

M Abdullah, M. Abed, R Ali, K. Baaske, P. Del Real, N. Farsa, G. Fernando, L. Fu, J. Garrison, D. Hazra, M. Hernandez, K. Schaff

ABSENT

Chair Bezdecny convened the (Zoom) meeting at 1:48 p.m.

Chair Bezdecny reviewed protocols and reminders about participating in Senate meetings. Senator Ramos read the Tongva land acknowledgement.

1. 1.1 Chair's announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1.1 The Senate office is currently at 50% staff. Please be patient as things may get done a little slower during this time.

1.1.2 Regarding the iClicker Cloud accounts, I've noticed that a number of Senators have not activated their accounts yet. If you have not activated your account, remember that you cannot vote until you do so, and voting is one of our two primary pillars in the Senate. Please activate your account when you get a chance. Information on how to activate your account went out on August 22 and everyone got an individualized email directly from me.

1.1.3 A quick reminder that this year, for all meetings moving forward, IRQs are due to the Senate office by the Monday BEFORE a Senate meeting. We will not accept any IRQs the day of a Senate meeting. Any IRQs received on a Senate meeting day or after will be held for the next Senate meeting.

1.1.4 On July 28, we received two signed policies from President Covino approving the following recommendations:

- Direction of Graduate Thesis and Projects
- Evaluation of Permanent Instructional Faculty

We also had a few policies returned unsigned from President Covino on July 28 and August 17:

- Disciplinary Action Procedures for Academic Personnel
- Procedures for Letters of Reprimand for Academic Personnel
- Career Planning and Placement

The first two were returned to FPC for review. Senate Exec will be looking at third one at our next meeting to determine next steps.

1.2 K. Elliott-Brown, AVP/Dean of GS announced: At the beginning of every semester I always want to remind my colleagues of the work that is being offered for our graduate students at the Graduate Resource Center. We of course have our writing consultants and thesis reviewers; funding opportunities; and we'll be having webinars and in-person workshops. Please encourage your graduate students to engage with us when the library reopens. More information can be found at www.calstatela.edu/graduatestudies.

1.3 Senator Avramchuk yielded to D. Fazzi, AVP of Faculty Affairs: Good afternoon. I just wanted to share with the Academic Senate that our faculty recruitment and faculty applications will be moving to an online format for the 2022-23 Academic Year recruitments. We will be using the same system, CHRS (sometimes referred to as Page Up) as we currently use in HRM for staff and administrator positions. We are really looking forward to moving to a place where candidates can submit their employment application and all required materials for consideration in one place. We'll be using it in a simple form and allowing committees to read the information inside of CHRS. There are a lot of other functionalities that we hope to roll out as we get used to the system.

CONCERNS FROM THE
FLOOR

2. 2.1 Senator Riggio raised the following concern:
Dear Senators,
President Covino recently returned unsigned three policies, policies that were passed unanimously by FPC and passed by the Senate. All of these policies are consistent with the CBA (Diane Fazzi attends every FPC meeting and we are very sure that our new and modified policies are consistent with the Contract). The policies address faculty workload, and provide for due process rights for faculty in Letters of Reprimand and Disciplinary Action Procedures. These are policies that protect faculty and provide for fair procedures. The only reasons for not wanting faculty to know their fair workload and to not have due process rights in Reprimands and Disciplinary Action Procedures are bad faith reasons, reasons that are not based on positive outcomes for faculty, reasons that allow Administrators to ambush faculty and punish them without ever speaking with them first.
In his reason for returning the policies unsigned, President Covino indicated that “It is beyond the purview of the Academic Senate to create policy for items that address the terms and conditions of employment that were bargained for between the CFA and the CSU.” He says this without providing any legal or other foundation for this claim, and he says this in spite of the fact that our Senate has been making policies that address items that are bargained for and included in the Contract for decades. Our Faculty Handbook (and Faculty Handbooks and policies on every other CSU campus) currently contains policies that address items included in the Contract (including policies on Appointment, Sabbatical Leaves, Evaluation, Disciplinary Action Procedures, and others). Senators, please be aware this blow to our ability to function in any capacity on this campus. If we cannot create policies that address items included in the Contract, items essential to our working conditions, then we have no power at all and I’m not sure what the actual function of this Senate is. What are we going to make policy on? Does this mean our current Handbook policies that complement the Contract are invalid? President Covino, in this statement, is attempting to eliminate the power of the Academic Senate to make any meaningful campus policies, and is in effect creating a Wild, Wild West, with an invalid Handbook and a powerless Senate. Please join me in standing up against this gaslighting of the Senate and the false insistence that we cannot address issues contained in the Contract in our campus policies.

Dr. Fazzi provided clarification from the floor that her attendance at FPC that she did provide some guidance on reprimand and disciplinary procedure with some concerns noted and wanted to make sure that was clear.

- 2.2 Vice Chair Flint raised the following concern: Several years ago a change was made to when waitlists are purged. They used to be purged a few days before classes started, and now they are purged after 7 days of instruction. I understand the rationale for leaving the waitlists intact after classes start because it is common for students to drop classes. But 7 days seems too long. Students are staying on waitlists hoping to get in, often when there is very little chance, and then when the WLs are purged they start scrambling for other classes. But they are doing that at the end of the second week of the semester, which is way too late. Has enrollment management considered purging the WLs earlier?

