

# Minutes

of the Academic Senate Meeting

May 12, 2021

- PRESENT: Aragon, Barding, Chase, Chaturvedi, Chen, Coburn, Corley, Davidov-Pardo, Fallah Fini, Flores, Gad, Gonzalez, Huerta, Kumar, Kwok, Lee, Lloyd, Monemi, Musgrave, Myers, Nelson, Ortenberg, Pacleb, Puthoff, Quinn, Shen, Small, Snyder, Soper, Speak, Urey, Vallejo, Van, Van Buer, Von Glahn, Wachs, Welke
- PROXIES: Senator Monemi for Senator Anderson
- ABSENT: Huh, Osborn, Singh
- GUESTS: N. Abramzon, A. Baski, L. Bricker, S. Dixon, S. Eskandari, K. Gasdaglis, C. Gonzales, M. Guerrero, L. Kessler, B. Kim, D. Lee, I. Levine, A. Madva, L. Massa, H. Mireles, J. Nourse, B. Quillian, T. Roby, L. Roosa Millar, P. Ross, M. Sancho-Madriz, L. Rotunni, D. Turner, Wei Yu

Chair Nelson thanked those in attendance and mentioned that the Zoom chat feature is not available for this meeting.

Chair Nelson stated that in accordance with the Academic Senate Bylaws Article IX, Section 1(C), emergency Academic Senate meeting agendas require a two-thirds vote of the Academic Senate. She asked for a motion to approve the agenda for this emergency Academic Senate meeting.

M/s/p to approve the May 12, 2021, Emergency Academic Senate meeting with one (1) abstention.

## 1. Emeritus Awards

Chair Nelson recognized Senator Nicolas Von Glahn, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The Faculty Affairs Committee has unanimously approved nominating resolutions for the award of Emeritus to 28 distinguished members of the Cal Poly community.

M/s/p that the resolutions be received and filed as a permanent part of the Senate Archives.

M/s that the resolutions be adopted, and with adoption, they are proclaimed to the entire University community.

The motion passed unanimously.

## 2. Honoring Retiring Senators

Academic Senate Chair Nelson recognized and appreciated the service the following five (5) senators for their service and stated that she hoped they would consider running for a Senate seat in the future:

Todd Coburn – College of Engineering  
Alvaro Huerta – College of Environmental Design  
Kelly Huh – College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences  
Phyllis Nelson – College of Engineering  
Manshaan Singh – ASI

Chair Elect Pacleb took the opportunity to thank Chair Nelson for her service to the Academic Senate. Chair Nelson received accolades from many of the senators.

### 3. Seating of New Senators

Chair Nelson recognized the following senators who were re-elected for another three-year term:

- Corwin Aragon – College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences
- Gabriel Davidov-Pardo – Don B. Huntley College of Agriculture
- Hector Flores – College of Business Administration
- Lee-Anne Milburn – College of Environmental Design
- Dennis Quinn – College of Education and Integrative Studies
- Alex Small – College of Science
- Jamie Snyder – College of Science
- Gerd Welke – College of Business Administration

Chair Nelson welcomed the following new senators:

- Ghada Gad – College of Engineering
- Sean Monemi – College of Engineering
- Jessie Vallejo – College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences

### 4. Voting on Degrees

M/s that the Academic Senate, on behalf of the Faculty at this University, recommend to President Coley that the degree candidates listed in the Registrars' List be awarded the appropriate degrees this May.

The motion passed unanimously and enthusiastically.

### 5. Election of Executive Committee

Chair Nelson introduced Senator Fallah Fini, Chair of the Elections and Procedures Committee. Senator Puthoff stated that the body must decide who is going to serve on the Executive Committee for the 2021-2022 academic year. The Elections and Procedures Committee received these nominations to constitute the Executive Committee for 2021-2022:

- Don B. Huntley College of Agriculture – Anna Soper
- College of Business Administration – Rita Kumar
- College of Education and Integrative Studies – Dennis Quinn
- College of Engineering – Sean Monemi and Jonathan Puthoff
- College of Environmental Design – Alexander Ortenberg
- Related Areas/Library – Julie Shen
- College of Science – Laura Chase
- Statewide CSU – David Speak and Gwen Urey

Senator Fallah Fini stated that nominations are open from the Senate floor. No additional nominations were received.

