

Minutes

of the Academic Senate Meeting
December 6, 2023

- PRESENT: Adams, Aragon, Barding, Chase, Dabas, Fallah Fini, Gad, Gekara, Givens, Guerrero, Guthrie, Hall, Hanink, Hoikkala, Husain, John, Kumar, Monemi, Moore, Myers, Osborn, Pacleb, Puthoff, Quinn, Roy, Sharma, Shen, Small, Suzer, Urey, Valentine, Vallejo, Von Glahn, Welke, Yoo
- Proxies: Senator Urey for Senator Stovall, Senator Fallah Fini for Senator Nakhjiri, Vice Chair Quinn for Senator Roy until he arrives
- GUESTS: A. Baski, J. Chong, A. DeRosa, K. Forward, T. Gomez, J. Hargis, N. Hawkes, S. Krishnamurthy, C. LaMunyon, Z. Ma, J. McGuthry, N. Pandadiya, K. Pascual, C. Pickett, L. Preiser-Houy, T. Roby, H. Sadaghiani, C. Santiago-Gonzalez,

Chair Kumar welcomed the new College of Engineering Senator, Dr. Zahra Sotoudeh. Senator Sotoudeh is replacing Senator Nakhjiri who has resigned due to a sabbatical in the Spring Semester.

1. Academic Senate Minutes – November 8, 2023

M/s/p to postpone the November 8, 2023 Academic Senate Meeting minutes.

2. Information Items

a. Chair's Report

Chair Kumar stated that there is important business to conduct during this meeting and asked the standing committee reports to be presented as quickly as possible. She also reminded the body that Robert's Rules will be enforced during the discussions on the resolutions.

b. President's Report

President Coley was unable to attend the meeting as she was at the Chancellor's office for a meeting of all Presidents called by the Chancellor. Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Gomez reported for President Coley, she stated that during the strike participating faculty members and other demonstrators were able to express themselves in an environment that was safe and respectful. Interim Provost Gomez conveyed that the President cares deeply about the wellbeing of the campus and looks forward to constructive dialogue with the Academic Senate and other campus stakeholders.

c. Provost's Report

The Provost's Report is located on the Academic Senate website at https://www.cpp.edu/senate/documents/packets/2023-24/12.06.23/provosts_report_to_academic_senate_2023.12.06_.pdf.

Interim Provost Gomez reported that over the last couple of weeks she has had the opportunity to engage with faculty from the faculty learning community and the council of chairs meeting, and she recognizes the urgency to communicate some of the priorities in Academic Affairs. Academic Affairs leadership has identified several priorities that they are focused on during the next semester. One of the highest priorities is addressing needed department chair support. The plan is to finalize the department chair workload and department staff level analysis and benchmarking. This work started several months ago, and it is close to conclusion. The goal is to establish transparent and consistent standards for chair assignments. Regarding faculty workload, as recommended in conversations and the workload resolution, there will be a workload analysis done by colleges and departments. Dr. Gomez stated that she and the President are committed to augmenting investments in the Provost Teacher-Scholar Program and to develop a common rubric to increase access and equity across the colleges. This is just the beginning of addressing workload issues.

The Office of Academic Affairs will also address operational process improvements by partnering across divisions to improve processes and remove administrative barriers. This is an effort to address the things that are broken and fix them sooner rather than later. One of which is Concur and the travel processes, which is a pain point for faculty and staff. There is also a workgroup dealing specifically with student travel, which is another overly complicated process that needs to be streamlined. Another process that will be looked at is the academic petition process, there continues to be unacceptable delays in processing petitions. The Academic Affairs process for academic petitions has been streamlined, but once the petitions get to the Registrar's Office, the high volume has prevented clearing of the backlog. The goal is to have the backlog cleared by the end of January and have a process that prevents backlogs. This is going to require some technology enhancements to ensure that we can process academic petitions within four (4) weeks of submission to the Registrar's Office. This is a workload and a graduation issue, because when petitions are not processed in a timely manner, department chairs are having to work on getting permission numbers and students may have to repeat courses they do not actually need. Dr. Gomez stated that the Office of Academic Affairs is deeply committed to streamlining the petition process.

The last priority for the Academic Affairs leadership team is to unpack and assess its graduate studies. The plan is to assess the current infrastructure and reimagine it to provide sustainable support. Plus, find a way to grow graduate programs that are innovative and develop student success outcome assessment tools.

d. Vice Chair's Report

NEW REFERRALS: (1)

GE-015-234 Implementation of New GE Learning Outcomes and GE Pattern

SENATE REPORTS FORWARDED TO PRESIDENT: (3)

AS-3050-234-AP NEW Minor in Sustainability Education
 AS-3051-234-AP NEW Cyber Security Minor
 AS-3052-234-AP New Self-Support Information Security Global Access Certificate

PRESIDENT RESPONSES TO SENATE REPORTS: (1)

AS-3046-234-AA Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement – **APPROVED**

e. ASCSU Report

Senator Urey reported that the CSU Academic Senate has not met since the November 8, 2023 Academic Senate meeting. She stated that there may be some communication coming soon about general education so please be aware there might be some significant changes and we want to make sure that the campus has an opportunity to respond.

f. Budget Report

The Budget Report is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://www.cpp.edu/senate/documents/packets/2023-24/12.06.23/12-5-budget-report.pdf>.

