



ACADEMIC SENATE
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 8, 2024

ASD 24-09

Approved 3-7-24

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-130

Present: Alva, Awadalla, Badal, Barber, Barros, Bauer, Bonuso, Brown, Brusckke, Casem, Dabirian, Evanow, J. Garcia, N. Garcia, Ghosh, Goodarzi, Graewingholt, Guo, Henning, Jarvis, Kakihara, Kanel, Kuffner, Landeros, Lewis Chiu, Luker, Meyer, Miller, Milligan, Nair, Ordonez-Jasis, Oseguera, Palencia Gutierrez, Plouffe, Robinson, Sacco, Salim, Scher, Self, Shepard, Stanley, Swarat, Thomas, Valdez, Valencia, Walsh, Weismuller, Wilson

Absent: Childers, Ebrahimi, Mallicoat, Wood, Zazueta

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

A moment of silence was observed.

In Memoriam

- Jacqueline Otis, Staff and CSUEU Chapter 317 President [died: June 2023]

II. URGENT BUSINESS

No urgent business.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

➤	The Mathematics Competencies Subcommittee of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) is conducting a survey to help define mathematical expectations in a variety of disciplines across the California Community Colleges (CCC), California State University (CSU), and University of California (UC) systems.	Survey link: Survey on Mathematical Expectations
➤	WAC Liaison Alumni AI-Cafes	February 16 th & March 22 nd PLS-240, 1:00 - 2:00 pm Registration link: https://fdc.fullerton.edu

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- M/S/P (Brown/Barros) Motion to approve the December 7th AS minutes. Motion passed.

4.1 ASD 23-124 Academic Senate Minutes 12-7-23 (Draft)

4.2 ASD 24-05 Academic Senate Minutes 1-25-24 (Draft) - *forthcoming*

V. REPORTS

- [Chair's Report](#)

I would like to highlight one item from my report. The presidential search open forum was on Tuesday, and I understand there were some technical issues with the comment form. The committee would like to make sure that we are hearing from more voices and make sure this was sent out widely and broadly and get as much input as we can. The link to provide feedback for the presidential search is: <https://www.fullerton.edu/presidential-search/>. Please give input by February 19th.

Q: (Kanel) Can you say forthright and openly that you feel this is a completely consultative process and that our opinion actually will be heard, and it will influence or matter to the person who actually does the hiring? Do you feel confident in the collegiality, the consult, and meaningful consultative process or are we just doing what we always do, go along through the motions and they pick who they want anyway?

A: (Jarvis) I feel confident that it's pretty hard to get me to shut up, but my experience in the world is that I cannot promise what other people's behavior will be.

If there are any questions about the process, I ask you to direct them to Chair McGrory from the Trustees. Chair Fong of the Trustees is there and will take part in it, but Trustee McGrory is the chair of this particular search.

Q: (Casem) Would it be fair to say that a choice not engage in this process is a guarantee that your voice would not be heard?

A: (Jarvis) That would be fair to say. I will note that an opinion can be ignored if it is offered, but an opinion not offered will certainly be ignored.

(Provost) I would like to ask all of you if you would submit your input. It is really critical for Senate and our faculty to have feedback for the committee. Even if you think somebody already said it, please say it again. I highly encourage you; this is our future president, and it is important that we have comments and feedback for the committee.

o (Jarvis) Please give the feedback by February 19th.

Q: (Bruschke) My concern is that I can only give feedback on things that I know about and will not know who the candidates are. I will not know if I give my feedback it should be this and then that ends up not being a candidate. I'm sure the feedback I give will be considered, but I don't feel like I've really had an opportunity to provide feedback on the central issue of the question. So, do you have any recommendations about how we might give feedback that can influence the outcome given that we will not know who the candidates are?

