



Academic Senate • 1000 E. Victoria • Carson, CA 90747 • WH-A420 • (310) 243-3312

Academic Senate Meeting Approved Minutes

October 14, 2020

Voting Members Present: Allen, Brandt, Buffaloe, Chaparro, Chhetri, Chiappe, Deng, Eames, Fortner, Gasco, Gray-Shellberg, Hernandez, Jarrett, Hill, A. Johnson, Kalayjian, Kitching, Kuwabara, Laurent, Ledesma, Ma, Macias, Malladi, McGlynn, Naynaha-Gill, Nguyen, Nicol, Park, Pederson, V. Price, Raianu, Roback, Salehin, Sanford, Skiffer, Spruill, Stang, Supernaw, Turner, Vieira

Voting Members Not Present: Dixon, Kulikov, Morris, Pawar

Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Anderson, Anger, Ares, Heinze Balcazar, Norman, Ospina, Parham, Russo, Talamante, Thomas, Weary

Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Celly (sabbatical)

Standing Committee Chairs Present (Voting Ex-Officio): Boroan, Caffrey Gardner, Heinze Balcazar, Mancillas, Naynaha

Standing Committee Chairs Not Present (Voting Ex-Officio): Macias

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Avila, Barrett, Brasley, Caron, Costino, Franklin, Hutton, Koos, LaPolt, O'Donnell, Ortega, C. Peyton, J. Price, D. Roberson, Spagna, Wen

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Manriquez, McNutt, Poltorak, Wallace

Guests: E. Arrunategui, D. Brandon, D. Chonwerawong, J. Hart, J. Kimmitt, L. Martinez, Z. Padilla, N. Rodriguez, R. Rios, S. Valdez, S. Wood

2020-2021 Academic Senate Executive Committee:

Academic Senate Chair, Laura Talamante; Vice Chair, Ivonne Heinze Balcazar; Parliamentarian, Hal Weary; Secretary, Dana Ospina; EPC Chair, Salvatore (Sam) Russo; FPC Chair, Terri Ares; NTT Representative, Rita Anderson; Statewide Senators, Kirti Celly (sabbatical) and Thomas Norman; Previous Senate Chair – Charles Thomas

Recorded and Edited by SEW and the Executive Committee

Chair Talamante called the meeting to order.

Land Acknowledgement Statement of the Tongva people was read by Chair Talamante

Talamante noted that the agenda was amended since it was sent out. Changes include under Second Reading items; the distance and hybrid learning committee resolution were renamed online and hybrid learning committee resolution. Additionally, a few items were added to the chairs report. Amended agenda was approved.

Two corrections were put forth for the September 30th meeting minutes. Both Dean Peyton and Dean LaPolt were present at the 9/30 meeting, the draft of the minutes that was sent out was inaccurate. Minutes from September 16, 2020 were approved. Amended minutes from September 30, 2020 were approved.

Senate Chair Report:

Talamante noted that there were only three more Senate meetings to the Semester after that meeting. 10/28, 11/18, 12/2.

Chair Talamante invited Senate Secretary/Digital Initiatives Librarian Ospina to share about Open Access Week. **Ospina** said she had sent out an announcement via DH mail letting folks know that the university Library will be participating in [Open Access Week](#) starting Monday, October 19th. Within the link will be a full suite of primarily a synchronous content to share with you. There will be one synchronous event a Black Lives Matters, Wikipedia Edit a THON, and there is an enrollment limit for that so interested students should enroll soon. If additional information is needed, Ospina offered her email address dospina@csudh.edu.

Talamante then discussed seeing a call for faculty feedback from the Chancellor's office for the CSU General Education Breath Requirements revision. She believes it to be a call for feedback as a response to not only DH's resolution but also those that passed at CSUN, as well as San Francisco State University. Talamante did a share screen and provided a visual of the request to the Senate. She highlighted one of the proposed revisions was under Lower Division General Education breath requirements, looking at the addition of Area F. She noted that the proposed change is to create subsections A through F, with F being the new Ethnic Studies designation and requirement in General Education that they are proposing here. Talamante explained that as senators, to go back to your departments and ask for their feedback, and then send that feedback to either herself at academicsenatechair@csudh.edu or the Senate Coordinator Susanne Walker at swalker@csudh.edu. Talamante then displayed the feedback form that the Chancellor's office is asking that the Senate office use to correlate and synthesize feedback. Talamante pointed out that we are required to put in who on this campus provided feedback. She noted that the date feedback is due is November 2 to the Chancellor's office. Talamante said the next academic senate meeting is October 28th and she would like any feedback before that meeting. Talamante informed Senators that the CSUDH Senate would like feedback on all the areas that the Chancellor's office made changes in which include the changes to Title V, the creation of Area F, the recommendation that these be Lower Division GE courses to fulfill the Ethnic Studies requirement.

Q&A/Comments:

Senator Malladi said to create Area F they're cutting key units from Area D, which is where the economics courses are housed. Malladi asked who makes that call to cut from Area D? Why not some other Area? He wanted to know if this was irreversible. **Talamante** responded she understood his question completely and that is where we want feedback to say why Area D, why does it need to be placed in one Area over another?

Senator Gray Shellberg asked if there is some place that she can access that all the information is together with exactly what feedback is being asked. **Talamante** said she will follow up today's meeting with the necessary documents for people and outline how we would like the feedback to come. She said that Senators can send feedback in the form of a Word document and Talamante noted, she will lay all that information out in the email.

Senator Sexton noted that it was her first Senate meeting and asked when Senators go back to their departments, what would they be sharing with them? The resolution? And when asking professors within the departments to provide comments, would they submit one comment for each department? Are we able to receive every comment from all the professors within the department? **Talamante** requested to put it in one document. **Sexton** asked once feedback is received what is the ideal timeline. **Talamante** said she would like it by the 28th.