Senator Osborn reported that the Budget Committee met with President Coley, Interim Provost Gomez, Vice President Trinidad, and Assistant Vice President Lee to discuss the budget for fiscal year 2023-24. There is currently a 13-million-dollar deficit which is being backfilled with one-time funds. There was discussion about impacts to the budget; the impact of the CFA and Teamsters negotiations, redistribution of funded FTES, the increase in tuition starting in fiscal year 2024-25, and salary increases and steps in upcoming years.

Senator Von Glahn asked since the deficit must be backfilled with one-time money, how much of it was one-time funding and can that easily absorb the cost. Senator Osborn responded that he did not have the answer to the question.

g. CFA Report

CFA President Von Glahn reported that most of the faculty showed up for the one-day strike on Monday, December 4, 2023. Dr. Von Glahn stated that he is hoping that was the last time that faculty must strike. There have been questions about why only a one-day strike, and the answer is that the CFA did not want to impact students and student

learning. CFA is going back to the bargaining table on December 12th and hopefully, with the press coverage and the fact that the union showed that campuses could be shut down, there will be a fair contract offered. He added that there were some regrettable emails received regarding the possibility of union harassment and Dr. Von Glahn was glad that faculty got a little fired up and came to the picket line to demonstrate in an organized and peaceful manner with no anger or harassment. Senator Von Glahn thanked Dr. Vallejo for organizing the mariachi music during the rally and putting on a mariachi concert after the rally ended. He also thanked Dr. Jonathan Puthoff for directing traffic for 12 hours to keep the picketers safe, Dr. Päivi Hoikkala who helped organize the effort, and Dr. Urey for all her contributions to the effort. He went on to thank everyone whose hard work went into the organization and participation in the effort on Monday and thanked everyone for helping the bargaining team settle a fair contract.

There was a question about the next steps for bargaining. The plan is to go back to the bargaining table and see what the Chancellor's Office offer is and if it is an agreement that the faculty will vote on. If the CFA gets a tentative agreement, then the members will have to vote on it. The current offer on the table is 5-percent for this year, but for any raise after that has a caveat about state funding, and the bargaining team has decided that the offer is not acceptable.

h. ASI Report

Senator Suzer reported that she has had multiple consultations with the board of directors regarding the resolutions that are on today's agenda. She and the ASI Vice President met with legal counsel and have talked to as many faculty members as possible to gauge the impact of any action that is taken. She shared that there are many student concerns and criticisms regarding the resolutions.

ASI Vice President Pandadiya spoke to the inadequate student representation on the Academic Senate, stating that ASI has a single vote for a population of 29,000 students. He stated that every other CSU has more than one student in the Academic Senate. The ASI Vice President stated that this is something the Academic Senate can change. ASI VP Pandadiya commented that ASI would like more representation on the Academic Senate because they want preventative action put in place so that they are not always reacting.

Senator Suzer stated that regarding shared governance, the ASI student government was surprised to see the resolution of no confidence against the university president that was raised at the last Academic Senate meeting. The majority of content in both resolutions on today's agenda call for shared governance between the academic senate and the administration, there is nothing pertaining to shared governance with students, or even for what shared governance from the student angle means. Senator Suzer stated that personally she has been on multiple committees and provided student input when needed. But all student input was redacted before the committee made its decision, be it for a hiring committee or student feedback regarding campus initiatives. She commented that if

this body is interested in student feedback, it is likely to be subjective, it is likely to be opinionated, it is likely to have content that might not be as professional as faculty feedback, but it is still important to have student voices heard. She added that the resolutions have no student context. She appreciates that you value students and that the resolutions state that the action needs to be taken for the students but emphasized that student feedback should be represented in the resolutions. She urged the academic senate to reconsider shared governance from the perspective of the students, especially when considering the scope of the resolutions.

i. [Staff Report](#)

The Staff Report is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://www.cpp.edu/senate/documents/packets/2023-24/12.06.23/12.05.23-staff-report.pdf>.

Senator Valentine reported that on Thursday, December 7, CPP is partnering with USC Race and Equity Center to offer a series of workshops geared to shape inclusive teaching practices. On Thursday, December 14, 2023 there is a *Learning with a Leader* event featuring Dr. Victoria Bhavsar, director of the Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence (CAFE). CAFE is a treasured resource on campus, helping instructors create lesson plans, working in Canvas, and numerous tutorials for faculty.

The College of Agriculture is hosting *Holidays at the Petting Farm* on Saturday, December 16, from 10:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m.

3. Academic Senate Committee Reports – Time Certain 3:45 p.m.

a. [AA-004-234 2024-25 Academic Calendar and Five-Year Projection – **SECOND READING**](#)

The second reading for AA-004-234, 2024-25 Academic Calendar and Five-Year Projection, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/aa004234sr.pdf>.

The 2024-25 academic calendar is located on the Academic Senate website at https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/AA004234sr_2.pdf.

Senator Vallejo presented the report.

M/s to adopt A-004-234, 2024-25 Academic Calendar and Five-Year Projection.

Recommendation:

After careful review and discussions, the Academic Affairs Committee recommends adoption of the latest revised calendar for 2024-25.

Discussion:

Senator Vallejo reported that the committee did not receive any comments since the first reading. She does have a meeting to discuss concerns raised about Add/Drop period and other things that might be revisited for future calendars.

The motion to adopt A-004-234, 2024-25 Academic Calendar and Five-Year Projection, passed unanimously.

b. [AP-001-234 Replacement of Graduate Institutional Learning Outcomes \(GILOs\) with Institutional Learning Goals \(ILGs\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for AP-001-234, Replacement of Graduate Institutional Learning Outcomes (GILOs) with Institutional Learning Goals (ILGs), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap001234fr.pdf>.

