



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: ACADEMIC SENATORS
FROM: Ana Medić, Academic Senate Secretary
SUBJ: **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**
DATE: Thursday December 1, 2022, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/81231074627?pwd=ZWFzZVpKVENOY2pEb0drdC8vaE43dz09>
Meeting ID: 812 3107 4627 Passcode: 761594

Present: Alvarez, Boyd, Bruns, Burk, Cline, Coons, Draper, Ferrari, Ford, Sangmin, Gibson, Gray, Hutchinson, Kaiser, Kralj, Larson, Leon, Magnus (Hidalgo), McBride-Pretorius, Medić, Moss, Musvosvi, O'Conner, Paiva (Chair), Peterson, Sendze, Sherman, A., Sherman, N., Sistrunk (Newell), Smith (Yeager-Struthers), Son, Teague Miller, Trailer, Traver, Walter, and Zeichick.

Absent: Adamian, Bailey, Boura, Brundage, and Wagner.

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 2:36 pm.

1. Approve Minutes of October 6, 2022 and November 10, 2022
2. Approve Agenda
Agenda approved.
3. Announcements
 - a. CFA votes for officers, encouragement to vote.
4. University Reports – Hutchinson/Boura/Brundage/Larson/Sendze/Sherman
President Hutchinson:
 - a. Call for compassion and empathy for students, faculty and staff as semester is ending. Variety of services available on campus.
 - b. Enrollment is priority, more updates will be shared by Jerry Ross tomorrow. The funding that Chico State is receiving is for FTES 17,500, and current enrollment is at around 12,300.
 - c. Indication of improvement for first time freshmen enrollment increased 14%, transfers up 20%.
 - d. The presidential search is starting. Academic Senate and Staff Council are conducting a search for their representatives. Associated Student Government will submit their nominations soon.
 - e. The open forum for the presidential search will be February 2. Encouragement to participate and share what we want in future presidential candidate. The Board of Trustees and the Search Advisory Committee take seriously feedback on future candidates from the campus community.
 - f. BoT Chair Wenda Fong, and Interim Chancellor Jolene Koester are scheduled to attend the February 2 open forum.
 - g. The UBC meeting will be on December 12 on zoom 3 – 5 pm. VPs will prepare presentations, and some EC members will as well. Chaired by Paiva.

VP Sherman:

- a. CSU Chico is one of the initial campuses involved in an update on campus procurement system, which allowed more ready procurement across all major vendors.
- b. Meeting with the Chancellor's Office today confirmed this will become active mid to late spring of 2023.
- c. Library basement water is shut down due to a broken pipe 8 ft down the ground. Will be fixed during upcoming break.
- d. Encouraged to check modeling regard budget planning, look at various scenarios and prepare better at forecasting budget over the next three years.

VP Sendze:

- a. Recruiting ADP for the Division of IT.
- b. Starting interview process for the Executive Senior Director for Institutional Research and Strategic Analytics.
- c. Tom Ross will retire at the end of a month; looking to fill that position in IR.
- d. Major updates to financial aid in PeopleSoft system done; started sending financial aid letters.
- e. Working with the Chancellor's Office on an IT security audit. Exit interview next week.
- f. On November 21 two email systems transitioned to one. Everyone at Chico State will use the same csuchico.edu domain.
- g. A certain number of tickets were addressed. Mainly for those students that missed communication about what would happen and what they needed to do.

5. [Associated Students Report](#) – Alvarez

AS President Alvarez presented student report and updates:

- a. Reached out by CSSA Vice President Samaniego to have the opportunity to speak with Acting Vice Chancellor Freedman to listen about the progress with the Cozen O'Connor- Systemwide Title IX Information.
- b. Government Affairs now has a Chief of Staff and representative Brandon Hooper.
- c. Senator for the College of Humanities & Fine Arts now has one applicant, and the search committee will continue the process of interviewing the candidate.

6. Staff Council – Peterson

Senator Peterson presented Staff Council report:

- a. Joy of Giving ongoing. Next week the gifts will be given to Butte County kids at the University Farm on Tuesday 5:30 – 7:30 pm.
- b. Each family will receive a \$50 gift card for a holiday meal.
- c. Fundraising to support those gift cards, selling olive oil from local olive oil company, selling calendar with Jason's photographs, selling poinsettias at the farm.

7. Statewide Academic Senate [Report](#) – Boyd/Ford [CSU Academic Senate](#)

- ASCSU [Agendas](#), [Minutes](#), [Resolutions](#), & [Summaries](#)

Statewide Senators Boyd and Ford presented Statewide Academic Senate report and updates:

- a. The plenary report was presented at the last meeting. The current attached report has approved resolutions as an update since the last meeting.
- b. Next plenary will be in January.
- c. Tomorrow will be the interim committee meetings.
- d. Request to look at first reading resolutions, hyperlinked, and provide feedback prior to next January plenary meeting.

