

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
MINUTES  
OCTOBER 24, 2024**

ASD 24-112

*Approved 12-12-24*

**11:30 AM - 12:50 PM**

**PLN-130**

Present: Badal, Barros, Bauer, Blandon-Gitlin, Brown, Brusckhe, Casem, Childers, Chik, Dabirian, Ebrahimi, J. Garcia, N. Garcia, Gradilla, Graewingholt, Guo, Jarvis, Kakihara, Kanel, Kleinjans, Landeros, Larios, Luker, Miller, Milligan, Morales, Ong, Palencia Gutierrez, Plouffe, Sacco, Scher, Stanley, Thomas, Valdez, Valencia, Wilson, Wood, Wynants

Absent: Barber, Bonuso, Fontaine, Ghosh, Henning, LeeKeenan, Mallicoat, Nair, Robinson, Rochon, Salim, Swarat, Weismuller

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Jarvis called the meeting to order at 11:30 am.

**II. URGENT BUSINESS**

No urgent business.

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- (Jarvis) The symposium for John Patton will take place tomorrow and Saturday.
- (Jarvis) The AA/AS Retreat is tomorrow. As the Senate staff reminded me, if you haven't RSVPed, we only have so many seats to place, but if you have RSVPed, make sure you put it on your calendar and show up there tomorrow. The retreat will start at 8:00 am with breakfast, 8:15 am is when people will actually start addressing you.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- M/S/P (Brown/Miller) Motion to approve the August 29<sup>th</sup> Minutes. Motion passed.  
4.1 ASD 24-84 Academic Senate Minutes 8-29-24 (Draft)
- M/S/P (Barros/Kanel) Motion to approve the September 12<sup>th</sup> Minutes. Motion passed unanimously.  
4.2 ASD 24-93 Academic Senate Minutes 9-12-24 (Draft)
- M/S/P (Barros/Graewingholt) Motion to approve the October 10<sup>th</sup> Minutes. Motion passed.  
4.3 ASD 24-103 Academic Senate Minutes 10-10-24 (Draft)

**V. TIME APPROXIMATE**

**12:00 PM – 12:30 PM**

**Topic: 1. ASD 24-46 Revisions to UPS 100.001 - Academic Senate Bylaws  
2. ASD 24-108 Constitution Committee Memo**

- M/S/P (Jarvis/Brown) Lines 711-715 revise to read "Ex officio and student members: the Provost/Vice-President of Academic Affairs (or designee); the Vice-President of Human Resources, Diversity and Inclusion (or designee); and two students". Motion passed.

Back to main motion

Q: (Barros) So back to the conversation about the terms. Based on what was reflected in the comments that we heard. I don't know if the issues are the terms themselves but are collective understanding of these terms. I think to solve that issue, we need to have an operational definition for them. Is the policy itself the place to include those educational components or is there another place where that could happen?

A: (Kakihara) So I understand that one of the places where we have the existing UPS 100.007 is a place for some of the terms like diversity, inclusion, equity and social justice have been defined. I think it's possible also to include a definition for belonging and accessibility. I think accessibility might show up, but I think the point about the belonging is a really important one.

➤ M/S/P (Graewingholt/Dabirian) Lines 899 - 901 delete wording. Motion passed.

Back to main motion

➤ M/S/P (Casem/Childers) Lines 347 - 355 delete wording. Motion passed.

Q: (Valdez) Since this was a huge ask right of the committee to institutionalized somewhere, who would be in charge of revising that section that you mentioned to include it?

A: (Jarvis) To Senator Valdez's question, (and this is referring to Senator Children's earlier comment), I will note that Senate Exec did refer UPS 100.015 to the DRI Committee for revision just this week.

Q: (Valdez) So the same committee would be in charge of revising that document.

A: (Jarvis) Yes.

Back to main motion

➤ **Senate voted:** ASD 24-46 Revisions to UPS 100.001 - Academic Senate Bylaws passed as amended, without dissent.

## VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

➤ M/S/P (Wynants/Casem) Motion to approve the consent calendar. Motion passed.