Senator Small presented the report.

M/s to receive and file AP-001-234, Replacement of Graduate Institutional Learning Outcomes (GILOs) with Institutional Learning Goals (ILGs).

Recommendation:

The Academic Programs Committee recommends the proposed Replacement of Graduate Institutional Learning Outcomes (GILOs) with the following Institutional Learning Goals (ILGs):

- Application of Knowledge: CPP graduates will apply existing and new knowledge and skills to real-world situations, opportunities, and challenges.
- Critical Thinking and Problem Solving: CPP graduates will use analytic and decision-making skills to identify and solve problems effectively.
- Creativity, Discovery, and Innovation: CPP graduates connect theory and practice to drive creativity, discovery, and innovation.
- Diverse and Multi-disciplinary Perspectives: CPP graduates will demonstrate awareness, understanding, and respect for diverse viewpoints—particularly those perspectives historically silenced—related to current and emerging issues across cultures and disciplines.

- Integration of Technology: CPP graduates will appropriately utilize and adapt to new technologies.
- Collaborative Learning: CPP graduates will demonstrate the ability to share and gain knowledge and skills as part of a team.
- Community and Global Engagement: CPP graduates are prepared to contribute to and improve local and global communities.
- Professional and Career Readiness: CPP graduates embody the knowledge and skills of their chosen discipline/profession.

Discussion:

Senator Small explained that this referral brings the assessment of graduate and undergraduate programs more in line with each other. This transition aligns with the institution's strategic direction, supports graduate programs, and reduces faculty workload by streamlining assessment efforts. It aims to connect ILGs with student learning outcomes across all academic programs, ensuring a more effective and meaningful approach to assessment and program review. It was noted that graduate programs are a little more specialized and getting some graduate programs in line with all eight of the institutional learning outcomes might be a challenge, but the committee agreed that if programs are significantly in line with at least a majority of the learning outcomes then there should not be a problem.

c. [AP-002-234 Program Review for MS, Electrical Engineering – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for AP-002-234, Program Review of MS, Electrical Engineering, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap002234fr.pdf>.

Senator Small presented the report.

M/s to receive and file AP-002-234, Program Review of MS, Electrical Engineering.

Recommendation:

The Academic Programs Committee commends the Electrical Engineering MS Program for their work, in their operation of the program and in the preparation to get a thorough and thoughtful detailed review highlighting pertinent issues.

Discussion:

Senator Small reported that the external reviewers felt that the MS, Electrical Engineering is a strong program. The reviewers also mentioned several challenges facing this

program. The External Program Review team mentions the challenge of available classes for graduate students as some classes gets cancelled due to low enrollment which also adversely affects the meaningfulness of the concentration structures that lack required courses. The reviewers have also identified low density of tenure track faculty and low enrollment.

The reviewers had several suggestions. To address class cancellations due to low enrollment, reviewers suggested that the minimum number of students should be reduced to eight, instead of twelve. The reviewers also suggested consolidating the concentration or specialization areas to a smaller subset as all areas might not be feasible for the department to offer due to limited number of courses offered and/or course cancellations. Finally, the reviewers also suggested that the department consider changing the program name to Electrical and Computer Engineering to increase enrollment and attract more students.

The Department and Dean's office agreed in general with the comments and suggestions made by the External Review Team and the action plan for improvement is sound as well. Overall, the review of this MS program is positive, finding that this is a Program with diverse student body with qualified faculty as well as a commitment to working with students. Areas of concern are primarily resource (course offering, tenure density) issues that all the programs on campus have.

d. [AP-005-234 New Self-Support Counterpart to the Master of Science in Information Security – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for AP-005-234, New Self-Support Counterpart to the Master of Science in Information Security, is locate on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap005234fr.pdf>.

Senator Small presented the report.

M/s to receive on file AP-005-234, New Self-Support Counterpart to the Master of Science in Information Security.

Recommendation:

The Academic Programs Committee recommends approval of the new Self-Support Master of Science in Information Security.

Discussion:

In collaboration, the Colleges of Business Administration (CBA) and Professional and Global Education (CPGE; formerly the Extended University) have proposed a new self-support version of the existing MS in Information Security. This proposed program is thirty-one credits, just like the existing state-support program, and the curriculum would be

identical to the state-support program. The chief difference is that the self-support program would be face-to-face, to meet the needs of international students who cannot get a visa if their program is fully online, while the state-support program is online, per the demonstrated preferences of most current students.

After receiving this referral, the Academic Programs Committee conducted campus-wide consultations. No concerns were raised by other campus constituencies.

In its own investigation, the AP Committee concentrated on three key questions: The discrepancy between the face-to-face nature of the self-support program and online nature of the state-support program, potential supplanting issues, and the sustainability of the budget.

At first, the face-to-face nature seemed worrisome, as students and faculty in many disciplines find in-person classes to offer distinct advantages over online instruction. However, the CIS department surveyed sixty-two undergraduate students in CIS and other relevant disciplines in the College of Business Administration, of whom thirty-four are considering an MS, and found that fully online was the preferred format. The preference arises from a combination of factors, including the fact that many MS students in this discipline have full-time jobs or demanding part-time jobs, the prospect of serving students throughout California, and the digital nature of the discipline lending itself to online work.

