

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
November 5, 2024

ASM 24-7 DRAFT

A. Natarani, A. Sarin, A. Carnevali, B. Baker, D. Beamer, G. Fried Amilivia, G. Simon-Cerejido, J. Garrison, K. Castillo, L. Chao, M. He, O. Bernal, R. Tagayuna, R. Vogel, S. Lopez, T. Bettcher, T. Meyerott, T. Jackson

ABSENT

J. Dennis

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Avramchuk convened the meeting at 1:48 p.m.

Senator Ramos read the Tongva land acknowledgement.

1. 1.1 Chair's announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1.1 I would to remind everybody that an email solicitation for nominations for the 2024-25 Outstanding Professor's Awards was sent on October 22. The Senate Office will accept nominations via email due by 5:00 p.m., Friday, November 15, 2024. Only the completed and signed nomination form is needed at this time. Please nominate your deserving colleagues. Any questions? Email AcademicSenate@calstatela.edu.

1.1.2 The results of our vote on the Academic Senate CSU Constitution Amendments Ratification to add three designated lecturer faculty positions to the ASCSU:
Yes = 112 votes (78%)
No = 32 votes (22%)
1466 votes were sent out.

1.2 Senator Rodriguez announced: Just a reminder that all faculty should have received a newsletter from the Library last week providing updates on services collections. There was also an announcement regarding the Library collections budget reduction that the Library is planning for. A website has been created that provides more background information about some of the resources that we're considering for cancellation. Also, a reminder that the Library will be hosting a townhall on Wednesday, November 20, 3:00-4:00 p.m. on Zoom. If you haven't received the information, it is available on the Library website.

2. The following questions/concerns were raised from the floor:

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- The Library collections budget redirection – are we losing access to journals and replacing with similar journals or does it mean that there's a redundancy?
- Do we have a timeline for the master plan and how we're (department or college) going to participate?
- We don't have a lot of student voice in the Academic Senate and is there is any representation from ASI.

Responses were provided by Senator Rodriguez, Senator Ford, VP Lindow and Chair Avramchuk.

3. None.

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

4. It was m/s/p (DeShazo) to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 22, 2024 (ASM 24-6)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

5.2 It was m/s/ (Oropeza Fujimoto) to add "Academic Senate Resolution Condemning the Expansion of Administrative Policies Undermining the Right to Peaceful Campus Protest" as a First Reading Item and new item 10.

5.3 Debate ensued. No objections were raised for the Oropeza Fujimoto motion.

5.4 It was m/s/ (Harris) to move the Proposed Policy Deletion: Library Cubicles from the table and place it on the agenda as item 7. No objections were raised.

5.5 The agenda was approved as amended.

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

PROPOSED POLICY
DELETION: LIBRARY
CUBICLES, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VIII
(24-3)

Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

PROPOSE POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: POLICY ON
ELECTIONS, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER II
(24-6)

Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

PROPOSED POLICY MOD-
IFICATION: ELECTRONIC
RECORDING OF CLASS-
ROOM LECTURES AND
CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES,
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER V (22-18.2)

First-Reading Item

ACADEMIC SENATE
RESOLUTION CONDEMN-
ING THE EXPANSION OF
ADMINISTRATIVE
POLICIES UNDERMINING
THE RIGHT TO PEACEFUL
CAMPUS PROTEST

First-Reading Item

ADJOURNMENT

6. Chair Avramchuk presented his report.
7.
 - 7.1 Debate ensued
 - 7.2 The recommendation was APPROVED. (V:33/1/3)
8. The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 35/0/5)
9.
 - 9.1 It was m/s/ (Larkins) to approve the recommendation.
 - 9.2 A five-minute question and discussion period took place took place.
 - 9.3 It was m/s/(Baaske) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes. No objections were raised.
10.
 - 10.1 It was m/s/ (Wells) to approve the proposal.
 - 10.2 The body was given time to read the proposed resolution prior to discussion.
 - 10.3 A five-minute question and discussion period took place
 - 10.4 It was m/s/ (Larkins) to extend the question and discussion period for an additional five minutes. No objections were raised.
 - 10.5 It was agreed that the authors would make editorial changes to the document prior to the next meeting when it becomes a Second-Reading Item.
11. It was m/s/p (Ramos) to adjourn at 3:28 p.m.