

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, January 28, 2026

CLA Building, 98, P2-8

Zoom Link: <https://cpp.zoom.us/j/89518858114>

Zoom ID: 895 1885 8114

Passcode: executive

Attendees: Greg Barding, Aaron Cayer, David Edens, Ghada Gad, Peter Hanink, Rita Kumar, Kelly Min, Dennis Quinn, Julie Shen, Faye Wachs, and Gerd Welke.

1) Minutes

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes from January 21, 2026

There was no discussion.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Senator Edens seconded.

M/s/p to approve the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes for January 21, 2026.

2) Chair's Report

Chair Hanink mentioned that the CPGE Dean search failed and a second search committee will be formulated to continue the work this semester.

3) Vice Chair's Report

Senator Edens motioned to consolidate AP-021-256 through AP-023-256 for today's meeting. Senator Kumar seconded.

AP-021-256 Agriculture, M.S. – Plant Science Option Discontinuation – REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

Senator Kumar motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Gad seconded.

M/s/p to send AP-021-256 to the Academic Programs Committee.

AP-022-256 Agriculture, M.S. – Agriculture Science Option Discontinuation –
REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

Senator Kumar motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Gad second.

M/s/p to send AP-022-256 to the Academic Programs Committee.

AP-023-256 Agriculture, M.S. – Animal Science Option Discontinuation –
REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

Senator Kumar motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Gad seconded.

M/s/p to send AP-023-256 to the Academic Programs Committee.

AP-024-256 New Artificial Intelligence – REFERRAL

The Executive Committee recommended adding deans, ECE, IME, CIS from CBA, department chairs, and associate deans to consultation under the recommended resources section of the referral form.

Senator Edens motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Gad seconded.

M/s/p to send AP-024-256 to the Academic Programs Committee with consultation suggestions.

FA-002-256 Syllabus Policy Statements Update (Policy 1200) – **REVISED**
REFERRAL

The Executive Committee recommended adding faculty, senators, department chairs, deans, assistant deans, and associate deans to consultation under the recommended resources section of the referral form.

Senator Gad motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Kumar seconded.

M/s/p to send FA-002-256 to the Faculty Affairs Committee with consultation

suggestions.

FA-003-256 Update Policy 1207: Misconduct in Research - REFERRAL

The Executive Committee determined to leave the referral as is. No suggestions were added to the recommended resources section of the referral form.

Senator Kumar motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Gad seconded.

M/s/p to send FA-003-256 to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

GE-033-256 KIN 3020 – Science Driven Fitness (New GE 5D) – REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Kumar seconded.

M/s/p to send GE-033-256 to the General Education Committee.

GE-034-256 Satisfaction of the GE Area 1B (Critical Thinking) Requirement by Completion of the FYE Engineering Course EGR 1000/ 1000L – REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

Senator Kumar motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Edens seconded.

M/s/p to send GE-034-256 to the General Education Committee.

4) Reports

There were no reports.

5) Old Business

There was no old business.

6) New Business

Tentative Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for Wednesday, February 4, 2026.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to approve the senate meeting agenda. Senator Gad seconded.

M/s/p to approve the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for Wednesday, February 4, 2026.

The Executive Committee approved the following appointed faculty members:

Service Opportunity | University Writing Committee ENV Vacancy

- Karlyn Griffith (Art History)

Service Opportunity | Ad Hoc Learning Video Technologies Working Group

- Marta Albala Pelegrin (CEIS)
- Paul M. Nissenson (EGR)

Service Opportunities | One-for-Ones

First Year Experience Faculty Committee 2025-2026 (ENV Vacancy):

- Chris Giamarino (ENV)

Special Projects for Improving the Classroom Experience (SPICE) (Collins and ENV Vacancies):

- Claudia Wainer (ENV)
- Li Ge (Collins)

University Writing Committee (AG Vacancy):

- Dakota R. Discepolo (Ag)

7) Discussion

Senator Faye Wachs reported the following:

- Senator Wachs introduced concerns regarding NAGPRA compliance, emphasizing the importance of respecting Native American artifacts, antiquities, and ancestral remains.
- She noted that a Geology professor raised an urgent issue: the department has been given a short timeline to comply with updated or enforced NAGPRA requirements.

- Senator Wachs clarified that Senator Van Buer was not opposed to compliance itself. His concern centered on the broader impact the required procedures could have across multiple academic fields, including:
 - Geology
 - Engineering
 - Soil management
 - Other disciplines that involve fieldwork
- According to Senator Van Buer’s experience, the current language of the compliance process is extremely broad, such that:
 - Any field trip where participants may touch rocks or disturb natural materials could require prior approval.
 - Departments would need to go through the designated NAGPRA compliance office and obtain authorization from relevant Native American groups associated with the land.
 - The approval process is time-consuming, creating logistical challenges for classes and field-based research.
- There is also a cost burden:
 - Each application for compliance or site approval carries a fee of approximately \$100–\$200.
 - At present, these costs are charged directly to departments, which may strain limited budgets.
- Senator Wachs noted that Senator Van Buer’s overall concern is the combination of:
 - Compressed timelines
 - Administrative complexity
 - Department-level financial strain
 - The broad applicability of the rules to routine academic activities

Further Discussion on NAGPRA Requirements

- Senator Wachs noted that it may be valuable to invite NAGPRA/NAGRA representatives to present directly to the Academic Senate, as many faculty—including those in engineering—were unaware of how broadly the compliance rules apply.
- She emphasized that the concerns raised by Engineering echo those raised by Geology:
 - Any geotechnical studies, including those conducted by students, where rocks or soil are disturbed, may require NAGPRA compliance approval.
 - Faculty were surprised by how many routine academic activities fall under these rules.
- Senator Wachs shared that she had spoken with the campus NAGPRA representative (identified as Desiree Martinez) and found the discussion helpful. However, she expressed concern that campus-wide awareness remains low, especially regarding:
 - The potential fines and penalties for non-compliance
 - The burden placed on faculty to complete multiple applications
- A suggestion was made that, while broader system-level solutions will take time, the campus could pursue a short-term, practical measure:

- Create an internal database or shared record of previously approved sites so departments do not need to repeat the approval process for the same location.
- Faculty noted that eventually a map or zoning system would be useful, for example:
 - “Red zones” requiring full approval
 - “Green zones” where access has already been cleared

This could clarify compliance expectations and reduce unnecessary workload.

Clarifications on Compliance Requirements

- A question was raised whether approval is based on access to a location or specific activities performed there.
 - Senator Wachs explained that it is generally tied to access.
 - If anything of cultural significance is discovered during field activities, faculty and students must stop immediately and notify the appropriate Tribal Nation.
- She noted that instructors like Nick from Geology include training, so students know how to recognize potential items of concern and understand when to halt work.
- Senator Wachs emphasized that if one department (e.g., Geology) has already secured approval for a field site, then other departments (e.g., Engineering) should reasonably be able to share that authorization.
 - This would prevent duplicative applications and reduce unnecessary departmental costs.
- Participants suggested that Desiree Martinez may already possess approval data and that information-sharing across departments—and even between nearby CSU campuses—could be beneficial.
 - For example, if CSU Fullerton has secured permission for a site, other campuses might also be able to use that approval.
- Senator Wachs indicated she may follow up directly with Desiree about these possibilities, noting that such coordination may not require formal Senate action.

Closing Notes

- Senator Wachs reiterated that the current process is highly labor-intensive for faculty and improving information sharing could significantly reduce workload and repeated fees.
- Chair Hanink requested that Senator Wachs condense the key issues into a short set of talking points for inclusion in her upcoming state report.

Adjourned @ 4:37 PM