Considering these facts, the state-support program already converted to fully online in 2022. The AP Committee is thus satisfied that the self-support face-to-face program is not supplanting what would otherwise be a preferable state-support modality. Instead, a significant audience for this program is international students who would not be eligible for a discounted state-support program in any modality and would not be eligible for a student visa if attending a fully online program.

Furthermore, the courses will be taught as overloads, subject to the usual CSU caps on overload, ensuring that faculty time and effort are not shifted away from existing state-support programs, and will be taught using CPGE facilities.

Finally, the AP Committee reviewed the budget. It is constructed on the assumption that the first cohort will be fifteen students, 75% of the usual target of twenty students. Under these assumptions the program still meets its costs and produces a surplus. The support model for faculty time and program administration is consistent with the usual practices for joint programs between CPGE and CBA. The forecast further assumes reaching and then exceeding the target of 20 students (eventually reaching 30), remaining at a size that program faculty can accommodate with reasonable efforts supported in the proposed budget. The conservative assumptions here give the AP Committee confidence that this program is sustainable.

e. Faculty Affairs Referrals:

- [FA-003-223, Policy for Offer of Faculty Tenure on Initial Appointment – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for FA-003-223, Policy for Offer of Faculty Tenure on Initial Appointment, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/fa003223fr.pdf>.

- [FA-001-234, Review of Policy 1302 – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for FA-001-234, Review of Policy 1302, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/fa001234fr.pdf>.

- [FA-002-234, Review of Policy 1303 – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for FA-002-234, Review of Policy 1303, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/fa001234fr.pdf>.

- [FA-004.234, Review of Policy 1315 - Visiting Faculty Appointment – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for FA-004-234, Review of Policy 1315 – Visiting Faculty Appointment, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/fa001234fr.pdf>.

- [FA-005-234, Review of Policy 1395 – Honoraria – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for FA-005-234, Review of Policy 1395 – Honoraria, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/fa005234fr.pdf>.

Senator Barding presented the reports as a group.

M/s to receive and file the following reports:

- FA-003-223, Policy for Offer of Faculty Tenure on Initial Appointment
- FA-001-234, Review of Policy 1302
- FA-002-234, Review of Policy 1303
- FA-004.234, Review of Policy 1315 – Visiting Faculty Appointment
- FA-005-234, Review of Policy 1395 – Honoraria

Recommendations:

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the Policy for Offer of Faculty Tenure on Initial Appointment is not necessary until the language of either the CBA

or policies are updated to require department consent instead of department recommendations. The remaining policies considered here, 1302, 1303, 1315, and 1395, should be removed from the University Manual as they did not go through the shared governance process nor are necessary policies.

Discussion:

Senator Barding reported that four of these five reports are policies that were carry-overs from the original University Manual, and there was no record of them going through the shared governance process when the on-line Academic Manual was created. The committee voted to remove them from the Academic Manual since they were not sure of what their purpose was.

The Faculty Affairs Committee decided not to consider FA-003-223, which requested a policy update for awarding initial tenure without return rights, because it is currently up to the President's Office to consult with the appropriate departments and make a final appointment.

f. General Education Math and Statistics Reports

- [GE-001-234 MAT 1050 – College Algebra \(GE Sub-area B4\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-001-234, MAT 1050 – College Algebra (GE Sub-area B4), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge001234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-002-234 MAT 1250 – Introductory Calculus for Business \(GE Sub-area B4\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-002-234, MAT 1250 – Introductory Calculus for Business (GE Sub-area B4), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge002234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-003-234 MAT 1940 – Mathematical Concepts for Elementary School Teachers \(GE Sub-area B4\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-003-234, MAT 1940 – Mathematical Concepts for Elementary School Teachers (GE Sub-area B4), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge003234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-004-234 Trigonometry \(GE Sub-area B4\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-004-234, Trigonometry (GE Sub-area B4), is located on the Academic Senate website at

<https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge004234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-005-234 MAT 1910 – Survey of Mathematics \(GE Sub-area B4\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-005-234, MAT 1910 – Survey of Mathematics (GE Sub-area B4), is located on the Academic Senate website at

<https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge005234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-006-234 STA 1200 – Statistics with Applications \(GE Sub-area B4\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-006-234, STA 1200 – Statistics with Applications (GE Sub-area B4), is located on the Academic Senate website at

<https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge006234fr.pdf>.

Senator Aragon presented the reports as a group.

M/s to receive and file the following reports:

- GE-001-234, MAT 1050 – College Algebra (GE Sub-area B4)
- GE-002-234, MAT 1250 – Introductory Calculus for Business (GE Sub-area B4)
- GE-003-234, MAT 1940 – Mathematical Concepts for Elementary School Teachers (GE Sub-area B4)
- GE-004-234, Trigonometry (GE Sub-area B4)
- GE-005-234, MAT 1910 – Survey of Mathematics (GE Sub-area B4)
- GE-006-234, STA 1200 – Statistics with Applications (GE Sub-area B4)

Recommendations:

The GE Committee unanimously recommends approval of the changes to the courses.