A: (Jarvis) I will note that I believe this body has passed resolutions asking for changes to the process at the Board of Trustees. I believe there are four going back in history, but I am not sure of that number. I believe there are resolutions from a large number of campuses, I have not surveyed to know the exact number, but I believe it is a solid majority if not a super majority of campuses. I believe there have been five resolutions from the Statewide Senate in the last decade or so. I do not have that number on the top of my head, but I'm positive there's at least one or two resolutions from various senates including the Statewide Senate asking for changes to this process.

o (Awadalla) I wanted to emphasize to tell all of your students to also fill out the survey. Student voices are imperative in this search. I am sitting on the committee as well as another representative, but we do need as many student voices as possible.

• (Sacco) I welcome your comments regarding the closure and us being ready, but I was emailing my chair and dean Saturday night regarding whether we'd be closed as I teach first thing Monday morning and there is a lab that is very difficult to transition to online. So, I was quite irritated at 3:00 pm on Sunday when I found out we were shifting as I had gotten an answer that there was no discussion by Sunday morning. I feel like this is something that could have been entertained much earlier. Of course, we have our absence reporting, but I'm sure all of us sprung into action and worked Sunday to change the modality of our course instantly. It's just all around something I think a lot of people are very unhappy about.

I actually had experienced worse commute Tuesday morning and I wish we had stayed online for that, and I don't know what the decision was to stay in person. I have another class 8:30 am Tuesday morning that I sent out a link for many students to join by Zoom, but it was already too late for the ones who live furthest that have to commute through that. So, it would be nice if we had some kind of policy to make these decisions early enough so we're not steering the ship at the last minute before we hit the iceberg.

o (Brown) AS CFA President, it's really hard to reconcile getting these notices from the University of dock our pay for legally protected thing and at the same time on the Sunday, we get an email saying that you need to change your modality and all the work that went into that, that's uncompensated. It's the same thing that happened during the pandemic and it almost triggered me because all my faculty have to change modality with 24 hours' notice. I have already done this, and this is just painful. It's another example of the administration doesn't know what we do and how we do it. We work so many hours that are not 8 to 5 and counted in that way outside of class time. I think we need a system in place where the administration at least is more sensitive to that.

- (Landeros) I would appreciate if HR could send an email. I am getting a lot of questions from lecturers that they're confused. I was on strike, but I didn't have class. Do I report do I not report? There's a new system and I'm also kind of confused. At first, I thought it was we were not going to report if you did not have a class to teach if you are a part-time lecturer. But now I'm being told that you do, and you just have to report no leave taken. So, if there could be some clarification, I'd really appreciate that.
- (Provost) I have talked to VP Forgues; he is working on the right messages out and make sure the system works the way we need it to.
- (Garcia) There's been communication regarding the training for CHRS to enter that no leave taken. I believe there is going to be communication coming out again today. Also, VP Forgues will send out more communication regarding that.

Q: (Kuffner) We have also been getting these emails from HR saying that people have reported that we are on strike. I wonder if you can talk about how the information that was gathered from students reporting us for being strike, the parents being asked to report us on strike, and where this information if coming from and how it's being used?

A: (Alva) So, this information come in through various sources. The important point that I want to make sure is that when people receive these notifications, they have an opportunity to reply back to say that's accurate or it's not. It's important that you understand this is an interactive process and you should feel free to question whether you were or weren't withholding work that day.

- (Kanel) When you say you withheld work for the strike, do you really think any professor didn't make up for that by including it in another lecture or incorporating that work? I doubt any of us didn't work or didn't provide work for that day, we just didn't do it on that day. I think we really need to take seriously the morale issue and whether or not you want to have good morale on this campus or not. Or do you want us working to CBA regulations and that's it?
- It's really bad PR in terms of recruitment. We've had multiple searches already where candidates don't accept because they can't afford to live on the salary that the CSU pays, so we are missing out on really good faculty. On top of seeing that we don't get paid enough, seeing the pettiness of trying to dock folks that are fighting for a living wage. Who would want to come here? The CSU is very messy right now, so I am concerned about recruitment for searches that we have, but also retention where I would make more money if I was teaching in LA Unified than I would here.

➤ M/S/P (Brown/Meyer) Motion to extend the Chair's report. Motion passed.