Parliamentarian Report

Senate Parliamentarian Hal Weary provided results for the following [through Survey Monkey], electronic ballot elections.

Calls for Service that were still open:

Faculty Policy Committee – a representative from COE

Educational Policy Committee – representatives from COE and CAH

Non-Tenure Track Advisory Board - a representative from the CFA

Senate election results are as follows.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Advisory Board:

CHHSN - Meka Brown with 71.4% of the vote.

CAH – Paul Fornelli with 85.7% of the vote.

CNBS – Erin Barrett with 57.1% of the vote.

CBAPP – Mike Grimshaw with 71.4% of the vote.

CEIE – Steven Schuelka (unopposed)

Coach – John Bonner (unopposed)

Library – Aric Haas (unopposed)

GE Committee (two faculty from different colleges):

CNBS - Christopher Hallenbrook with 59.5% of the vote.

CHHSN - Annalynn Valdez Dadia with 51.4% of the vote.

Search Committee for Athletics Director (two candidates):

CHHSN - Gioella Chaparro with 48.6% of the vote.

Coach - Jalessa Ross with 73% of the vote.

Toro Team for Learning & Instruction Committee

CNBS – Monique Turner

Chair Talamante thanked the Parliamentarian for his efforts. She explained that in terms of the Non-Tenure Track Advisory Board, the charge for that did not indicate who would do the elections for it. She said that they'll be working on updating the Non-Tenure Track Advisory Board charge to include as ex officio voting members and the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Senators, which was accidentally overlooked. Talamante noted that she and the current Parliamentarian consulted with previous parliamentarians about voting and determined not to have senators vote because this is a body that is an advisory board representing non tenure track faculty. The voting was sent out to Non-Tenure Track faculty on campus to choose their representatives for that Advisory Board. **Senator Gray Shellberg** asked if she could put her name forth as the CFA representative to the Non-Tenure Track Advisory Board. **Chair Talamante** said that the charge would have to be consulted but she believed CFA will be appointing that faculty member. **Dr. Skiffer** said that CFA had received an email from Dr. Weary to provide some recommendations and they would like to give that opportunity to a person who's a Non-Tenure Track faculty member. **Dr. Gray Shellberg** said in addition to being an Emeriti, she is also a Non-Tenure Track faculty member as she is teaching several classes this semester. **Dr. Skiffer** suggested that Senator Gray Shellberg send an email to her and they'll put

it before the CFA Steering Committee for a vote. **Chair Talamante** thanked everyone who has stepped up for these committees. She pointed out that there were a lot of people willing to serve and that is really a healthy sign for shared governance on our campus.

Second Reading

EPC 20-16 Revision of the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Policy, EPC Chair, Sam Russo

Motion was made and accepted to bring the resolution to the floor for a Second Reading. Russo noted that the changes were minimal since the First Reading. He provided a high-level overview of the resolution. He noted that recent studies in pedagogy and in the discipline has demonstrated that big stakes testing is not the preferred way to test writing competence. We're looking to have writing competence be tested within the departments themselves, rather than through a test. Departments are going to essentially have akin to the writing intensive courses now, courses be designated as fulfilling the GWAR requirement with a C or better in order to satisfy the requirement.

UWC Chair Naynaha explained that one of the things that they've confronted in the UWC, because they've been having conversations for years, they recognize they have these kind of internal blind spots and kind of know what their assumptions and expectations are but then realizing it's not specifically articulated in the document. Naynaha said she would like to recommend a change to the Second Reading being displayed in 3.3.4 to clarify that "if in the future, a graduate program would like to add an additional requirement in their area for GWAR certification, it would simply need to meet the same standards as what we've articulated as the requirements for a GWAR certifying course, right now." Naynaha explained it would be the same as the requirements which are articulated in detail at the end of the document for undergraduate GWAR certifying courses, they would be designed and developed and implemented for a graduate level course. Expectations would be advanced for student performance in those courses. But those details would be determined by the graduate programs themselves and not articulated within the policy itself. She added that they wanted to make sure in case a program did want to add an additional requirement for GWAR certification in their area, it was clear that they meet the same stipulations as what we've outlined for bar certifying courses at the undergraduate level. Naynaha said There are no additional changes or requirements for certifying courses at the graduate level, clearly it would be simply an additional level of advancement and sophistication in terms of how the course itself is designed.

Motion was made to vote on the additional language recommended by UWC Chair Naynaha. Under 3.3.5 the language would now read: "If in the future a graduate program would like to add an additional requirement for GWAR certification in their area it would need to meet the requirements for GWAR certifying courses at the undergraduate level."

Chair Talamante explained the procedure for voting via Zoom.

1. Senators would remain in the "main room" to vote via poll on amended language.
2. All else would go into the breakout rooms until invited back.

Talamante invited comments in favor or against the amended language:

Russo said the additional language adds flexibility and prevents constantly having to revise this resolution? Should graduate programs make any changes going in the future? It's a sensible resolution that prevents having the Council from having to go back to the drawing board and have a graduate program makes any sort of changes or adds additional requirements for certification. **Senator Naynaha** said the point here is just clarification so we don't have to go back to the drawing board if a graduate program chooses to add an additional GVAR certification requirement in the future. It doesn't affect the policy in any other way. **Senator Khondaker** asked when somebody is coming to the graduate program, they must do either GMAT or GRE, why is that the need that a graduate program would need an additional GVAR certification? **Naynaha** responded it's not required, only if a particular program wished to add an additional requirement. **Khondaker** asked why would that program require an additional? **Naynaha** explained we've always granted graduate programs leeway in determining if they felt that requirements above and beyond the general standard across campus, were required for acceptance and progress in their programs. We have always granted that freedom to our graduate programs to determine what their standards are for performance. If no existing graduate programs do that, this amendment simply intends to address if a graduate program were to decide to do so in the future. **Talamante** added this isn't requiring any change by graduate programs. That would be something that program would debate among their faculty, it's not for us to debate on the floor of the senate, why they might want additional requirements. This just adds the possibility that a program could decide they wanted their requirements to be above and beyond the GVAR assessment. **Senator Sexton** asked if we grant graduate programs the freedom to add additional writing requirements, how do we assess at Senate or somewhere within the university, to ensure that whatever they're adding does not exclude and that it doesn't create inequities for some communities that might be considered disadvantage. **Talamante** responded we do have a Graduate Council and they are a standing committee of the Senate. She said the thought that would be the appropriate place along with the University Writing Committee to address these kinds of questions. **Senator Hill** added in response to the question why would a program want to do such a thing? An example might be in a professional program that wants to see some particular type of professional writing that's not addressed in normal admissions materials. The question was called to vote on the amended language. 43 in favor, 2 against and 3 abstention. **The amended language is accepted into the resolution.**

EPC Chair Russo noted they're not looking at any real changes since the last time this document presented before Senate. Barring any questions from the floor, Russo said he would be comfortable looking for a motion to call the question and bring the document forward. Motion was made and seconded.

Resolution passes: 44 in favor, 3 against and 4 abstentions

Second Reading

FPC 20-14 Evaluating Faculty Performance Disrupted by the COVID-19 Pandemic

FPC Chair Terri Ares

A motion and accepted was made to bring the resolution to the floor for a Second Reading. Ares then reviewed the updates that were made to the resolution after the last Senate meeting. Three major changes since the First Reading included: several areas where the language was updated to achieve more precision, for example, in the third resolved, and in Section 2.7. Most of the precision is related to using the correct language for evaluations that involve tenure track and tenured folks and the language that's used around evaluations for non-tenure track faculty. The

second update is in 2.6, this is a new section that was added for at the request of our Library faculty colleagues to outline specific and unique issues to them, similar to what had been done with the counseling faculty. The next major update is 2.7 which was to update and clearly identify that this particular policy would actually kick in to effect for the next academic year, not the current academic year, due to difficulties that would be created by attempting to implement something in the middle of a review cycle.

Chair Talamante asked FPC Chair Ares to be the first to speak. Talamante explained that after the September 30th Senate meeting, she had sent out an email late that night, and while its intentions were for the benefit of faculty, its impact caused stress on those who were putting their files in, or who had already submitted their files. Talamante noted it also caused stress for Deans, Chairs, and RTP committee members and for our AVP of Faculty Affairs, Cheryl Koos, for which Talamante apologized. She further stated that “intentions do not override impact.” Talamante said it did though yield a productive meeting from Senate Exec’s end in terms of having Provost Spagna reach out to us and inviting Senate Exec and AVP Koos to put together a joint statement. Additionally, Talamante noted, there was a Faculty Chat Zoom meeting last week and FPC Chair Ares also reached out to the Untenured Faculty Organization and what was understood from faculty who were stressed by this is that they were afraid that if they didn’t include something in their file about the impact of COVID-19, that would somehow be held against them and that they wouldn’t get the same kind of reading of their files. Talamante said while it cannot be implemented during an RTP cycle to affect those who are already in that cycle by our regulations; what we all agree is the purpose of this resolution is that it still could be used for how to read files. It emphasizes points made by AVP Koos and Provost Spagna which is that this is an exceptional time and people are under exceptional stress, and that we want to keep a holistic and humane reading. Talamante said in that sense, although it cannot be applied until it is passed as policy, we hope that the suggestions for things to consider as RTP readers will be helpful.

Senator Chiappe said she had another faculty member, contacted her about some issues for him or herself. One issue had to do with travel to conferences and since funds aren’t really guaranteed after this year, asking for us to pay out of pocket 100% for attendance and presentations towards our RTP doesn’t seem appropriate. The other concern was brought to Senator Chiappe was that we don’t necessarily do lab work and it’s become more difficult for us to do applied research in person in K through 12. school settings. **Senate Chair Talamante** asked FPC Chair Ares if she could respond. **Talamante** said that would be in the resolution in terms of the encouragement that faculty who are in departments that update the RTP guidelines, that they add an agenda, because an agenda would only be applied in exigent circumstances such as these. For each field that has those kinds of particulars that you would then be able to address that as part of files going in next year. The addenda could be approved and go through the process that they have to be for updating anything to RTP guidelines, and that all faculty next year would understand how their department is addressing those kinds of issues where research can’t just immediately be picked up. **Senator Chiappe** said for those addendas, how did how does that work? And who do we speak to about those issues? **Talamante** responded you would take it back to your departments and then there’s a process. Talamante added if you see the joint statement by Talamante and AVP Koos, it addresses suggestions for departments to go through and what the process is to get RTT guidelines updated. **Senator Khondaker** stated he sees there’s a line this