M/s/p unanimously to elect all single candidate nominees for the 2021-2022 Executive Committee by acclamation.

An election was held for the College of Engineering and the Statewide CSU representatives.

Senator Puthoff was elected as the College of Engineering representative to the Executive Committee with 21 votes. Senator Monemi received eight (8) votes and there were two (2) abstentions.

Senator Urey was elected as the Statewide CSU representative to the Executive Committee with 19 votes. Senator Speak received 12 votes and there were two (2) abstentions.

## 6. Academic Senate Committee Reports

### a. FA-010-189, Sabbatical Applications – SECOND READING

The second reading report for FA-010-189, Sabbatical Applications, is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/fa010189sr.pdf>.

The policy that accompanies the report is located on the website at [https://www.cpp.edu/senate/documents/packets/2020-21/05.05.21/policy\\_1375\\_sabbatical\\_leave\\_policy-for-second-reading.pdf](https://www.cpp.edu/senate/documents/packets/2020-21/05.05.21/policy_1375_sabbatical_leave_policy-for-second-reading.pdf).

The motion was made to adopt this report at the May 5, 2021, Academic Senate meeting before the meeting was adjourned. The discussion on this report is continuing during this meeting.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The FAC recommends the University adopt the changes to [Policy 1375](#), Sabbatical Leave Policy, to reflect the Modified-Northridge model.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Senator Von Glahn went over the [presentation](#) on sabbaticals. The presentation is located on the Academic Senate website at [http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/FA010189sr\\_3.pdf](http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/FA010189sr_3.pdf).

M/s to change the three (3) occurrences of the wording “semester long sabbaticals” in the policy to “term long sabbaticals.” \

The motion to change the references to semester long sabbaticals to term long sabbaticals passed with three (3) abstentions.

Senator Von Glahn yielded the floor to Senator Barding, 2021-2022 Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, to discuss questions raised over Policy 1376, Sabbatical Leave Application Form, in regards to Policy 1375, Sabbatical Leave Policy. Senator Barding commented that he reviewed Policy 1376 and determined that it is a standalone policy and needs revising regardless of the outcome of this report. The application complies with the proposed sabbatical policy. The dean and department chair portion of the application does not align with the existing sabbatical policy or the proposed policy. This will need to be addressed with a new referral. In the dean and department chair evaluation sections of the application, there are evaluation criteria regarding the appropriateness of the sabbatical proposal. This criterion was removed from the policy because the Professional Leave Committee stated that appropriateness was difficult to assess therefore, they gave all applicants the same score in this area. Senator Barding added that the Faculty Affairs Committee purposely structured the proposed sabbatical policy to better reflect CBA requirements. Senator Von Glahn added that the committee has discussed Policy 1376 and whether or not it is appropriate to be a policy or is it a procedure. The committee will generate a referral to review policy 1376 and make sure it is in line with the sabbatical policy.

Senator Van Buer commented that he believes there is an issue that there is going to be an 8-year minimum until a sabbatical will be approved under the new policy and stated that this policy should be thought about more carefully before adoption. Senator Barding responded that he believes faculty cannot apply for sabbaticals until after 7-years of service. Senator Barding stated that he understands that the 8-year minimum could potentially disenfranchise some of the more junior faculty from applying for sabbatical but he did not think the one-year difference is not really going to be a motivating factor assuming there are still a high number of applicants. Senator Van Buer clarified that it is 6-years of service before faculty can apply for sabbatical in their 7<sup>th</sup> year. This policy would potentially put off a sabbatical until the 9<sup>th</sup> year.