- (Sacco) In my department we were forewarned about the CHRS and already faculty are unhappy to now monthly record their absence. So, its absence reporting right? Then we have an email to some of the faculty that we were striking or can you verify it. So, now it's presence reporting. You had to reply to the email if you were present and not striking. Now we have a new email that says we have to report the dock by February 17th, but we were told initially to report absences by the end of the pay period. People are getting very confused about what we are supposed to do. Do we report by the 17th, the strike day and then do we have to report again at the end of the month, or just once? It's all getting confusing with contrasting things we're hearing from HR.

Q: (Ordonez-Jasis) As department chair, I'm getting questions from my faculty. Why were some faculty targeted and sent these emails and others weren't?

A: (Alva) This is an opportunity for us to engage with HR and bring back that specific response. I don't have the answer, I do know that it came from various sources. We don't know the accuracy of those sources and in every case whether you received a notice or not, I believe the professional responsibility is to report accurately whether or not you withheld work on Monday or not. Ultimately, that's where the responsibility is, in really reflecting what you did on Monday. Did you work or did you not work?

Part of what makes this complicated is the confluence of adopting a new system and reporting absences. Withholding work is considered a form of absence and we call it dock during a concerted strike activity. Whether our systems are accommodating that or not, I will commit to following up with VP Forgues to answer this specific question. Also make sure that the systems are robust enough to accommodate this unusual absence entry dock, but also to make sure that the lecturers and how we report people who may not necessarily be full-time salaried employees, but in temporary statuses or partial full-time.

Q: (Kanel) I want to emphasize the notice we received Sunday. Why is there not a similar message going out to students to complete a form whether your faculty withheld work for Monday? It is possible that some faculty said we're just not having class, because we can't come to campus. Why aren't we knowing whether faculty did that or not? Is that not withholding work because they said I didn't have time to set up Zoom, I didn't have time to reconstruct my class, so you are off the hook kids? Why is that person not being

monitored, scrutinized, and going after? I request that we get an answer on this. Are you going to let faculty be unhappy because of this one day? It's so easy to fix it, yet there seems to be a stubbornness or an opposition to even listening to what faculty are telling you, because the almighty Chancellor says something. That doesn't sound very democratic or collegial.

- o (Brown) Thanks for making that point because it really does show there's differential treatment on absenteeism. There is one reaction from the management about a legally protected right to strike. There's another no reaction, or no response. I'm not asking management to search what faculty cancelled their class on Monday, because I'm not advocating that at all. However, it does point up the difference in how they've treated this.

Q: (Kuffner) I just want to point out that my question was never answered earlier. My question was not whether I should report my absence, I was on strike that day. My question is what is happening with all this information that is being gathered from the student's and their parents about faculty?

A: (Provost) We will get back to you on this. We will have this question forwarded to VP Forgues.

Q: (Bruschke) The deadline which the dock must be reported still February 27th right?

A: (Garcia) Yes.

Q: (Landeros) Can we clarify if we are doing no leave taken or do nothing if we didn't have a class?

A: (Provost) I will get both of those answers and get them to the Chair so we can get it to you.

- o (Jarvis) One of my agenda items for myself for the next two weeks is to actually create a document flowchart, run it past both HR and CFA and deal with every single possible scenario that I can think of.

2. [Provost Report](#)

Q: (Jarvis) The 16 differential between approved and posted, is that jobs we expect to post in the spring?

A: (Provost) It could be job in the spring, could be cancelled, depending on what departments has decided to move forward.

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

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

- (Adawalla) Encourage your students to fill out the presidential search survey. Also, in addition to the elections announcement that I made last meeting, strongly encourage your students to apply for elections for ASI.

Q: (Henning) I knew about the student wellness initiative that ASI have been working on, I wanted to make sure folks knew what was contained within that. Maybe you can describe what are the different parts of the initiative that you are trying to accomplish for students?