- e. Statewide Senator Boyd attended the ICASS meeting yesterday at Rio Hondo College.
- f. Noticed less students present at community college; enrollment situation is apparent in CA.
- g. CC responded; UC response will come after their meeting on December 8.
- h. Next ICASS meeting will be in February.

8. Standing Committees Reports

- [Educational Policies and Procedures Committee \(EPPC\)](#) – Kralj
- [Faculty and Student Policies Committee \(FASP\)](#) - Sistrunk
- [Executive Committee](#) – Medic

EPPC report attached.

FASP report attached.

EC met once since last Academic Senate meeting; report attached.

No questions.

9. Ask the Administrator

Question: News on UC and graduate teaching assistants is ongoing. Do we have plans to include these types of conversations in future planning of contract negotiations? Answer: Current focus on UBC, enrollment, marketing, admissions, recruitment, retention, and investments for the future for this campus. Not yet focused on contract negotiation. CSU has a very different situation compared to the workforce and pay equity at the UC. Asked for the CFA responses.

10. Information: [Faculty/Staff Calendar 2024-25](#) – Robin Yant/Mahalley Allen: Time certain 3:00 pm.

- [Academic Calendar 2024-25](#) – Ann Wilson

Allen, Yant and Wilson introduced item 10:

- a. Allen and Yant presented faculty/staff calendar for the AY2024/25.
- b. Calendar provided 17-week semesters that included 15 weeks of instruction, one week of finals and one week of fall/spring break.
- c. Faculty are paid for three days of work and prep and meetings time prior to the start each semester. For this calendar those would be August 21 - 23, and January 15 - 17.
- d. At the end of the semester, faculty are paid for three days of grading and grade submission. In the fall 2024 semester grades will be due on December 31. In the spring 2025 semester grades will be due on May 22.
- e. There is a faculty workday scheduled for May 17 to compensate faculty to attend commencement.
- f. The start of the 45-day period on this calendar would be Saturday, August 17, effectively that will be Wednesday, August 21.
- g. Pay period pay periods cannot be longer than 45 days per the State Controller's Office.
- h. AB 1655 signed by the Governor created Juneteenth as a pay holiday for the K12 public schools and the community college system. The bill provided state employees with ability to use a personal holiday or other leave credits in observation of June 18.
- i. CSU is considering how best to recognize the legislature's adoption of Juneteenth.
- j. This calendar was shared with ELF (extended leadership forum) that includes Chairs and Deans.

Discussion and questions:

Question: is there a flowchart of processes that are included in forming of calendar and consultation?

Answer: in the past, calendar was shared with EPPC, PAC, Deans and Academic Senate. Concern shared

last year Chairs were not included. This year: ELF and Senate (as EPPC was part of it). After this calendar will go to the President for approval and then to the Chancellor's Office for approval. Question: are there existing rules to make calendar? Answer: There are tech letters and WASC requirements that campus needs to follow when making calendar e.g., the 45-day rule, minimum number of instructional days etc. Yant would build an initial calendar then the core group will work on meeting all requirements prior to taking it to other constituents mentioned above.

- a. Comment shared this is great example of shared governance.
- b. Suggested to have a written form of processes and rules followed.
- c. Discussed to have an EM that will define process and work on calendar.

Academic calendar presented by Ann Wilson:

- a. The calendar presents all major events for the academic year 2024/25.
- b. The only two unclear dates are the Wildcat Scholarship Application Filing period dates and the dates for commencement (in green).
- c. AB 8963 asked to include voting information for students. Calendar reflects that October 28 is the last day to register to vote with Election Day on November 12.
- d. Added Dr. to Luther King Jr Day.

Discussion and questions:

- a. Concern shared with December 9-13, which is showing fully admitted new student registration for spring 2025. This forces campus to do orientation during the first week of December, which creates multiple inequities regarding staff working on this and students that are still in class.

Question: asking for campus community feedback and response on this. Answer: TBA is an option for some dates to provide more freedom in selecting more appropriate dates.

- b. Praise shared for including information about election in calendar. BMU received a strong turnout of students voting in Butte County.
- c. Recommended to include AVP Ross in discussion tied to registration timelines and calendar.
- d. Comment shared there was a lot of confusion when students can withdraw from classes and to align it with other calendars.
- e. For follow up contact Yant and Wilson.