6.1 ASD 24-104 Revisions to UPS 210.020 - Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

6.2 ASD 24-105 Revisions to UPS 410.100 - Student-to-Student Tutorials

### 6.3 NOMINEES TO COMMITTEES

#### **NOMINEES TO SEARCH COMMITTEES**

##### **VICE PRESIDENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS** (3 faculty)

Nominees: Jaya Dofe (ECS)

Confirmed 10/102/24: Jeffrey Jolley (CBE); Amber Chitty Wilson (COMM)

## VII. REPORTS

### 1. [Chair's Report](#)

#### Additional Chair's report:

- (Jarvis) We are revisiting UPS 210.070 - Lecturer Evaluation. There is an open parliamentary question on this, which is, is this a returning to the discussion, or is this a new item?

It is my contention as chair that this is a new item being presented, because this is a new Senate from the time in which we discussed it. However, there is a legitimate parliamentary alternative interpretation and for that. I would like to call on the Parliamentarian to chime in.

- (Bruschke) So the deep history is that I think this body commissioned a working group on student evaluations that produced a white paper, and their task was to look at all the research. Their conclusion was that as an empirical question, student learning was not measured with SOQ scores. That conclusion has been written into many of our documents, including the one before the floor, UPS 210.070, that was six years ago.

Last spring, we debated this document for five complete sessions, then it went to the president. According to our Constitution, the President can do one of three things, approve it, disapprove it, or consult with us. The argument in favor of it is my belief that President Alva, at the time, chose the consultation option.

The document that we presented President Alva with did not say, approve, disapprove, or consult. It only said, approve or disapprove, and the president checked, disapprove, but then continued to consult. My advice, and I believe that the Chair agrees with me, is given the amount of debate and discussion that has gone into this document. This body and the campus would be best served by limiting the discussion to those items that the President wishes consultation on and the other thing that is looming is this is for the lecture evaluations, the vast majority, which happens in the spring, right? So, we can pass this document today and that will put in place a much less onerous process for everyone for this spring and then if there are issues anyone wishes to revisit after that's been passed and we've given for the time to implement the new policy, if you wish, there is those, we can always come back to it later. That's where we stand.

2. [President Report](#)

3. [Provost Report](#)

Q: (Wynants) I was hoping the Provost could share with the everyone here, to promote tech day coming up, because it would occur before we meet.

A: (Provost) Tech day is Wednesday, November 6<sup>th</sup>. Please come, it is really important about the future of AI, especially on curriculum and all the changes coming. We are also going to have some announcements about our partnership with Microsoft and how we can make AI available to our students in a safe way.

Q: (Jarvis) Should I change my password?

A: (Provost) Yes you should. It's always good to change your password. October is password change month.

Changing the password is not as important as when you you're a text message or Duo come to your device, and you approve it without thinking. So, if you get a message from your duo and says somebody's trying to authenticate with you and you approve without thinking, that is giving hackers access to it. Our students have been doing this, so this is something that we wanted to let all of you know.

When a text message comes or when you get a due approval, please do not approve it if it's not you, promote that to your students the best you can. Your password has no value with having access to the device that has it. Again, if you get a text message or Duo authentication that someone is trying to access your device, do not approve if it's not you.

Q: (Sacco) Sometimes I will log into things where it will take me to my organizations sign in page. Is that secure or is that something?

A: (Provost) Yes, it is secure. When he takes you to the organization page, that is actually the best of the security. Instead of you creating a passport with them, they're taking to us so we can securely authenticate you.

4. **Statewide Academic Senate Report - no report.**

- (Milligan) Time, Place, and Manner (TPM), is on the agenda at the state level. It would be brought up and we'll probably have it passed, but it got delayed. The reason it was delayed is they want to make sure that the legalities of it, that we're not overstepping our boundaries in terms of legalities. So, we are waiting for the legal department to come through.

The other thing is the part-time lecturer senator has been approved. I don't know when we'll be voting on it here, but it's been approved at the state level.

- (Jarvis) The Senate staff is working on this. The e-mail about voting is going out the end of day today for us to vote on that. Voting is Monday through Thursday of next week.