resolution that the policy will be in effect for the 2021 22 review cycle. Does that mean it doesn't does not apply for 20 2021 academic year for which we are being evaluated? **FPC Chair Ares** said yes, that's correct. Ares added that primarily for the reason that the cycle is already underway. The majority of individuals being reviewed have already submitted their materials. The reviewers have already completed their training. And so, upon further reflection and discussion, it appeared to be more disruptive to attempt to apply some of these philosophies and approaches to the year that's currently already underway. The idea is that we will have the start date the next academic year and we'll have some time then to have these discussions at our department and school levels, as well as training for reviewers for next year. **Senator Kuwabara** said she during the First Reading they had provided the comment asking what type of documents or evidence is necessary and she does not see anything added to the to the Second Reading. Kuwabara asked whether these would be addressed in a future edit. And an additional question is this document applied to tenured faculty who is going up to full professor? **Ares** responded the issue of specific documentation was discussed and it was the understanding through our discussions that to be that specific, and a policy was not really possible. And again, these are more local level discussions. And if that's helpful to put that level of detail in a departmental addenda to the RTP standards, or to the lecturer standards, then that can be done at the local level. Ares continued in terms of your second question, the short answer is yes, it applies all the way through the process. She explained the language in section 2.7 indicates that the policy would continue in the future until the pandemic effects have resolved and faculty working through the pandemic have attained their next temporary appointment, which, speaking directly to the non tenure track faculty, and tenure or promotion milestones talking specifically about the tenure track faculty. **Senator Nicol** asked regarding the guidelines that were sent out by Chair Talamante and AVP Koos, has that document gone out to the entire faculty or did it just go out to the senators? **Talamante** responded it went out to the entire faculty. **Nicol** said she wanted to make sure that folks who have put in files or who are putting up a file, a developmental plan or whatever, would be apprised of the ability to write a rebuttal if necessary. And so as long as that's been made clear, she said she doesn't see any problem with the resolution as it is. Nicol said she would have liked to have seen a little bit more specificity in terms of what is required, however she understands this is case by case because her departmental standards are different than someone else's departmental standards. She said she just wanted to make sure that there was some assurance for people who are currently in the middle of the process that everyone was aware of the suggestions. **Chair Talamante** noted that both Provost Spagna and AVP Koos are there and that is messaging that can be continued. She said if they didn't see that email, it can be messaged again. The question was called and seconded. 41 in favor, 1 against and 4 abstentions.

Resolution FPC 20-14 passes

Second Reading

EPC 20-13 Online & Hybrid Learning Committee Resolution (OHLC), EPC Chair Sam Russo

Motion was made to bring the resolution to the floor which was seconded. Russo explained that this resolution we saw essentially in same form of content at the last senate meeting for the creation of the now "online" and hybrid learning committee. Adding the word "online" was one of the changes and seems more straightforward a term than distance and hybrid. Russo explained that the other change was added to the rationale, explaining why it is the committee is going to be coming forward. It's from the recommendations of the task force and their report dated March

20, 2019 so we are fulfilling the requests and suggestions of that task force that such committee be able to oversee, essentially, online or hybrid courses and the university. The other change from last time was in Section 2.0, is the OHLC be integrated a function integral part of the university curriculum review process. We're making it clear that this is going to be a part of the curriculum review process. The approval of courses for Online and Hybrid modality shall be delineated by the University Curriculum Committee in consultation with college curriculum committees, the General Education Committee (if appropriate), and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies should matters relating to online and hybrid courses come forth. Also added was in Section 4.0 under membership, the OHLC faculty co-chair will receive appropriate reassigned time understanding that OHLC will bring with it a significant amount of work and the work should be recognized through the form of reassigned time that the faculty member on the committee will be able to actually carry out the duties required of them. Additional new language falls under 4.4.1 and 4.4.2, deals with the staggered terms. Terms of one year in order to set up staggered terms will begin with faculty from the CAH, CHHSN, and the Library. After the initial one-year term, newly elected faculty from these colleges and the Library shall serve for two-year terms until the next election cycle. Section 4.4.2 CBAPP, COE, and CNBS shall serve two-years terms before the next election cycle. The new language in section 5.0 just clarifies that OHLC will make recommendations and reports available to senate and the executive committee as they are prepared. The question was called and seconded. 46 in favor, 1 against and 2 abstentions.

EPC 20-13 Resolution passes

President's Report

Appreciation: President Parham thanked everyone for all of their work they continue to do on behalf of our students to ensure that they are provided with the best we can do in a first in class educational, both academic and co-curricular experience.

Moment of Silence: The President asked for a moment of silence. He said he was profoundly impacted the other day with the news that one of our sister campus presidents, Dr. Tom Jackson, and his wife Mona, their son was tragically killed in a car accident last week. His name was TJ. Parham reported they held a remote service yesterday via Zoom. He asked that we share a moment of silence in honor of a young man who has gone way too soon, at little over 20 years of age. Parham asked that we offer prayers in support of both President Jackson and his wife, Mona, and the whole community at Humboldt State University. The President said he hopes everyone is staying healthy and well as we continue to navigate through this horrendous pandemic that continues to exert its ugly head.

Accreditation in the College of Education: Parham said he had a great visit with the accreditation team and visit. Parham said he celebrates Interim Dean Hutton and that team of faculty there who have represented both that college and this campus very well. He said the preparation and his meeting with that team of site visitors was monumental. He said he really appreciate that and what folks have done and it follows a lot of good work we've done in lots of academic areas across the campus. He added it's just further evidence of the excellence we continue to produce as a Toro Nation.

Spring 2021 Plan: Parham noted that was are about to send forth to the Chancellor's Office for review and sign off are our academic year, spring 2021 plan. He first wanted to reemphasize a couple pieces that are important as we continue to move forward. He said as you recall, the CSU

system was almost first in the nation as a System to announce that we would be going principally virtual in the fall 2020. He said the target he set for folks was to come in somewhere between about 2% and 5%, and the faculty through their wonderful work came in about 4%, which is I think, is what we could manage and what we can do given a whole range of other variables and factors. Parham continued since the Chancellor a few of weeks ago announced that we would be going principally virtual in the spring. We are now being asked to submit a plan as well for the academic year, spring semester of 2021. Led by Ken O'Donnell and another team of people who are working with that, we're in the process of filling that out. All preliminary support for some of that suggests that the numbers have come in a little higher, and are encroaching up over the 8% round. He said he has sent back a note to say that we're he's comfortable as a president is in a 2% to 5% range. He noted he's trying not to be like other presidents who have said zero, and not going to the realm where some have gone as high as maybe 14% or 15%, which he thinks is way too much. Parham noted we continue to exist in LA County, where the numbers have gone from the red back up to purple range. And so COVID is not even close to gone and the vulnerability of our population, particularly the demographics, suggests that we need to exercise a high degree of prudence and care in managing our activities going forward. Parham said he's looking forward to both the Vice Provost and that team, working together to bring that number down so that we can submit to the Chancellor's Office in consultation with public health a metric that'll look something that parallels what we did in the fall.