There was a question on the history of funding sabbaticals in relationship to the number of applications received. At the last Academic Senate meeting, there was the comment that all 2020-2021 sabbaticals were funded, but is this historically accurate? Provost Alva responded that the contract speaks to a percentage of eligible faculty every academic year and that the eligible percentage is funded. She added that she thinks it is about 12% of eligible faculty. All faculty who apply for a half-time sabbatical or difference in leave pay are automatically funded. Recommendations are made by the Professional Leave Committee, from the appropriate administrator, and the department looks at the application from a resource and scheduling perspective; those inputs are part of the decision-making process to determine how many sabbaticals can be funded. She stated that last year all, but two (2) sabbaticals were funded, and the year before several sabbaticals were not funded.

Provost Alva commented that the CBA refers to there being an evaluation of sabbatical proposals, judgments made by the Professional Leave Committee, as to the questions of quality of the proposal. Provost Alva asked if anyone who submits an application and addresses the specific questions is all considered meritorious? So, the defining criterion is years since the last sabbatical? Senator Von Glahn responded that the Professional Leave Committee would still review all proposals and make sure that they are meritorious; the proposals have to address the issues in the criteria and not just speak on the issue. Therefore, if the proposal has adequately addressed the criteria, then the answer is yes, it is considered meritorious. He added that hard charge for the leave committee because they are going to have to inform some faculty members that their proposal was not prepared adequately and did not address all the criteria. This proposed policy is advocating against the ranking of those proposals that are deemed meritorious. The policy does not say that all meritorious proposals will be funded, but it does say that the ordering of proposals will not be based on a competitive model with representatives from the college but will be based on the ordering as outlined in the proposed policy. Senator Urey added that the Faculty Affairs Committee presented a survey to the faculty and the faculty did prefer this model where how long you have waited for a sabbatical is taken into consideration, right now this gets zero consideration.

Several discussions ensued supporting the proposed policy changes for sabbatical applications and the merits of scholarly activity. Faculty members discussed why they voted in favor of the proposed policy in the survey provided by the Faculty Affairs Committee. There was a comment that the current ostensibly merit-based system is a reaction to the problem of scarce resources and pits individuals, departments, and colleges against each other for scarce resources and it was suggested that faculty should lift each other up instead of competing against each other. It was commented that the problem is related to the scarcity of resources for sabbaticals at the state level and not the process itself.

Associate Provost Eskandari asked how this new policy would be operationalized. He ran through the following sequence of steps:

- An application is determined to be meritorious
- Then, time since the last sabbatical
- Then, years of service

He stated that if there is a tie, there needs to be some mechanism by which the tie is broken. If an application is not funded, what level of documentation will be required to demonstrate that all of those steps were followed properly? An applicant will want to be given some feedback on why their sabbatical was not funded. His concern is related to providing time since the last sabbatical and years of service of the other applicants. Senator Von Glahn responded that the policy talks about applications that are not meritorious and explaining why, and also stated that there would have to be a list of the number of years in service and that could be generated with anonymity.

Provost Alva stated that she is looking for implementation clarity. She stated that she spent seven (7) years at Cal State Northridge (the campus that the proposed policy is based on) and is very familiar with the sabbatical policy. One of the things she liked about their policy is that if there is a set number of sabbaticals to be awarded each year, the colleges are given a prorated portion to those sabbaticals, so every college knows how many sabbaticals can be awarded within the college. She asked if that was carried over into this proposed policy or does it just contain the Northridge rating system? She endorsed looking to see where eligible faculty are and distribute the resources proportionate to the number of eligible faculty and those colleges so that they are evaluated by their peers within their college and the kind of research they do within their college. Senator Von Glahn responded that he suspects the Northridge policy separates policy and procedure to some extent because the policy itself was fairly short and the committee tried to implement that policy as much as possible. The Northridge policy had an outstanding category that was ill-defined. The model with the outstanding category was included in the poll and it came in second to the policy presented in this report. The Faculty Affairs Committee did entertain sabbatical proposals using a college-level leave committee. The committee felt it would not be feasible to staff another set of committees at the college level. This approach would be better, but you would still be ranking a music composition, against a psychology project, against a science experiment. The proposed policy of awarding sabbaticals based on merit, time since the last sabbatical, and years in service is straight out of a paragraph in the Northridge policy.