Discussion:

These referrals were written to remove “Category III” from the list of pre-requisite options as part of EO 1110. This was done so Category III students could be included in introductory mathematics courses. This change does not affect the courses’ ability to meet GE sub-area B4 requirements.

g. General Education IGE Referrals:

- [GE-007-234 IGE 2350 – Rival Empires: Representation and Resistance \(GE Sub-area C1\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-007-234, IGE 2350 – Rival Empires: Representation and Resistance (GE Sub-area C1), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge007234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-008-234 IGE 1100 – Who Am I? : Understanding Ourselves, Our Communities, and Our Worlds \(GE Sub-areas A2 and C2\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-008-234, IGE 1100 – Who Am I?: Understanding Ourselves, Our Communities, and Our Worlds (GE Sub-areas A2 and C2), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge008234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-009-234 IGE 2250 – The Stranger: Encountering Difference and Creating Coexistence \(GE Sub-areas C2 and D1\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-009-234, IGE 2250 – The Stranger: Encountering Difference and Creating Coexistence (GE Sub-areas C2 and D1), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge009234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-010-234 IGE 3100 – Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Capstone Seminar \(GE Interdisciplinary Synthesis C3 or D4\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-010-234, IGE 3100 – Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Capstone Seminar (GE Interdisciplinary Synthesis C3 or D4), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge010234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-012-234 IGE 3200 – Mad Scientists and Aliens: Science and Technology in Popular Culture \(GE Synthesis C3\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-012-234, IGE 3200 – Mad Scientists and Aliens: Science and Technology in Popular Culture (GE Synthesis C3), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge012234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-013-234 IGE 1200 – Faith, Passion, and Power: The Saga of the Ancient and Medieval Worlds \(GE Sub-areas A2 and C2\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-013-234, IGE 1200 – Faith, Passion, and Power: The Saga of the Ancient and Medieval Worlds (GE Sub-areas A2 and C2), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge013234fr.pdf>.

- [GE-014-234 IGE 3500 – The Creative Process: Innovation and Transformation \(GE Interdisciplinary Synthesis C3 or D4\) – FIRST READING](#)

The first reading report for GE-014-234, IGE 3500 – The Creative Process: Innovation and Transformation (GE Interdisciplinary Synthesis C3 or D4), is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ge014234fr.pdf>.

Senator Aragon presented the reports as a group.

M/s to receive and file the following reports:

- GE-007-234, IGE 2350 – Rival Empires: Representation and Resistance (GE Sub-area C1)
- GE-008-234, IGE 1100 – Who Am I? : Understanding Ourselves, Our Communities, and Our Worlds (GE Sub-areas A2 and C2)
- GE-009-234, IGE 2250 – The Stranger: Encountering Difference and Creating Coexistence (GE Sub-areas C2 and D1)
- GE-010-234, IGE 3100 – Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Capstone Seminar (GE Interdisciplinary Synthesis C3 or D4)
- GE-012-234, IGE 3200 – Mad Scientists and Aliens: Science and Technology in Popular Culture (GE Synthesis C3)
- GE-013-234, IGE 1200 – Faith, Passion, and Power: The Saga of the Ancient and Medieval Worlds (GE Sub-areas A2 and C2)
- GE-014-234, IGE 3500 – The Creative Process: Innovation and Transformation (GE Interdisciplinary Synthesis C3 or D4) – FIRST READING

Senator Aragon reported that these are all Interdisciplinary General Education (IGE) referrals. Most of the referrals are requesting a rename of courses, except for the capstone course, and the removal of all pre-requisite requirements for the undergraduate courses to facilitate enrollment and timely completion of program requirements. The requested changes do not affect the courses' ability to meet the GE sub area requirements. The GE Committee unanimously approved all requested changes.

Senator Aragon added that GE-011-234 is missing from this list because that name change involves a topic and idea that different departments are involved with, and the committee needs to do further consultation.

4. New Business

Chair Kumar introduced the new business by stating that there are two resolutions before the body; the *Resolution of Non-Confidence in the University President* and the *Resolution of Immediate and Necessary Actions to Address Urgent Campus Crises*. She clarified what the body is voting on, especially about the resolution of non-confidence. The body is not answering the question “do you have confidence

in the President?” The body is voting on adopting a document, the resolution, and that means agreeing to the tone and the words in the document. That is an important distinction to remember. She also reminded the body about collegiality, which is enshrined in the Senate Constitution. Central to collegiality is the respect for differing opinions and points of view. Chair Kumar added that colleagues have expressed that they are hesitant to speak for fear of being alienated, labeled, mischaracterized, and marginalized, and she is incredibly saddened by this. There needs to be a space for today’s discussion which is based on respect and is welcoming of a diversity of opinions. There needs to be separation between what is under the purview of collective bargaining and what is under the purview of shared governance. The Senate Constitution has a statement about maintaining the Senate separate and apart from union issues. Chair Kumar commented that as a member of CFA, she is thankful for the union’s efforts to reach agreements on important bargaining issues, but the conversation in this room about the resolutions should only be about Senate issues.

She stated that she understands that the levels of frustration and anger on campus are high, and emotions and passions are inflamed. Some colleagues have shared that it has been difficult to find the time to read the resolutions and process them beyond the titles. There is a sense of despair and not caring about what happens next. The hope is that the Senate can channel the frustration into something positive and discuss these critical issues with the goal of collegiality and cooperation and a constructive approach to finding the best way forward for the university.

- a. [Academic Senate Resolution of Non-Confidence in the University President - SECOND READING](#)

M/s to adopt the Academic Senate Resolution of Non-Confidence in the University President.

Senator Small read the resolution in its entirety.