Athletics Director Search: Parham then spoke about recruiting for a brand new athletic director for the campus that'll take our athletic program in a new direction and to new heights. He thanked the prior athletic director for his support and service to the campus and for the contributions that he was able to make. Parham expressed his support for moving forward, as we look to create a new era of athletic success, bolstered by the academic success of our athletes, that'll be real important. Parham thanked VP Franklin and his team for helping usher in that endeavor.

Polling Center/Vote: Parham then spoke about his announcement he sent out almost two weeks ago encouraging folk to vote. He said we knew we were going to be a voting center and a polling place but because the county hadn't quite signed off on the plan yet, we could not actually announce the polling place. However, those announcements should be out now, and he reminded colleagues in the Academic Senate that this campus will be a voting place. We will be open for 11 days from October 24, through November 3, Election Day, when the polls will close. He said during that 11 day period, we look forward to folks exercising their constitutionally guaranteed right to go and vote. He noted that he in fact will be dropping off his ballot in person on campus, rather than mailing it in because he is very proud of that effort and the fact that our campus is connected to the community in that way.

Parham noted that we are in the midst of putting the team together to participate in the current GI 2025 conference that has been held system wide. He noted we'll do that virtually this year. Parham said he is very excited about some of the new endeavors that we are trying to put in place to make sure that we can hit our marks and that our metrics match. He added that the aspirational nature of our goals and wanting to make sure that we are not only getting our students in but getting through and helping them thrive once they do finish in that space. He said we're trying to learn what we can share best practice, share some of the things we're doing, and

learn as we go along. He wanted everyone to know that we are still committed to that GI2025 endeavor. He said he is looking forward to that conference and what we will bring back.

Parham said as part of our continuing visibility in this LA region, Cal State University Dominguez Hills in conjunction with the Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation (LAEDC), will be hosting the next iteration of our series called Future Forums. Future Forum is happening on October 15th and will highlight the future of entertainment. Parham said it is always a chance for him to highlight different elements of our academic core. And at this conference the Arts and Humanities he'll have a chance to speak on. Parham said given the list of participants, and the cohort of people that we have a chance to get in front of, he thinks it's a major kudos to campus and what we provide. Parham said he always looks forward to showcasing the campus and watching people's mouths drop when they say "I didn't know the mainsail did that."

Senate Chair Talamante thanked the President offered her condolences on behalf of the Senate. She asked that he convey those wishes to President Jackson and his family. **President Parham** said he had already done so and that they're waiting on him to arrive back in Humboldt as they were in South Dakota at his prior location. Parham noted that once he's back, we'll have a letter from President Parham and this campus and a plan for something to plan to provide a loving memory.

Provost Report

Provost Spagna said following up with the news that the President shared at the top of his report, he expressed gratitude and heartfelt thanks to the entire College of Education community led by Lisa Hutton. He noted that former Dean Davis also had a critical role. He also appreciated the chairs, all the faculty, the staff, in getting a preliminary report of full accreditation from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Spagna noted that the College of Ed plays critical role in student's success. He said if we don't have teachers that are well prepared as the college moves forward with trying to put together racial equity lenses with which the teachers to go out into the community, it makes our work, basically undoable without world class teachers. He stated the College of Ed just reaffirmed again, how stellar they are.

The Provost then spoke about sensitivity to COVID-19 and the RTP process. He offered his gratitude and thanks to the entire Academic Senate Exec Committee, who starting this summer, were in conversations and in particular with Chair Talamante and FPC Chair Ares, they did and continue to do a fabulous job. The Provost said hear directly from him, and along with the President, and he's going to message this consistently and constantly, that we have do three things as we go forward with evaluating and supporting our colleagues. One is that all of the evaluation should be holistic, meaning you shouldn't look at anything in separation from other things; you also have to show quite a degree a level of both empathy and being humane in terms of how you view this. He said he and the President will be overseeing this entire process this time as people go through this cycle, to make sure that as people have been struggling with getting their research agendas taken care, doing creative activity, trying to work and teaching and alternate environments, all of this stuff has a direct impact on probably the most important job we have, which is sitting with our colleagues and trying to promote them. The Provost reiterated, "As I say to new faculty when we welcome them into the campus, we brought you into the

family for a purpose, you belong here, we want to support you. And believe me, I will say as Provost, and also with your president attendance, we're going to make sure we do everything to keep those faculty thriving in this environment." The Provost continued we will have this policy coming into play for the next cycle and will be applying this in this cycle in terms of making sure people embrace those kinds of perspectives as they go through all their levels of review. The Provost offered in response to something Senator Nicol said earlier, all of these decisions have to be driven by the department with disciplinary lenses. He explained as you're looking at within the Department of Biology, or Africana Studies, or chemistry, what does it mean in terms of productivity and support for our colleagues, you have to bring that to bear in terms of your conversations internally to make sure that this is equitable, it's supportive. He added the last thing he wanted to say is that this was not just a disruption for this time period and then we magically go back to being able to do the functions we normally do. The Provost said he believes this is going to be borne out over several years. He said we have to apply that sensitivity and empathy as we review files going forward for several years.