The motion to adopt FA-010-189, Sabbatical Applications, passed with seven (7) NO votes and two (2) abstentions.

b. [AA-009-201, First Year Experience \(FYE\) Catalog Designation – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for AA-009-201, First Year Experience (FYE) Catalog Designation, is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/aa009201fr.pdf>.

Senator Wachs presented the report.

M/s to receive and file AA-009-201, First Year Experience (FYE) Catalog Designation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends the use of the course attribute feature for FYE course designations, and there is no longer a need for a separate course designation for FYE.

**DISCUSSION:**

The Academic Affairs Committee met with the First Year Experience (FYE) Committee, and it was determined that the existing course attribute feature would allow the committee to get the data needed without having to create a separate designation for FYE courses.

c. [AA-010-201, Revision of Policy 1603 – Credit by Examination for Semesters – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for AA-010-201, Revision of Policy 1603 – Credit by Examination for Semesters, is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/aa010201fr.pdf>.

Senator Wachs presented the report.

M/s to receive and file AA-010-201, Revision of Policy 1603 – Credit by Examination for Semesters.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends the policy be updated to read:

**CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA POLICY NO: 1603**

**CREDIT BY EXAMINATION (CHALLENGE)**

In instances where students have obtained knowledge from nonacademic or informal educational experiences equivalent to course work offered at this university, it is possible to receive credit through examination

Students may challenge courses by taking examinations developed at Cal Poly, Pomona. Only enrolled undergraduate students may challenge courses. Credit shall be awarded to those who pass them successfully. **A student may not challenge more than 24 semester units worth of course work.**

An approved petition for Credit by Examination permits regularly enrolled students to obtain University credit for subject matter in which they are especially qualified through nontraditional education or experience. Students must not have previously received credit for any course containing similar or advanced material from the same subject matter field. Students are not permitted to obtain credit by examination unless all the prerequisite for the course as specified in the University Catalog have been satisfied. Credit by examination will not be allowed for a course that is prerequisite of a course which the student has already completed or in which the student is currently enrolled.

Challenge exams shall not be permitted as a mean of earning a higher grade in a course. Once a student has enrolled in and earned a grade (passing or failing) in a course, the only way to earn a higher grade is to repeat the course and pay normal course unit fees. A course may be challenged only once.

No student, including resident, out of state, or foreign, shall be permitted by an instructor to sit in a class without enrolling either for audit or credit, and paying appropriate fees. Challenge exam credit will not be given for any course that has been audited. Units of credit received through this procedure may not apply toward the residence requirement for any of the degrees or credentials offered by the university.

The length of the examination will be consistent with the unit value of the course. It may include written, oral, or skills tests, or a combination of all three types and will be sufficiently comprehensive to determine that the student has essentially the same knowledge and skills as those students who successfully complete the course are required to possess. Challenge examination credit is entered on the student's permanent record. For courses in the student's major, the credit is a letter grade. Other challenge exam credit is awarded on a CR/NC basis.

Detailed instructions for applying for credit by examination may be obtained from the Registrar's Office.

## DISCUSSION:

This is a minor change that is necessary to convert quarter units to semester units. This was overlooked during semester conversion.

### 7. Old Business

- a. [Resolution on Community Oversight of the University Police Department - ORIGINAL](#)
- b. [Amended Resolution on Community Oversight of the University Police Department](#)

Chair Nelson reminded the body that the original Resolution on Community Oversight of the University Police Department was postponed from the May 5, 2021, Academic Senate Meeting due to time constraints.

Senator Aragon motioned to consider the amended *Resolution on Community Oversight of the University Police Department* instead of the original version. A second was received.