As a point of information, Unit 3 faculty are eligible to vote. That's the rules of the Statewide Academic Senate Constitution. So, for all of our adjuncts, staff, other people who we choose to enfranchise in our Senate here on campus, the Statewide Senate does not choose to enfranchise them. This is, in fact, their first conscious attempt to enfranchise adjunct lecturers.

- (Kanel) I just wanted to urge everybody to vote yes on this. The way that it's set up, we are very likely to probably have one of the three part-time lecturer senators represented here from Cal State Fullerton, because we have such a big voting bloc.

So, when we do eventually vote for somebody, we will have really good representation there at the Statewide Senate.

5. ASI Report - **no report submitted.**

- (Morales) We've also just been having a lot of discussions about TPM, especially because we just got back from CSA. So, one thing that we've been trying to do is do the best to not only maintain our relations and make sure that we're ensuring everything is the best possible atmosphere that it is on this campus, but also trying to do the most to see what we can do in order to make sure all students feel heard and represented.

6. [CFA Report](#)

- [Executive Compensation](#)
- [Bargaining Survey 2024](#)

Q: (Stanley) I was wondering if that data about executive compensation was drawn from the Sacramento Bees State Worker database or another database of salaries?

A: (Brown) We've compiled our own from CFA.

Q: (Kanel) Has the issue about compensating faculty for the time spent on research ever been brought up at the at the bargaining table? And can you let me know a little bit about that in terms of workload and payment for activities that we do that we actually don't get paid for?

A: (Brown) It's a very interesting issue. At the Assembly a lot of major issues came up and that hasn't been brought out and we know that there's a lot of uncompensated labor at the university. Our lectures bore the brunt of it, because as a tenure, tenure-track faculty we understand this is expected of us, and we do it.

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

8.1 ASD 24-106 Revisions to UPS 210.070 Evaluation of Lecturers

1. Revisions to UPS 210.070 Evaluation of Lecturers - clean version

- M/S/P (Wood/Landeros) Motion to approve ASD 24-106 Revisions to UPS 210.070 Evaluation of Lecturers. Motion passed as amended.
  - M/S/P (Sacco/Casem) Line 377: add the wording "and SOQ response rates". Motion passed.
    - (Wood) Amendment to the amendment, add the wording "as well as". Considered friendly.

Back to main motion

- M/S/P (Landeros/Sacco) Lines 366 and 367: rewrite it to read "does not measure teaching effectiveness, but rather gather student opinion on teaching performance". Motion passed.
  - M/S/P (Kanel/Landeros) Motion to extend the meeting by 5 minutes. Motion passed.
    - Back to the amendment, motion passed.

Back to the main motion

Q: (Kanel) Point of order. I thought we were only supposed to be talking about stuff that the President wanted us to look at, and not going through the entire document.

A: (Jarvis) It is the ruling of the chair. I disagree with the point of order is the ruling of the chair. The ruling of the chair may be appealed. If I am outvoted, that would then restrict our guidance to what the parliamentarian had had advised us to start.

- (Valdez) I am appealing the ruling of the chair.
- (Jarvis) Senator Valdez appeals the ruling of the chair, it's an immediate vote. To clarify, the ruling of the chair is that it was in order to discuss the entire document. I yield to Dr. Walker, former Senate Chair.

Q: (Walker) What was the original motion made for this document? Because that's what dictates what is applicable for debate.

A: (Jarvis) The motion was the entire document.

- (Jarvis) The ruling of the chair is the small the changes necessary to bring it in compliance with President Alva's objections was ok.

If you vote yes, you are sustaining the ruling of the chair, that will allow this debate to continue longer. If you vote no, you are saying we have to constrain our comments to the two things at hand in the Alva rejection memo.

- **Senate voted on the point of order:** Judgment of the chair that the No's have it, therefore it is out of order.

Back to the main motion to approve the document as amended.

## 8.2 ASD 24-107 Revisions to UPS 270.103 - Staffing of Graduate Courses

### **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

- M/S/P (Garcia/Valdez) Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.