The Provost said there's a new initiative for returning to campus system in place. He noted we're trying to streamline what we do. He thanked Nora Garcia and Larry Kimaara in terms of the work they're doing to try and make it easier to put in requests and be able to affirm those.

The Provost said there was a request at the last senate meeting, where ASI VPAA Blake Anger brought forward an issue related to how can students not be confused by how we are using the designation of courses? This was followed up then by one of our colleagues in child development, that wanted to know what are our plans with this, and if there's a way that the faculty can be involved in this. The Provost then asked Vice Provost O'Donnell to address this issue to share what he has done so far with ASI leadership, and addressing the notion of how we could expand this so that everybody in our community, particularly faculty, and staff, are aware of how we decipher and what does it mean to be synchronous or asynchronous? How can students make choices related to the catalog? The Provost said that then ASI VP Anger can follow up on this with her report. **Vice Provost O'Donnell** said he did speak with ASI last week, and what he and ASI VP Anger saw was that it takes only about a minute to explain how the schedule display works, so that people can see clearly where they're expected to be. O'Donnell said that one of the ideas that he and Anger floated was that instead of convening a separate meeting for this they might just record a brief YouTube clip and then post it widely so that people can see it on their own time on how to read and understand the schedule. O'Donnell said a lot of it is reflected in footnotes and other language on screen but people don't always think to look there or understand what supersedes what. O'Donnell asked if there was anything VP Anger wished to add. **Anger** said that the presentation that the Vice Provost gave to ASI Board of Directors was very informative. She added it was super easy to understand it took less than a minute for him to explain the difference between asynchronous and synchronous courses. She said she believed that the YouTube video would be more beneficial to students than a town hall because if it is after hours, they can go to the YouTube link and access that information. The Provost said we want to make sure that this is something that's consolidated, we give access to our whole community. He said he appreciates that the students responded positively and wants faculty we brought in as well. And there is a fashioning of this that we're going to continue to have as a conversation to make sure that again, the aim here is not to be confusing it's to really

guide people in choices and to bring faculty perspectives in, in terms of this is kind of how we do synchronous and asynchronous instruction.

Chair Talamante said that around having conversations at the faculty level, and understanding student experiences, she knows we've been fielding some emails at Senate Exec and taking that conversation back into the Toro Team for Instruction and Learning around students experiences in asynchronous courses. Talamante thanked Dean Wen for responding to his faculty, who also began a discussion around feedback they've been receiving from students about their experiences in asynchronous courses, and what their expectations are, and what are some of the best practices. Talamante commented she thought it a great model for thinking at the other college levels how we can get more student feedback, and also to educate what a synchronous can mean which is very different from a synchronous course and that may also help with some of the expectations of students but also the practices of professors as they move forward into this second semester of online learning.

ASI Report

VP of Academic Affairs, Blake Anger gave the following narrative of an experience she had in her virtual classroom in the CBAPP Department. She noted that their professor this past week, said that there was an exam posted on Wednesday and that there would be an exam on Friday with two essay questions. Anger said it was vague. She added they didn't know if they needed to cite the book given, give examples or anything. She said he also instructs the class to ask exam questions in the discussion for him to answer on Wednesday. She said that students replied between Wednesday and Friday and did not hear anything back from the professor. She noted that everyone was very concerned because now they have to take the test not knowing what our exact instructions are. She said the professor responds to everyone's questions after the exam, and he specifies everything. The exams are graded less than 24 hours. Anger noted she got a C, a 175 out of what she believes to be 220. Anger said she is a 3.7 student overall. She said she is trying to maintain it to graduate this semester, with *magna cum laude* honors. She said she reached out to the professor, as a student, and not as an ASI representative and sent a very lengthy email. She noted the response she received was very brief and did not address her by name. However, Anger noted, the professor wanted to know what other students she was speaking on behalf of. Anger said she did not reply because she felt that that's not the communication, she believes students deserve, especially in this virtual environment. Anger said she's been on the honors list since her freshman years and so she was very disturbed and wanted to share with Academic Senate because although we are virtual, this can affect a retention rate. Anger said if she were a freshman, and a professor replied to her like this, she might feel like the professor did not care about her or her grades. She noted she loves to tell people to go to Dominguez Hills and that she really appreciates the faculty there and that you can go to them for everything and that they answer all emails. There's free tutoring. It's just a great campus. She said she would hate for this to affect her story and her telling people why she chose to go to Dominguez Hills.

Anger then spoke about the upcoming Halloween Haunt. She noted there's a series of activities starting on October 24th, including a Video Game Day, a Horror Trivia Night and a Murder Mystery. Go the ASI webpage for additional information. <http://asicsudh.com/programs/>

Chair Talamante said she wasn't sure if the CBAPP Dean would like to respond on the floor but Talamante wanted Anger to know that he is here today and he's heard your report and perhaps Provost Spagna would like to respond. She said that she hopes something will come from this report. **Anger** said she did email Dean Wen from her Toromail account and it might have gotten caught up with a many other emails he had. **Dean Wen** thanked ASI VP Anger for sharing that information. Wen said they did meet two weeks ago where he asked her if she had any concern about the virtual campus and virtual instruction? Wen said he really appreciates her input. He said he had invited her and the ASI CBAPP rep Jonathan Mancio Molina to CBAPP's college forum that would be taking place on October 15. Wen said he would like her to share her experience in this virtual environment with all the faculty and staff tomorrow. Part of that forum, they're going to discuss the teaching and how we can continuously improve in this environment. Wen said he knows we are learning because this is a new environment but really through the conversation tomorrow, he's pretty sure they will learn more on behalf of the students. Wen noted that the CBAPP ASI Rep Mancio Molina sent a survey to all the students asking if there's any concern in the virtual learning and instruction and campus, they need to know. Wen asked ASI to keep everybody posted, once they close the survey, to let them know as they want to continuously improve their instruction and service to all the students. **Anger** thanked the dean and said when this situation occurred it was after they had met. She said she would be more than happy to attend the meeting. **Talamante** said suggested that Dr. Anne Choi who is the new Associate Director for online learning has a lot of expertise in asynchronous as well as synchronous online learning. And so, it would be beneficial to reach out to her as well. **Wen** said he will definitely will do. The **Provost** said he appreciates ASI VP bringing it up. He said all of our action should be first and foremost, student centered. Spagna said he liked what Anger said earlier, we want every student to be an ambassador for this campus saying this was a special experience.

