

J. Garrison

ABSENT

M. Talcott

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 Chair's announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 1.1.1 You are invited to attend the remaining Spring 21 Assessment Workshops:
- Building Better PLOs, Course and Curriculum Mapping – Friday, March 19, 11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
 - Taking it to the Next Level: Measuring Graduate Learning Outcomes – Tuesday, April 13, 11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

If you are unable to join but would like to view a recorded session and have access to the workshop material, please email Veena Prabhu vprabhu@calstatela.edu.

- 1.1.2 The following faculty members have been nominated for the two Senator-at-Large positions that will become available at the end of Spring, 2021:

Christopher Harris, A&L
Mohammed Abed, A&L
Michael Runnels, B&E
Anthony Hernandez, CCOE
Rebecca Joseph, CCOE
Sharon Ulanoff, CCOE
Valerie Talavera-Bustillos, COES
Melina Abdullah, COES
Elizabeth Winokur, HHS
Jessica DeShazo, NSS
Kirsten Fisher, NSS
Luis Nuno, NSS
Edith Porter, NSS
Molly Talcott, NSS
Paiza Stoothoff, LIB/SA
Jennifer Masunaga, LIB/SA
Kendall Faulkner, LIB/SA
Tiffanie Ford-Baxter, LIB/SA

Please note that ECST reported that they **did not have any nominations.*

A **petition notice** will be sent out **Wednesday, April 7 and will close on Tuesday, April 13** to allow for additional nominations for these two positions. The **university-wide election** will be held **April 14-20**.

- 1.1.3 A reminder that the Quasi Meeting of the Whole meeting will be next Tuesday, March 23, 1:45 – 3:45 p.m.

Chair Bettcher requested Senator Baaske to share the rules of a Quasi Meeting and the meeting topics received to date.

2. It was m/s/p (Warter-Perez) to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 2, 2021 (ASM 20-15).

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3. 3.1 It was m/s/ (Porter) to approve the agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

- 3.2 It was m/s/p (Wells) to move item 15: Concerns from the Floor and item 16: Intent to Raise Questions to the new items 4 and 5, respectively, and renumber the remaining items. (V: 40/9/6)

APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA
(continued)

CONCERNS FROM THE
FLOOR

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS

- 3.3 The agenda was approved as amended.
4. 4.1 Senator Wells raised the following concern: In light of today's vote, I would like to request that the Executive Committee move "Concerns from the Floor" and "Intent to Raise Questions" for subsequent meetings to before the "Approval of the Agenda".
Chair Bettcher responded from the floor.
- 4.2 Senator Esparza raised the following concern: I only recently received the text of the formal reply to the Intent to Raise Question that I introduced recently. I believe that the transcript is inaccurate and I would like to move to reconsider the approval of the minutes and strike that text for being inaccurate.
It was m/s/ (Esparza) to reconsider the approval of the minutes.
Debate ensued.
The Esparza motion failed. (V: 21/30/4)
5. 5.1 Senator Cristian Flores announced his intent to raise the following questions:
Many graduate students who are enrolled in full-time per university AND financial aid guidelines (those enrolled in 8 units or more but less than 12 units) only received HEERF II as if they were enrolled in classes as part-time students. My question is if HEERF II eligibility for graduate students was determined using undergraduate guidelines, whereas 12+ units is the equivalent to full-time enrollment. The students enrolled in 12+ units recorded full HEERF II funding. The reason this is of concern to me is due to the fact that many students who are enrolled in 8-11 units did not receive the full HEERF II funding despite the fact that they should be eligible per the guidelines listed on the website.
The HEERF II funding does not state a specific unit count criteria needed to be met to receive funding for graduate students versus undergraduate students. It only gives guidelines for enrollment status based on full-time, 3/4 time, 1/2 time, and 1/4 time. If the case is that the eligibility criteria is based upon the undergraduate enrollment unit count, this needs to be specified. To add, if it was based off of this, why was it not specified? If it wasn't, can this error be corrected?
- 5.2 Senator Bezdecny announced her intent to raise the following questions:
I am submitting this question on behalf of the NSS Graduate Studies Subcommittee. We have several non-resident graduate students on our campus. In a typical year, nearly-all of them would qualify for California residency that would allow them to pay in-state resident tuition that in their second year of study.
With COVID-19, many of those same students were not able to move to California to establish residency while they pursued their graduate degrees from our campus. This means that they will continue to be required to pay out-of-state tuition rates for 2021-2022. This effectively creates a COVID-tax for our non-resident graduate students who hope and plan to complete their degrees.
Every year, the university offers a limited number of non-resident tuition waivers for graduate students. Will the additional funds provided to the university by CARES/HEERF/ARPA/etc. be used to offset the tuition difference for those students who would have earned residency status in their second year, so that the students themselves do not have to bear the considerable increased cost of out-of-state tuition? If not, what is the rationale for not doing so?
- 5.3 Senator Krug announced his intent to raise the following questions:
Question 1:
The University has now posted three required quarterly reports detailing expenditures of the institutional CARES Act funding we received, nearly \$22 million. The 2nd quarter report originally posted on 12/18/2020 indicated over \$4.2 million was spent in the "other uses" category between 9/30 and 12/18, and specified those uses as:

“Campus services for student health and safety. Campus services that were modified due to COVID-19 and to comply with State and local mandatory safer-at-home orders”

This form was subsequently replaced on the website with a revision, inaccurately dated 12/18/20, which states that the \$4.2 million was instead spent on:

“Salary, benefits other costs for parking, housing campus programs modified to comply with local/state mandatory safer at home order and to reimburse for COVID related PPE”

- (A) Why was the original 2nd quarter form replaced with a different form providing a very different list of expenditures? Why was the replacement back-dated to 12/18/20, which was not the date this version of the form was made public?
- (B) Please clarify the actual nature of the expenditures for the \$4.2 million spent from October to December 2020. The list on the form is unintelligible, and two alternate explanations were provided to the community for a large amount of funding.
- (C) As stated on the form, **Institutional Portion funds may only be used “to cover any costs associated with significant changes to the delivery of instruction due to the coronavirus”**. Please clarify for the Senate how these expenditures related to changes in the delivery of instruction given our sustained campus closure.
- (D) The form asks that institutions “post additional documentation as appropriate” to substantiate their expenditures. Please provide such documentation to the Senate, given that conflicting reports generated uncertainty over the use of these funds.

Question 2:

The University has spent \$22 million in institutional CARES Act funding, and received an additional \$47 million in institutional HEERF II funds. These funds were awarded to cover changes in the delivery of instruction due to COVID-19.

- (A) What is the procedure for academic departments to request resources from HEERF II funds needed to return safely to in-person instruction?
- (B) What is the procedure for academic departments to request resources needed to enhance remote instruction from HEERF II funds?

6. Chair Bettcher advised the body that she did not have a report.

7. Nominations were accepted from the floor.

8. 8.1 Chair Bettcher reminded the body of the status of the policy on the floor and returned to the speaker’s list from the previous meeting.

8.2 It was m/s/ (Flint) to waive the First-Reading Item rules.

8.3 Chair Bettcher reminded the body of the Miscellaneous Rules related to waiving the First-Reading Items rules.

8.4 Debate ensued and the Flint motion was APPROVED. (V: 47/9/2)

8.5 Debate ensued and it was m/s/ (Albey) to insert in line 383 after “COMPETENCIES.” IF THERE IS NO ETHNIC STUDIES DEPARTMENT FOR ONE OF THESE GROUPS, COURSES THAT FOCUS ON ISSUES RELATED TO THAT ETHNIC GROUP WILL COUNT.

INTENT TO RAISE
QUESTIONS
(continued)

SENATE CHAIR’S REPORT

NOMINATIONS FOR TWO
POSITIONS ON THE
NOMINATIONS
COMMITTEE: CCOE AND
NSS, TERMS ENDING
SPRING 2024

PROPOSED POLICY MODI-
FICATION: DEFINITION,
PHILOSOPHY, STUDENT
LEARNING OUTCOMES
AND CRITERIA FOR
GENERAL EDUCATION
BREADTH REQUIREMENT
FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER IV (20-20)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: DEFINITION, PHILOSOPHY, STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND CRITERIA FOR GENERAL EDUCATION BREADTH REQUIREMENT FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (20-20)
(continued)

PROPOSED NEW POLICY: FACULTY TEACHING AND SUPERVISION RECORDS, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (20-21)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: DIRECTION OF GRADUATE THESES AND PROJECTS, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (20-23)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: PERSONNEL ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORT (PAR), FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (20-22)
First-Reading Item

PROPOSED POLICY DELETION: ENTRY LEVEL PROFICIENCY IN MATH AND ENGLISH, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (20-11)
Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: CURRICULAR POLICIES, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (20-13)
Second-Reading Item
Forwarded to the President

PROPOSED NEW POLICY: GRADING AND STUDENT FEEDBACK, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (20-14)
Second-Reading Item

ADJOURNMENT

- 8.6 Debate ensued and the Albey motion FAILED. (V: 14/38/3)
- 8.7 It was m/s/p (Hernandez) to call the question. (V: 38/13/5)
- 8.8 The recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 46/6/7)
- 8.9 It was m/s/ (Flint) to forward the policy ahead of the approval of the minutes. No objections were raised.
9. 9.1 It was m/s/ (Heubach) to approve the recommendation.
- 9.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
10. It was m/s/ (Chuck Flores) to approve the recommendation.
11. 11.1 It was m/s/ (Riggio) to approve the recommendation.
- 11.2 A five minute question and discussion period took place.
12. Debate ensued and the recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 37/3/9)
13. Debate ensued and the recommendation was APPROVED. (V: 44/3/3)
14. It was m/s/ (Hanan) to continue this as a Second-Reading Item at the next meeting. No objections were raised.
15. It was m/s/p (Riggio) to adjourn at 3:43 p.m.