A: (Adawalla) In the initiative we have different types of services that we want to offer to students, but the main point of it is to centralize our basic needs and to build a wellness center in the campus so we can have our pantry, Tuffy's basic needs, and CAPS all in one centralized area. As well as expanding our student recreation center and TSU, expanding on the services that ASI does offer to students, because we offer a lot to assist the students.

The whole point of it is to expand and talk about student wellness. In that process we do survey the students and we make it very clear what is going to be offered, how much they will be paying for the fee increase, and what they are going to be getting every single year.

Q: (Henning) Do you have any knowledge of in the past whether or not ASI leadership has advocated from University to provide that funding, rather than having to resort to utilizing additional student fees, instead have the University pay for that?

A: (Adawalla) I'm not too aware of that, but I do know that is very difficult to get state funding in general for wellness resources.

- o (Alva) We have had years where there's been money from the state that's been earmarked or allocated for basic needs and some of those priorities. So, there's an actual identified set of dollars that flow from the state's allocation to the system to each of the campuses around some of these basic need areas. Where we are very unlikely to ever see state dollars is to create physical spaces for wellness. Our own instructional priorities and needs will always take priority over a facility dedicated to wellness. It's not to say we don't offer these services.

I shared with the ASI students when I met with them at the start of the spring semester, I was really pleased to see that wellness broadly defined is a Cal State Fullerton priority, and it's embedded in Goal 2, and we will do what we can to support the wellness and well-being of students.

This increase the students are proposing, to increase their own contribution to that through a Category 2 fee, would accelerate that. But we remain committed to ensuring that well-being is a priority, and we are attending to the needs of students.

5. [CFA Report](#)

Q: (Valencia) Regarding the dock day, what is the next step the CFAs will be taking if as usual the university doesn't reply to our needs as workers?

A: (Brown) We had a meeting with Michelle Tapper this past week because one of the big issues about the dock was communication. I think we had three emails with three different dates and it's very confusing. I was under the impression that we would have received an email by now clarifying when the reporting is. Also, the system to actually report dock is kind of wonky, so hopefully management will clarify that.

- o (Provost) We will follow up with VP Forgues to make sure those communications get out to all of you. They are working on it.

Q: (Landeros) There is a lot of information coming around about the obviously disagreement with the new tentative agreement. So, I'd like to know if you can reiterate a little of the outcomes if we vote yes and potential outcomes of voting no?

A: (Brown) We've had a couple town hall meetings here at Cal State Fullerton, and we were tabling out there all day yesterday. There has been a lot of misinformation out there. The tentative agreement is so much better than the imposition. The imposition was 5%, and it was going in effect in February 2024, which in effect really means it's a 2.5% raise. If nothing else, we have to recognize that when the Chancellor's team moved on increasing the base pay for our Range A and Range B faculty, that was monumental. It's also going to help our librarians, our counselors, our coaches, and our assistant professors. So, we got a guaranteed 5% versus 2.5%. But in addition to that we should be getting another 5% in July 2024, that's four months away and by my math, that's 10% compounded for that first year, that's a great deal. I forgot to mention that we get an additional four weeks of parental leave and the new faculty that were hired last year will also be included in this deal. They were excluded in the last and final offer and all of that will be gone if this deal is rejected. So, we really have the opportunity to accept a deal that recognizes for the first time aspirational language of 1,500 to 1,000 students per counselor, that's monumental. Health and safety issues that you can have a representative there if you have interaction with law enforcement. As well as the lactation spaces and the gender neutral bathrooms, and safe spaces. We are a little better at Fullerton than most campuses, some campuses don't have any lactation spaces. I think it's a great deal, that's why I voted for it. If anybody has any questions or doubt this is a great deal, please contact me.

Q: (Landeros) Some of the information that I'm also getting that I would like clarity on is they are saying if we vote no that's going to get us back to bargaining table and we are going to get what we want. I'd like to know what are the possible outcomes of voting no. How realistic that is or not and the cost and benefits of that versus saying yes?

A: (Brown) If the tentative agreement is voted down, the Chancellor's last, best, and final offer will go into fact, so we will lose all the things we have on the table, and they have made it very clear that they are not coming back to the table. So, if this offer is rejected, this contract will expire in June 2024, and we'll be reopening all the items and get none of the stuff that we've gained.