CFA Report

Co-President Dr. La Tanya Skiffer thanked the Senate for having her.

- Re. PTE concerns CFA has and some feedback they received from management.
 - o Skiffer said she's heard reports that faculty weren't able to get the individual PTE forms for each student, but rather only had a summary form. Skiffer said she would like to hear how widespread that issue was, because it's very important that you have not just the summary form but the individual PTEs so that faculty can see the magnitude of both positive of things that have occurred within your class but also negative things. Skiffer said that the summary form does not delineate which students said which statement, and therefore, it could be one student, two students, or all of your students, we don't know. Skiffer asked again if faculty can report out on it that would be helpful and AVP Koos has agreed to take a look at the system to make sure that both sides of that evaluation component are available to faculty, because it's essential for you to do and it's an assessment of your teaching with that information.
 - o Skiffer said they've also had a very fruitful discussion about PTE extensions to have them for new hires. One concern is that we do need evaluations as it's very important to the work that we do. She noted they'll continue to talk to management about how we might support our newest hired faculty, like we did with the spring 2020 MOU, where they were allowed that generation of faculty to

determine if they wanted to submit them. She noted they'll report back to the Senate on that matter.

- Moving forward, it's always important that everyone addresses whatever issues that are raised in their PTEs, both positive and negative, and those that are associated with COVID. It would be good for faculty highlight the impact on their teaching, research and service obligations. She suggested if they weren't able to do it in this narrative, always note that faculty have a rebuttal right, 10 days that faculty have to submit a rebuttal after the date that they've received any evaluation, and CFA is happy to support them if they have any questions about the rebuttal process. Skiffer said they are in the works of trying to have a Rebuttal Workshop and they're doing their best to get it out as soon as possible as they know that people are receiving their letters now.
- Regarding Retention Tenure and Promotion (RTP), they do have good news that there will be a new MOU to new hires to extend the tenure clock on the RTP process which will include offering it to faculty who didn't take advantage of it this last round. Skiffer said they would like faculty, Administration and Senate's help to get this information out. She asked the Senate to please share it with your colleagues shared within your colleges within your departments so that those faculty that would like to take advantage of that extension get it submitted in a timely manner.
- Regarding Range Elevation – they do have good news that we will have a range elevation list for lecture faculty where lecture will receive a pay increase if they are approved through that range elevation process. Skiffer noted there is an application process and there will be a workshop associated with it. There were six faculty or possibly more that received that raise last year. Skiffer noted that while it does require some work, it's well worth it. Skiffer said lecturer faculty should not be intimidated by it and CFA is here to support you in that as well as your senior faculty who might have been going through that process. It's very similar to what we do for our RTP files except there's some components that aren't necessarily as relevant.
- Course Match -Skiffer said we received emails as faculty about Course Match from the Chancellor's Office, and CFA wanted to be clear about the impact that that might have. Skiffer explained it is a program where students from all over the CSU can take courses, GE often are prioritized, on other CSU campuses, if there's an agreement between those two campuses, and that, that those particular courses. Skiffer said we do not receive FTEs for the Course Match nor will we get graduation credit for those students. There are some benefits to that program in that if you have low enrolled courses, that might be an option because it does require you to set aside 10 seats in your courses. Skiffer said CFA's concern is that we have some departments that struggle to meet the needs of our own students. She added if we're in that situation, it would not be something that CFA would encourage. But if you are in a situation where you have low enrolled courses you should reach out to Dean Costino and talk about how you might be able to participate in it.

Dr. Skiffer offered an apology to Senator Anger for her experience. She noted most of our faculty are very diligent. But sometimes we have bad days. Skiffer said we will continue to support and encourage our faculty to be responsive, particularly in light of COVID. And we recognize that faculty are really engaged in a lot of high touch activities right now and

wanted to commend them for that. She suggested all support our faculty who may be struggling to find their footing in this new environment.

Talamante thanked Dr. Skiffer for her report. She said she really appreciates all the ways that CFA is working on our behalf and the ways that we can intersect and support one another during these very difficult times.

Talamante asked of Senator Norman wanted to add anything regarding PTEs as she knows that it is something he is working on at committee in Statewide.

Statewide Senate Report

Statewide Senator Thomas Norman said the committee did work Friday October 9th but did not get a response from the Chancellor as they had hoped. He said they put in a request to encourage the whole system to be humane and looking at peer observation, as well as the student evaluations. The resolutions they've prioritized were about the mental health and well being is critical to CSU success for students, faculty and staff. He said they'll be hearing more about that in the future.

Norman said one thing he would like this campus to help with because the votes are not quite there yet. He said on his committee were to add three dedicated seats on the statewide for contingent faculty only. Norman said it is something they'll probably come back to this body if our campus thinks that that's a good idea. Talamante said she knows that our non tenure track faculty appreciate the work of the Senate to bring more representation at the statewide level and she imagines we have folks who would be very interested in that opportunity.