Senator Aragon explained that the resolution was created, in part, because of an open letter published by a CPP student relating his experience with the University Police Department (UPD). That instance fits into a broader pattern of racial discrimination reported by students and complaints that it is difficult to engage in a meaningful complaint process about their treatment. The resolution is also sparked in part by the Academic Senate's adoption of the [Resolution on Cal Poly Pomona's Commitment to Anti-Racism](#) on June 17, 2020, and the university's commitment to action.

The "resolve" statements in the resolution mostly support actions that are already in process in particular as a part of the commitment to action, but also in the work of the Police Advisory Task Force.

The motion to substitute the amended *Resolution of Community Oversight of the University Police Department* passed with one (1) NO and three (3) abstentions.

Senator Small expressed concern about the 2<sup>nd</sup> whereas statement, "*On February 15th, 2021, a Black veteran Cal Poly Pomona student (henceforth referred to as The Student) published an open letter, "[I Reported a Crime and Ended Up Being Accused of One](#),"<sup>2</sup> about his negative experience with the Cal Poly Pomona University Police Department (UPD), and this experience was later reported in part four of the "[My Story Matters](#)"<sup>3</sup> series published by the Poly Post; and...*". He went on to say that they support every "resolved" item in the resolution and the case for oversight and transparency in law enforcement is self-evident and believes that there is no need for any "whereas" statements to support all of the "resolved" statements in the resolution. The concern raised is because the newspaper articles cited are not investigative pieces vetted by a reporter, they are first-person accounts, and the Academic Senate is committing itself to these very serious individual accounts, which could very well be true, but they have not been vetted by experienced reporters. A reporter could seek comments from all parties relevant to the events and do public records searches on the events in question.

Senator Huerta expressed support for the resolution and his support for oversight over the UPD but believes it should be more of a Board of Directors type oversight where there actually is policy and consequences. There needs to be a move to more accountability and transparency. When a student files a complaint there needs to be action and resolution.

Senator Coburn stated he wants to support students but agrees with Senator Small that the cited incidents are first-person, unvetted accounts, and there is no evidence cited in the resolution. He stated that he wants to support both students but there needs to also be support for faculty, police officers, and administration. Senator Coburn believes that there is currently the right level of oversight for the UPD and having another type of oversight committee undermines the police. He strongly believes in holding into account people who act indiscriminately or inappropriately, but will

vote no on this resolution because there is already an existing infrastructure to handle “bad actors.”

Senator Aragon responded that there is evidence, the testimony of the student. Understandably, that evidence is defeasible and some people might be about to find reasons for rejecting the student’s testimony, but he has publicly reported his encounters. He has made the same statement multiple rounds of complaints and they went unanswered for nearly ten (10) months. Senator Aragon commented the fact that someone is not privy to the evidence, does not mean the evidence does not exist.

Senator Aragon, who was the author of the resolution, appreciated Senator Small’s concern about the cited first-person accounts may put too much onus on the Academic Senate to affirm the voice of the student(s). The amended version now in consideration takes out many of the specifics of the particular case and situates it more in a broader pattern. The attempt here was to try to take seriously student voices, especially about something as serious as this kind of discriminatory practice, while not settling the case. This specific case will be handled in another forum, so the resolution is taking seriously the voice of the student who reported this incident and calling for action that can be largely agreed upon.

Senator Wachs commented that the body needs to turn to people who are actually experts on policing and history. She also stated that defunding the policy is not saying that people do not want public safety, it is about re-envisioning and reimaging policing as something designed to help and assist the most vulnerable, rather the most powerful, which is the system currently in place. Senator Wachs strongly supports the resolution but agreed with Senator Small’s concerns about the first-person citations in the 2<sup>nd</sup> “whereas”.

