access stymies faculty ability to advise students coherently and competently, and essentially requires faculty to turn students away, to find help elsewhere. The existence of advising professionals in the Colleges does not affect faculty job description, which includes advising. Limiting full GET access to “designated advisors” in the Departments is discriminatory and affects the ability of faculty to do their jobs effectively. Why can’t GET access be restored to faculty who want to be able to effectively advise students, whether they are a designated advisor or not?
 - 2) This question is for Associate Vice President of Human Resource Management Susie Varela, University Counsel, and Provost Alvarado: The NSS Dean's office is distributing a new "policy" on s-factor, the compensation faculty receive for supervision of student research, scholarly, and creative activities. Item 4 on page 1 indicates: "If tenure track faculty wish to teach a course for which there aren't resources to offer, such as s-factor courses, they may agree to take this on as part of their normal workload, if they agree it would not constitute an unreasonable or excessive workload." My question is: is this is a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which prohibits employers from requiring employees to engage in uncompensated work during their normal work? If it is not a violation of this Act, please explain how it is not. If it is a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, please explain how you will compel the Deans to cease and desist this illegal behavior.

4. It was m/s/p (Wells) to approve the minutes of meeting of November 17, 2020 (ASM 20-10).
5. It was m/s/p (Riggio) to approve the agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE
MINUTES

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

CAL STATE LA LAND
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
RESOLUTION (20-16)
First-Reading Item

ASI CAPS RESOLUTION
(20-9)
Second-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MODI-
FICATION: EVALUATION
OF PERMANENT
INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER VI (20-10)
Second-Reading Item

ADJOURNMENT

6. Chair Bettcher presented her report.
7.
 - 7.1 It was m/s/ (Larkins) to approve the recommendation.
 - 7.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
8.
 - 8.1 Chair Bettcher reminded the body where we ended in the discussion from the last meeting.
 - 8.2 Debate ensued.
 - 8.3 It was m/s/f (Taing) to close the debate. (V: 21/32/1)
 - 8.4 Debate ensued.
 - 8.5 The recommendation was APPROVED. (v: 52/0/4)
9.
 - 9.1 Debate ensued.
 - 9.2 It was m/s/p (Warter-Perez) to continue this as a Second-Reading Item.
10. It was m/s/p (Warter-Perez) to adjourn the meeting at 3:46 p.m.