Chair Talamante said she wanted Vice Chair Heinz Balcazar to share any updates on the work of the Council of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators (CDCPC), but before that she wanted to the Senate to know that the Senate needs help at the college level with identifying Chairs to serve on the CDCPC. She noted that the Parliamentarian has sent out an updated call regarding the CDCPC. Talamante stated that if departments did elections in the spring, and they have their two representatives from the college that the chairs and program coordinators voted on, Senate really needs those names. Talamante explained that we've really had trouble with this committee being able to smoothly transition from one year to another. Talamante said one of the things that she and the Parliamentarian are going to work on is an updated list for the colleges that they can use to say these are the things that we regularly ask the colleges to elect so that they can update their standing lists for those elections in the colleges. Talamante asked that if senators would take the message back. Talamante noted it would likely be beneficial to update the charge to make it a two year commitment to keep the committee functioning. She said it's something that's needed because year to year is just not transitioning smoothly. She said with two years staggered terms there's always a group that can continue on the work from the previous year.

Senate Vice Chair Heinz Balcazar said yes, as they're waiting for this committee to be fully filled with members, she is working on the survey that is based on the current policy of chairs' responsibilities and duties and she's in the process of tallying the results. She said she is hoping that the results will of course, inform a possible revision of these policy. **Talamante** explained that Dr. Heinz Balcazar has been serving double duty as Senate's Vice Chair and continuing to chair the CDCPC as it re-forms. Talamante said FPC Chair Ares is working with the Faculty Policy Committee and with AVP Koos as well as Vice Chair Heinz Balcazar to bring together

policies. We've been asked by the Provost that we need to make recommendations to reconcile the two policies we have. We have a Presidential Memo on the selection of chairs and then we have an Academic Affairs policy on duties of chairs. Talamante said part of what's in the mix, there is better chair development and we're asking for that to happen not just at the central level from Faculty Affairs and Development, but we'll also be reaching out to the colleges and asking Dean's and Associate Deans and ARMS to also start building in ongoing training throughout the year for chairs. Talamante said this is really important because one of the things that's holding up the recommendations for having equitable chair reassigned time and stipends across the colleges is that we don't currently have evaluations happening and evaluations need to be in the context of proper chair development. We've got a lot of work to do and this Council is important to that work, as well as the FPC, and FAD.

Talamante noted she has been working with the affinity centers and some members of Senate Exec to host the next “It Takes a Village” event. And President Parham will try to join us at that event. She noted we're working on a date at the end of the month, tentatively looking at Thursday, October 29 at 4pm. Talamante said we're looking for a 4pm to 6pm time to make sure that our afternoon and early evening students and faculty have an opportunity to participate as well. It will be as a webinar this time, we're going to have a panel of the organizers, students who moderated the first event and members of the audience. We're inviting the co-chairs of our Taskforce on Racial Reconciliation, Anti-racism and the academy and if they can participate, students and staff. Talamante said we will pick up the threads of the conversation, we really got to some good points that we couldn't fully unpack and we certainly won't do that on only two conversations. She noted that as President Parham said in her one on one meeting with him, we can't leave people hanging, we've got to make sure that this conversation and the solutions, that we're all working for together, especially on an institutional level, can be assisted by the “It Takes a Village” series this year, and by all of the other folks that are working in these directions.

Open Mic

- **Senator Thomas** said kudos to ASI VP Blake Anger.
- **Senator Skiffer** encouraged faculty to reach out to Jackie Teepen. She said we have the political action season and they are doing a lot of phone banking. And we have hours we have to meet as a chapter and we don't want to miss out on the opportunity to encourage people to do the work that we need to do and show up to the polls and vote and educate our voters. She said please give us some time. Skiffer said it's all socially distanced, at home, you'll be texting sometimes, and Jackie Teepan has a whole list of events.
- **Senator Nicol** said she's addressing the body in her capacity as the co-chair of Anti-Racism in the Academy Task Force. She noted it has been brought to their attention, and they've known this just interacting with faculty on campus, that there are a number of informal groups discussing diversity and race in their departments. She said she knows Athletics has one of these kinds of working groups as well as CHHSN and COE. Nicol said they're trying to get a sense of how many of these different groups are working. She noted you might have them in your department, you might have them in your college. If you could please email her and let me her know if you're meeting and who your basic contact person is. Nicol said they're trying to reach out to each of those groups so they can integrate their perspectives and feedback into what their putting together.

- **Senator Nicol** said in her role as Senator, she wanted to address a question with regards to the GE breath requirement that is being proposed. She said she wished to clarify one major question. This is that proposal to move courses out of Area D into F and create Area F is being proposed by the Chancellor's Office. It is not being proposed by Statewide Senate or the CSU Ethnic Studies Council. This is all driven by the Chancellor's Office. She said she would like for people to know that and keep that in mind because of the lack of information, it seems as if this is driven solely by ethnic studies faculty, but it's not. Today, the Chancellor's Office, Statewide Academic Senate and Council on Ethnic Studies are finally having their first meeting today, October 14 as a collective. Nicol said we don't even know if this is this proposed draft is going to change as a result of that meeting. **Talamante** responded that's very important and asked Senator Nicol to please let us know the results of that meeting as she would like to be able to include that in the email she sends out to the campus with the appropriate attachments so people can understand not just the documents that were shared today but AB1460 and any other related documents that helped to unpack the situation going on here.
- **Senator V. Price** thanked Senator Nicol for bringing up about the nature of this proposal. She said she thinks it can be very confusing. Price said she knows there are senators who've already sent out the fillable form to departments as well and it might be very confusing to people in terms of what is this, who is proposing it? Price said she would also urge us to include the CFA letter that that sets out this is the law. This is what AB1460 requires, and then this is what this Chancellor's Office is proposing and it's not required by the law at all, in terms of just being a lower division class.

Meeting adjourned.