Chair Kumar reminded the body that Robert’s Rules will be enforced during the discussion. In a debate/discussion, each member has the right to speak twice on the same question on the same day but cannot make a second speech on the same question so long as any member who has not spoken on the question desires the floor. A member who has spoken twice, on a particular question on the same day has exhausted their right to debate that question for that day. To ensure that members have the opportunity to speak, each member will have a 3-minute speaking time limit. Senators are given priority for the speakers’ list.

Senator Suzer remarked that this resolution has been shared with the ASI Student Government Board of Directors and the entire student body in an email. She shared that some students are confused by the language in the resolution, understating that some of the language is new to the student body. She asked if all the content and the facts quoted in the resolution are verifiable. She also asked if all the verbiage in the “whereas” statements is under the authority of the campus president, or is the resolution calling for corrections under someone else’s jurisdiction?

Chair Kumar asked if either one of the proponents of the resolution would like to answer Senator Suzer’s questions about (1) all statements being demonstrably verifiable, and (2) if all of them are under the purview of the campus president?

Senator Von Glahn stated that he was not going to respond to those questions and that the answers are available. He added that people have had a month to unpack the verbiage in the resolution and do their due diligence.

Senator Von Glahn commented that it is with a heavy heart that this resolution has been brought forward. He added that he has had the privilege of working with administration over the years in his various roles on campus and thinks that everyone understands that in these positions, that these are role conflicts and not people conflicts, and it is not meant to be personal, but it can be perceived that way. He hopes that it is understood that this is about the role and how that position has manifested on the university over the last eight years. Specifically on tenure density, this is one of the few issues that President Coley did promise that the campus would move back to the pre-recession levels of 66%, and she has not succeeded in accomplishing that goal. The campus still has the same number of tenure track faculty, roughly, as in 2002. The campus has seven thousand more equivalent students, but the same number of tenure track faculty as there were 21 years ago. Understanding that some of it is state funded, but there has been a commensurate growth of MPP and director positions that has grown with the number of students, and that is a serious concern.

Interim Provost Gomez thanked Senator Suzer for her questions and stated that they are important questions that should be addressed. Dr. Gomez addressed the statement in the resolution (“WHEREAS, the University President, Soraya M. Coley, instilled other interim and other temporary positions across campus without consultation with the Academic Senate, faculty, or leadership groups, disrupting the continuity and stability of academic leadership within the university;”). Provost Gomez stated that there is a fundamental misunderstanding of the role of cabinet and division leaders. Division leaders are responsible for their divisions and the hiring of MPP within their divisions. She gave the example that in her role as Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs, she is responsible for the interims that are in Academic Affairs, so the statement about President Coley being responsible for interim positions across the campus is not accurate.

Senator Valentine commented about the statement on transparent communication (“WHEREAS, the foundation of a successful university relies on effective shared governance, transparent communication, inclusivity, and ethical and stable leadership to uphold its academic mission and values;”). Senator Valentine remarked that she believes the President has been as transparent as she can. President Coley comes to the Academic Senate meetings when her schedule allows and reports on the business of the campus. She is always willing to answer all questions that do not encroach on confidentiality issues. In terms of budgetary issues, she has shown as much transparency as possible for the resources that Cal Poly Pomona has been allocated. President Coley reports to the Budget Committee on the state of the university budget, she talks about recurring versus one-time funding. One-time funding cannot be used for faculty hiring because there is no guarantee that those funds will be available in the following years. This information has been passed onto the Academic Senate through the Budget Committee reports and even through the President’s reports.

Senator Dabas thanked Senator Valentine for her input. She asked Interim Provost Gomez if the positions filled under division leaders require the President’s input or consultation. Interim Provost Gomez responded that there are various levels of MPP positions. MPP I and MPP II almost never required consultation or consideration of the President. In hiring an MPP III or MPP IV, there would be a conversation, but the division vice president is responsible for the hiring in their division. For interim positions, the division vice presidents are responsible for filling MPP III and MPP IV interim position in a timely manner and they are also responsible for consultation with the Academic Senate. Interim positions are appointed when somebody who can quickly step into the role with the least disruption is needed, that recommendation will come from the divisional leader, especially when talking about MPP III and MPP IV roles.

Senator Dabas’s second comment was about transparency and what is meant about the statement of transparency. Is it transparency in the communication to the levels in the university who look up to the President as a leader? Or are we talking about transparency between the President’s Cabinet and the faculty and staff? She agrees that there may be transparent communication between those people who are very vocal and have opportunities to speak directly with the President. She added that there needs to be better downward communication in the President’s organization, and even other leadership roles, department chairs, and deans, to the faculty and staff.

Senator Small commented that he agrees that hiring responsibility lies within the division leader, but the truth is that if there is a systemic problem in the university, it must lie with the head of the university.

Senator Valentine spoke regarding the feeling that there is a lack of communication between the President’s Office and the faculty and asked if faculty have regular meetings to discuss their concerns? And do the concerns pertain to the President? If yes, do they receive responses or feedback? What is the path forward with the adoption of a no

confidence resolution in the President, will it help the faculty? She added, that like the ASI Representative, she is trying to figure out what the goal is of the resolutions.

Chair Kumar responded that the President typically meets with the Executive Committee about once a month, and that she and the Vice Chair typically have a meeting with the President, Provost, and VP Hawkes once a month. Those are opportunities for the Academic Senate/Executive Committee to voice concerns to leadership. During one of those meetings there was a request for information on MPP III and IV appointments. How many MPPs are there? Who is permanent? Who is interim? How long have they been in their position, etc.? The President's Office did provide a report with all the information requested, plus information on MPP I and MPP II appointments. During the President's Report given at the Academic Senate meetings there is always an opportunity to ask questions. When the President is not available to attend Academic Senate meetings the reason is articulated.