Q: (Scher) In the last 20 years, how many times have we gotten a contingent raise?

A: (Jarvis) I can recall there were conditional raises in one of the recent agreements and we didn't get them. So, I think there was one we were supposed to get four and we got three. I think that happened two years in a row in that agreement if I remember correctly.

- o (Bruschke) The issue is what is it contingent on? The original Chancellor's offer was 5% contingent on getting an additional \$217 million added to the budget, so that was what we walked away from and that was never going to happen. The deal that was reached was 5% contingent only on the baseline budget not being cut and that hasn't happened since 2008. So, the reason I'm in favor of it is it's not impossible and the state budget doesn't look good, but this is not something that has never happened, this is something that is a once in 18 year chance and I anticipate we will get that second 5%.
- o (Dabirian) It is very critical that our faculty that were already here in August will get it. This didn't happen in the past and I wanted to point that out, that's really positive about the contract. I'm not trying to encourage one way or another, but I think it's really critical for our faculty who just started, they will also get the 5%.

Q: (Valdez) I've only been in CFA for nine years and one of the stories I heard from an elder was that membership voted no on a tentative agreement in 1999 and then elected new membership who then returned to negotiating and got a much better deal. Is that accurate, that it was voted down and new leadership got a better deal?

A: (Brown) I have no knowledge and I don't think that's accurate that a tentative agreement ever been rejected by CFA. The only thing I heard that happened to us recently was the APC that rejected the tentative agreement.

Q: (Stanley) I wanted to come back to the contingency issue and perhaps the President or someone in Political Science can clarify the California budget process. My understanding is that the idea of Governor Newsom's budget was to defer funding to the CSU and UCs until next year, giving them and IOU. I am not quite sure how that relates to the term you just mentioned, which was baseline budget. If the baseline budget is related to this new idea that Governor Newsom had regarding the IOU, and I assume the legislators will be voting before June 30th, whether to include that IOU.

A: (Brown) I think that was about the compact, he said he was going to push the compact forward, which is the money that the Governor has agreed to give us to make the graduation initiative successful.

(Jarvis) I will note that a long-standing frustration of mine has been the tendency of both CFA, CSU, and everyone involved to present the budget as if we are asking for \$240 million, which is ridiculous. The budget of this campus alone is over half billion dollars. That is the amount they're asking for over last year. It's a frustration of mine; everyone phrases these things as differences, and no one remembers that we're dealing with a significant fraction of a trillion dollar state budget.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6.1 ASD 23-119 Revisions to UPS 102.001 - The Faculty Development Center (FDC)

- M/S/F Motion to approve ASD 23-119 Revisions to UPS 102.001 - The Faculty Development Center (FDC). Motion failed.

There was an extensive discussion on the revisions to UPS 102.001 - The Faculty Development Center (FDC) continued with those who were on the speakers list from the January 25th meeting.

- M/S/P (Plouffe/Meyer) Motion to call the question on the document. Motion passed.
- M/S/P (Casem/Weismuller) Motion to have a hand vote on the document. Motion passed.

Motion to approve ASD 23-119 Revisions to UPS 102.001 - The Faculty Development Center (FDC):
Hand vote: Yes = 16, No = 22, Abstain = 2

VII. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 ASD 23-120 Revisions to UPS 210.080 Classroom Observations

- M/S/P (Plouffe/Henning) Motion to postpone discussion of ASD 23-120 Revisions to UPS 210.080 Classroom Observations until after we conclude discussion of UPS 210.070, the next item on the agenda. Motion passed.

7.2 ASD 24-06 Revisions to UPS 210.070 - Evaluation of Lecturers

- M/S/ (Bruschke/Kanel) Motion to approve ASD 24-06 Revisions to UPS 210.070 - Evaluation of Lecturers.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

- M/S/P (Garcia/Meyer) Meeting adjourned at 12:50 PM.