Senator Pacleb thanked Senator Aragon for this important resolution and voiced her support for the resolution. She stated that as a university, we have to revisit our core values in terms of creating a safe space for all students, faculty, and staff, but there needs to be much more work and action in regards to tending to the needs of grievances of students. She strongly supports that this is a long pattern of broader incidents that tells us the university needs to do better at addressing what is going on in regards to student safety. Senator Pacleb went on to say that she agrees with Senator Small’s concern but added that this most recent incident happened in 2021, and this illustrates that this continued pattern of behavior is still happening.

M/s to amend the resolution to delete the second “whereas” statement and in the 3<sup>rd</sup> “whereas” replace “this incident” with “there” so it reads “There is concern that there may be a broader pattern of reported racial discrimination by students and statements by students that they have no meaningful avenue for reporting racial discrimination on campus, and...”

Senator Corley added that he is personally acquainted with this student, and with the year of travail that it has been, he believes that there is more here than this being an anecdotal opinion piece. Part of the facts that have been submitted in the story in regards to the financial institutions which had a vested interest in determining the veracity of the student’s claims did, in fact, refund the money. He stated that his concern about erasing this inciting incident from the resolution because it will erase the valuable voice of a black student.

Senator Chaturvedi added that he is concerned with removing the language because it speaks to the broader culture that we are trying to better Cal Poly Pomona. Especially given that over the last few years there have been several incidents where black students do not feel heard. Removing this statement would suggest that we are again not listening to the voices of black students. This resolution was motivated by this incident and therefore Senator Chaturvedi stated he did not support the motion to amend the resolution.

Senator Lloyd spoke in opposition to removing the “whereas” statement since it was the motivation behind creating this resolution. Removing the statement would erase an important voice that brought



this incident to the campus's attention. Senator Lloyd suggested that the word "alleged" in the statement so it would read "...a Black veteran Cal Poly student (henceforth referred to as The Student) alleged in an open letter..."

Senator Aragon commented that removing the statement in question would not only erase the voice of the student, it would also erase the specifics of the student's testimony. One of the things that is especially valuable about what the student has done here is going on record to state specifics and back those specifics up with evidence. He also stated that he would agree with Senator Lloyd's suggestion to use "alleged" in either the second or third "whereas" statement.

Senator Chaturvedi commented that the word "alleged" should be used in the third "whereas" because if it is used in the second statement it suggests that the Academic Senator questions the record of what this black student reported. Therefore, it would fit more rhetorically in the third "whereas" if our goal is not to call into question the open letter and the article.

Senator Small recalled his previous motion and made the motion to amend the third whereas statement to read "There is concern that this alleged incident may be part of a broader pattern of reported..."

Senator Corley spoke in opposition to the use of "alleged" in connection with the testimony of this black veteran student and suggested that the term "reported," be used instead of "alleged" since this is more descriptive of the action in this case. The term "alleged" has a history of use to undermine the veracity of claims.

Senator Small agreed to the word "reported," instead of "alleged" in his motion.

Chair Nelson stated that the motion before the body is to adopt the resolution with the amendment of adding the word "reported" in the third "whereas" statement.

The motion passed with three (3) NO votes and two (2) abstentions.

## 8. Closing Comments

Chair Nelson introduced a resolution for emeritus status for departing Associate Provost Dr. Sep Eskandari.

Chair Nelson read the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Professor Sepehr Eskandari has rendered distinguished service to the University, the College of Science, and the Biological Sciences Department for 21 years (2000–2021); and

WHEREAS, Professor Eskandari is an outstanding teacher and scholar, specialized in membrane transport of the neurotransmitter GABA in the brain; and

WHEREAS, Professor Eskandari secured \$2.99 million dollars in grant awards during his career at Cal Poly Pomona, with a NIH award totaling in excess of \$1.2 million; and

WHEREAS, Professor Eskandari established a vibrant research program and trained a large number of graduate and undergraduate students in research, authoring more than 40 refereed journal articles, book chapters, and review papers; and

WHEREAS, Professor Eskandari was awarded the College of Science Distinguished Teaching Award in 2005 and the Biotechnology Faculty Research Award (CSUPERB) in 2011; and