Senator Givens said that she is uncertain on how she is going to vote because she generally likes to work collaboratively with people to solve problems, but at the same time she voiced frustration with President Coley's leadership. She stated that there appears to be a lack of responsiveness and urgency. Senator Givens added that she continues to bring up issues and problems, and there does not seem to be any response. She commented that she does not bring these things up to the President because she does not have that kind of access, but there are things that are not going well on campus and who is responsible for them. Whose job is it to fix systematic problems? Chair Kumar asked Senator Givens to bring the problems to her and she committed to take them to the President during their meetings.

Senator Vallejo addressed the issue of toxic work environments and Title IX proceedings ("WHEREAS, the University President, Soraya M. Coley, has dismissed the Provost during a pivotal phase of the semester, exacerbating the effects of persistently weak leadership surrounding university's academic and administrative operations. These effects encompass uncertainty, instability and tumult surrounding timely employee compensation, receiving contractually obligated pay increases, management and stewardship of financial resources, accreditation proceedings, Title IX proceedings, the implementation of systemwide changes in General Education and the Ethnic Studies Requirement, and a deficient response to formal complaints of excessive workload, racial aggressions and marginalization across campus, toxic work environments and whistleblowing; thereby fostering uncertainty, discontent, and low morale among the university's stakeholders;"). She stated that she has had a very telling experience over the last eight- and one-half years, being a younger woman of color, wearing her ethnicity and background on many of the events on campus, she has experienced negative experiences and treatment. She commented that if she had to pare down the resolution to the most egregious point, it would be the statement on the toxic environments, and that is entirely in control of the leadership on campus. Why does the campus still not have an ombuds person? Faculty

Affairs condoning memes about people's disabilities, racial, racist, and sexist epithets being used against faculty has shown a pattern of abusiveness in departmental issues and other settings. Senator Vallejo commented that she knows of at least a dozen specific cases of abuse in the workplace and the worst thing is that many students and faculty volunteered to speak on instances of abuse, and to her knowledge none of them were interviewed. There is a lack of transparency and a lack of integrity. She added that it has taken too long to hire an ombuds person and one is urgently needed.

Chair Kumar noted that the Academic Senate adopted the [Resolution for the Academic Senate in Support of the Hiring of a University Ombuds and the Filling of the Office of the University Ombuds](#) on May 4, 2022. After that there was a working group formed to make a recommendation to the President and now there is an active search for a university ombuds person.

There was a comment that during one of the President's Reports prior to the resolution it was stated that leadership was reviewing whether the ombuds actually works, and at this time we are not going forward with hiring an ombuds person. The Senator was struck by the lack of explanation for changing from whether or not the model worked.

Senator Pacleb expressed her frustration, anger, and disappointment. Students have reported racial incidents on campus and have talked to the faculty asking what can be done to address some of the racial aggressions on campus. She and Vice Chair Quinn have been in conversations with students who have been impacted by racial microaggressions by leaders in the college. There were townhall meetings and students were fighting for their rights, comfort, and their safety. It is frustrating when the most vulnerable and talented students are sharing with administration, faculty, and counselors that there is the need for change, and nothing happens. But at that time when Dr. Pacleb was having the hard conversations with students, there was an ombuds office that she could refer students to. She stated her surprise and disappointment when the ombuds disappeared. Faculty must fight, as people who care about our students, to create a safe environment so that students can learn. The question is not about who is to blame, it is about what we are going to provide for current and future students. For past students, they remember the quality of education they received, but unfortunately, they are also remembering that the campus did not do their part in protecting students from racist incidents.

Dr. Teshia Roby commented that she is currently an administrator but arrived at CPP in 2005 as a faculty member in the College of Education and Integrative Studies (CEIS). She has previously worked with students that have experienced racism, and she expressed frustration also. She is frustrated that when that work should be at a more focused accountable level within the divisions, within the departments, within the colleges, it is attributed to the President. There was an ombuds person, she retired. There is a Title IX person and administration was considering how to navigate the two roles. There is a current directive to fill the ombuds person vacancy. She stated that she is frustrated that there is a level of transparency that happens in the positions that do report to the

President. She communicated that she is an administrator, she has staff, and that she would not expect her staff would supersede any type of interaction and go directly to the Vice President. Her expectations are that she is their representative and advocate, and she shares their concerns with the leadership that she reports to, and it is her responsibility to make sure they are heard. President Coley did her listening tours when she arrived at the campus, and there was not an expectation that there would be regular college meetings with the President. The reality is that the Provost, for those of us in Academic Affairs, is the conduit to the President. She added that she does have access to the President in her current role as a person who is responsible for student success, outreach, and pipeline initiatives that are near and dear to the President's heart. She added that she is hearing some level of frustration that the President is not hearing or unaware of and Dr. Roby does not share that view.

Dr. Roby also stated that in terms of transparency, soon after President Coley came to campus, she gathered a group of faculty, staff, and administrators together to go to Georgia State and learn how they turned things around on their campus. She knew there was hard work ahead and she was more than willing to do the work. As far as transparency, President Coley is not afraid to have the hard conversations and she does not avoid the difficult discussions.