M. Garcia, Executive Director of EM responded from the floor and advised that it is currently on the EPC agenda.

- 2.3 Senator Harris raised the following concern: We’re currently under a heat advisory and the majority of the water fountains on campus are on lockdown. I’m wondering how this issue is going to be resolved?

There was no response from the floor. Chair Bezdecny advised will follow up.

2.4 Senator Ramos raised the following concern: My concern is about the evaluation process for President Covino. We went from a 91% no confidence vote in May and a few months later, there is a 29% raise (\$102,000). I would like that explained because that evaluation does not make sense. If our Academic Senate has no role and no worth to the president, or the Board of Trustees, then I'm not sure what we're doing. I'd really like to see the connection between and affirmation of what our shared governance role is.

CONCERNS FROM THE
FLOOR (continued)

Chair Bezdecny responded from the floor.

2.5 Senator Talcott raised the following concern: I echo the concerns from Senators Riggio and Ramos. My concern overall and it's really just addressed to all of us faculty is that it's vital that if we want to build the best university we can for our students, ourselves, and staff colleagues, we've really got to get involved in pushing for a more transparent search process for the next president. It's really important that we take back the people's University, and that we talk and listen to each other about what we want in a new leader. So it this just a friendly call to action.

There was no response from the floor.

2.6 Senator Eleby raised the following concern: I would like to see if we can work together more offline and if anyone wants to take action on steering the ship, I'm on board.

3. Senator Riggio announced her intent to raise the following questions:
To: President Covino; University Counsel Victor King; Dr. Diane Fazzi, Faculty Affairs; CFA Chapter President Anthony Ratcliff; CFA Faculty Rights Chair Molly Talcott.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS

President Covino recently announced to Executive Committee of the Academic Senate at Cal State LA that "It is beyond the purview of the Academic Senate to create policy for items that address the terms and conditions of employment that were bargained for between the CFA and the CSU."

My questions are:

- 1) What is the legal or other foundational basis for President Covino's claim?
- 2) Faculty Handbooks and policies on every CSU campus contain policies that address items that involve terms and conditions of employment that were bargained for between the CFA and the CSU (e.g., policies on Appointment, Sabbatical Leaves, Evaluation, Disciplinary Action Procedures, and others). Are these existing campus and Handbook policies across the CSU campuses valid or invalid?
- 3) The current Cal State LA Faculty Handbook contains policies that address items that involve terms and conditions of employment that were bargained for between the CFA and the CSU (e.g., current Handbook policies on Appointment, Sabbatical Leaves, Evaluation, Disciplinary Action Procedures, and others). Are these existing policies in the Cal State LA Faculty Handbook valid or invalid?
- 4) The Preamble of the Collective Bargaining Agreement indicates that "the CSU and CFA recognize the unique roles and responsibilities of the Academic Senate(s)." Does this indicate that campus Academic Senates may make policies that are consistent with the CBA and which complement the CBA? If not, how so?
- 5) The CBA calls for "senate committees" to create rules and policies (e.g., Articles 12.16, 20.37). Doesn't this indicate that campus Academic Senates can create policies that are consistent with the CBA and which complement the CBA?
- 6) Article 12.16 in the CBA indicates that procedures will "remain in effect unless revised by the campus." Doesn't this language indicate that campus Senates can revise or add to policies and procedures outlined in the CBA?

4. It was m/s/p (Hanan) to approve the minutes of the meetings of May 10, 2022 (ASM 21-17; ASM 22-1).

APPROVAL OF THE
MINUTES

5. 5.1 It was m/s/ (DeShazo) to approve the agenda/

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA

5.2 It was m/s/ (Flint) to remove item 7 due to an oversight. No objections were raised.

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA (continued)

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: DEPARTMENT/
DIVISION CHAIRS AND
SCHOOL DIRECTORS,
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER III (22-2)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: PROBATION,
DISQUALIFICATION,
SPECIAL PROBATION, AND
READMISSION POLICY
FOR UNDERGRADUATE
STUDENTS, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER V
(22-3)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: GRADUATE
THESES AND PROJECTS,
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER V (22-4)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED NEW POLICY:
STUDENT MENTAL
HEALTH, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER III
(22-5)
First-Reading Item

ADJOURNMENT

- 5.3 The agenda was approved as amended.
6. Chair Bezdecny presented her report.
7. 7.1 It was m/s/ (Avramchuk) to approve the recommendation.
7.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
7.3 It was m/s/ (Flint) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes. No objections were raised.
8. It was m/s/ (Keslacy) to approve the recommendation.
9. 9.1 It was m/s/ (Ford-Baxter) to approve the recommendation.
9.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
9.3 It was m/s/ (Hanan) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes. No objections were raised.
9.4 It was m/s/ (Ulanoff) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes. No objections were raised.
10. 10.1 It was m/s/ (Larkins) to approve the recommendation.
10.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
11. It was m/s/p (Ford-Baxter) to adjourn at 3:13 p.m.