- WHEREAS, Professor Eskandari served with great distinction as department chair of the Biological Sciences Department from 2011 to 2015 as well as Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs, Academic Senate Chair and Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Faculty Excellence; and
- WHEREAS, Professor Eskandari served with great distinction in numerous committees at the Department, College and University level; therefore be it
- RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona unanimously expresses its deepest appreciation for Dr. Eskandari's many years of dedicated service to the students, the University and the community; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the title of "Professor Emeritus" be bestowed upon this faculty member; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That this resolution be presented to Professor Eskandari in recognition of many accomplishments and contributions, and that it be permanently recorded in the Minutes and Archives of the Academic Senate.

M/s to adopt this resolution and recognize Dr. Sep Eskandari as Professor Emeritus. The motion was received enthusiastically and passed unanimously.

Associate Provost Eskandari declared that this was a total surprise to him and extended his gratitude to all. He added that Cal Poly Pomona and its faculty, staff, and students are very dear to him, and he will miss everybody.

Chair Nelson passed the gavel to incoming Chair Pacleb who stated that she looks forward to the opportunity to serve. She then introduced and read the following resolution for outgoing Chair Nelson:

- WHEREAS, Dr. Phyllis Nelson served as Chair of the Academic Senate from 2019 to 2021 and Vice Chair from 2017-2019, and
- WHEREAS, She has served the Academic Senate Executive Committee since 2016; and
- WHEREAS, She has served the Academic Senate as a Senator representing the College of Engineering since 2014; and
- WHEREAS, She has served as a member of the Academic Senate Academic Affairs Committee (2013-2016) and Chair of the Academic Senate Academic Affairs Committee (2015-2016); and
- WHEREAS, She has served as a member of the Academic Senate Elections and Procedures Committee (2002-2004) and General Education Committee (2004-2006); and
- WHEREAS, She represented the faculty by serving on the Police Advisory Task Force, the Cal Poly Pomona Foundation Board of Directors, and the Inclusive Excellence Council Executive Board; and
- WHEREAS, She took an active role in all issues related to the campus pivot to virtual teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic, oversaw semester conversion and the implementation of the new Area F: Ethnic Studies requirement, and
- WHEREAS, She has advocated for the mentoring and leadership training of faculty in the

Academic Senate; and

- WHEREAS, She has effectively and tirelessly represented the interests of the faculty, staff, and students of Cal Poly Pomona; and
- WHEREAS, She has provided effective, collaborative and constructive leadership, while consistently advocating the principles of shared governance to local and statewide faculty and administrators; and
- WHEREAS, She has vigorously promoted the effectiveness and visibility of the Academic Senate in all matters that vitally affect the interests of the faculty, staff, students, and administration; and
- WHEREAS, She has argued effectively, in small and large settings, for the legitimacy and indeed essentiality of the Academic Senate in all matters pertaining to the interests of the faculty, staff, students, and administration; and
- WHEREAS, She conducted Senate meetings in an organized, efficient, collegial, and inclusive manner, fostering tolerance and openness, clearly articulating the nature of the motions considered, demonstrating good judgment on all matters before the Senate, sharing her wisdom and institutional knowledge, and always promoting and fostering an informed Senate body; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, express its sincere appreciation to Dr. Phyllis Nelson for her leadership and concern for faculty, staff, and students; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That this resolution be permanently recorded in the Minutes and Archives of the Academic Senate in recognition of Dr. Phyllis Nelson's service to Cal Poly Pomona and the Academic Senate.

M/s to adopt the resolution in recognition of Dr. Phyllis Nelson's service to the Academic Senate. The motion passed unanimously.

Incoming Chair Pacleb personally thanked Chair Nelson for her mentorship and thanked her for her leadership.

Chair Nelson thanked everybody for all their perseverance in 2020-2021 and adjourned the meeting.

The May 12, 2021 Academic Senate Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