Senator Guererro thanked everyone who has spoken because it is good to hear multiple perspectives. He stated that the resolution started out with the dismissal of the previous Provost, which we all had questions about. When the Executive Committee asked for more information, the President read a prepared statement. When the Executive Committee asks about tenure density and faculty hiring, which is almost every meeting that the President attends, the conversation turns into how we need to increase enrollment at the university without addressing the original question. The response is disappointing, but it is common in terms of interaction with the President. There have been multiple opportunities for the President to address the concerns in the resolutions, but during the most recent interaction, the Executive Committee was given a packet of data, without much context, of MPP hiring, which was part of the resolution, but the President did not really address the exact items in the resolution. Instead, she spoke for 45 minutes with a packet of information that was very overwhelming and hard to respond to. Senator Guererro commented that this is characteristic of the interactions between the Executive Committee and the President. He stated that he feels like he is having the same conversation repeatedly and that is a leadership issue. This resolution is sending a message and standing up for faculty, and students as well. There is a need for strong leadership at the university and he appreciated those in the room who are making this hard decision and taking a firm stand to try and do the right thing. He added that he will be voting yes on this resolution.

Senator John stated that it has been helpful to hear all of the comments and opinions regarding the resolution. He asked if it was possible for either the Chair or Vice Chair to

brief the Senate on the outcome of the townhall on the resolutions. He commented that the townhall was well attended by the campus community.

Chair Kumar responded that the townhall provided an opportunity to hear all the perspectives of colleagues who spoke up and to help answer questions. There were faculty members who spoke to a sense of frustration, Unfortunately, there were also faculty members who spoke to Chair Kumar privately who felt intimidated. That was one of the reasons that Chair Kumar mentioned collegiality during discussion regarding the resolution. She added that she made the mistake of keeping the chat feature available during the townhall and so she was not available to keep up with the conversations and the questions/comments happening in the chat at the same time. After reviewing the chat after the meeting, Chair Kumar commented that many frustrations were expressed in the chat surrounding processes for payroll, and travel and reimbursement. One of the other things that came up were things that could be interpreted as positions of the Academic Senate, and she stated that the Senate does not take up a position until an actual vote happens. So, at the time of the townhall, there was no official position from the Academic Senate. The townhall was a forum for colleagues to express their opinions, and Chair Kumar appreciated the conversations. It will help identify issues that need to be focused on, for example, payroll and travel reimbursement. She also held office hours for an opportunity to engage with senators. She heard from a couple of senators who felt conflicted and from a couple who were not entirely comfortable speaking up during the meetings. She commented that she will continue to have office hours to provide senators an opportunity to engage with her, but she is also concerned that there are voices that are not comfortable speaking.

Senator Hanink communicated that the Academic Senate and other faculty members have had a month to talk about the resolutions and to the best of his knowledge, no one disputes any of the facts laid out in the resolutions. The issue is the chain of command and organizational structure. If there are disputes about any of the individual claims and the premise of any of the whereas statements, they should be introduced. There have been comments about that "it does not work that way." He gave an example of a sinkhole on campus and the fact that the President is not directly in charge of groundskeeping. But if that sinkhole does not get fixed for three years, then it is ultimately the President's responsibility. He reiterated if there are facts in the resolution that are incorrect, he would like to hear them to better make his decision on how he is going to vote on the resolution. Currently, he believes that all the facts in the resolution are correct. He added that when the President met with the Academic Senate to discuss the dismissal of Provost Brown there was a question about the plan going forward to deal with the chaos. The response to the question was that there is no chaos. The example of Dr. Forward came up about he is doing three jobs and things are going great. This was not a response that inspires confidence. That is what this resolution is about, what is the plan going forward and does the leadership inspire confidence?

Senator Urey thanked Senator Hanink for his comments. At the November meeting when this resolution came up, she stated she was prepared to ask for a postponement of the question during today's meeting, but after that the faculty strike was announced and the leadership of the university responded to the strike with threatening emails sent both to faculty and students. The students were asked to report faculty members who did not show up for classes on the day of the strike. This resolution is about confidence in our leadership and after their reaction to the faculty strike and the conversations in this meeting there should be enough information for the members of the Academic Senate to make their decisions and if they have not decided more talk is not going to help them make their decision. Senator Urey called for the question, and it was seconded.

Chair Kumar asked for clarification from the parliamentarian, Senator Hanink, on whether the speakers list must be exhausted or if the motion to call the question goes for a vote. Senator Hanink clarified that if no one else has the floor and the motion is made and seconded, the question is voted upon. There is a two-thirds majority required to call the question.

M/s to call the question to adopt the resolution. A YES vote means that the question will be called to adopt the resolution and a NO vote means that the discussion will continue. The motion passed with 25 YES votes, 7 No votes, and two abstentions.

A secret ballot was requested.

The motion to adopt the *Academic Senate Resolution of Non-Confidence in the University President* passed with 25 YES votes, 3 NO votes, and six abstentions.

b. [Academic Senate Resolution of Immediate and Necessary Actions to Address Urgent Campus Crises - **SECOND READING**](#)

The Academic Senate Resolution of Immediate and Necessary Actions to Address Urgent Campus Crises is located on the Academic Senate website at https://www.cpp.edu/senate/documents/packets/2023-24/12.06.23/resolution_immediate_and_necessary_actions_to_address_campus_crises.pdf.

Senator Urey moved to postpone this resolution until the next Academic Senate meeting on February 14, 2024. There were comments made to this resolution during the townhall meeting therefore this resolution should be revised to include that input. The motion was seconded. The motion passed with one (1) abstention.

The December 6, 2023 Academic Senate Meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.