11. Proposed [Significant Change: Biological Sciences BA](#) – EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Kralj presented item 11:

- a. This is an action item.
- b. This is a revamping of the BA in biology.
- c. Comments about chemistry included in the revised proposal.
- d. Reformatted to have CHEM 111 & 112 as a default, while CHEM 107 may be acceptable for some students in specific situations.
- e. Added specific language to the catalogue copy, primarily that made it clear what careers this was intended for like pre-physician's assistant, pre-nursing, pre-occupational therapy.

Discussion:

- a. BIOL311 is a brand new GWAR course. Concern shared if this course doesn't attract enough students will there be a plan B to use a different course instead e.g., BIOL371?
- b. That would not be suitable but planning to use another class and make alternates with 311.
- c. Complemented work on assessing what careers can be these degrees used for.

Academic Senate voted: 33 yes, no opposition. Item 11 passed as an action item.

12. Proposed revision of [FPPP Lecturer Issues: Definitions, Sections 1 and 5](#) – FASP Introduction Item

FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 12:

- a. Dean Vela couple of years ago started observing problems and providing language to lecturer hiring and differentiating ranges.
- b. Purpose of changes is to clarify language around ranges and other aspects of lecturer hiring.
- c. Lecturers are eligible for sabbatical leave, which was not commonly known at Chico State.
- d. By contract, local lecturers are supposed to be encouraged to apply, interviewed, and can compete for tenured position.
- e. Ranges and initial employment language was added to be more specific.
- f. Part of EC charge was to look at lecturer ranges and salaries, impact on both.
- g. Clarified order of the assignment, qualifications, and range elevation.

Discussion and comments:

- a. Praise for FASP work on FASP changes done to support lecturers.
- b. Stated that sentence under the fourth bullet point and under the 5.2.5.d is not clear and suggested to add language that will improve current one.
- c. If department doesn't have a recruitment, they can appoint lecturer. This can be amended when discussed as an action item.
- d. Praise shared for work on this document especially for lecturers to clarify process.
- e. There is a part stating lecturers are eligible for a three-year contract. Question: Is there a part where departments notify lecturers when they are eligible for a range increase? How does this happen for lecturers? Answer: This is addressed in a different FPPP section 12. Language specifying that departments notify lecturers of range elevation, pay increases is there and departments do a good job notifying lecturers.
- f. Appreciation shared to strengthen information around the lecturer appointments.
- g. Commented that although intention was to provide clarity, it was found that the construction of the document is poorly organized, writing is unclear.
- h. Provost through representative provided comments to this document.
- i. Example provided CBA 12.22.c language is clear unlike previously mentioned FPPP 5.2.5.d.
- j. Suggested to provide additional placement of topics, redundancy of a topic, or word change.
- k. Suggested as an alternative for FASP committee to work on these changes.
- l. Suggested to have Provost and FASP Chair to work together on expressed concerns.
- m. Suggested for Senate to hear main points and global topic suggestions prior to next meeting while this is an introduction item. Once changes are implemented, remediated document can be shared during next Academic Senate meeting.

Suggestions:

- a. FPPP 1.14. statement should be placed under section 5 as it is of the same context and not under the definitions.
- b. Suggested to place appropriated topics together.
- c. FPPP 5.2.5 move to section 9.
- d. FPPP 5.1.5.e concern that this is not a direct quote from CBA. Concerning "lecturers should be encouraged to apply", more appropriate would be "may apply". Concern who is doing "encouraging" action?
- e. FPPP 5.2.1.c may be a good statement for all faculty, not just lecturers.

- f. Concern shared toward FPPP 5.2.5.d that CBA reference is clear, however, rewritten statement is not clear. This item belongs to another section in FPPP. The following bullet point is not an active statement from CBA. There is a footnote that states that.
- g. FPPP 12.9 and 12.11 can be placed somewhere else.
- h. It was commented that some of the comments above were suggested by Provost's representative. Some language placement exists due to being there in old FPPP.

Discussion continued:

- a. Senate ready to vote on item as an introduction item. Asked to explain if approved vs not approved, what does this mean? If approved, AVP Allen and FASP will work on cleaning the document with suggested comments and return it as a new document to the next senate meeting.
- b. Suggested that if senators want to return this to a committee, there should be a motion. Otherwise, this issue may not be allowed in the same session as considered a voted down item as per Robert's Rules.
- c. Clarified that if this is voted down, item will not be allowed to come back this academic year.
- d. Motion made to return this item to a committee and make suggested changes. Second.
- e. Suggested FASP break down this into two pieces as it may be easier for senate to approve it.
- f. Stated that there were three semesters of work already done on this FPPP document and support shared to support moving forward with this.
- g. Commended that if this document is unclear to the Provost, AVP OAPL and FASP Chair, how do everyone think lecturers feel? Commented that this feels embarrassing as those who works in private sector have clarity while here, we do not have information on sabbatical rights, range elevation, pay increase.
- h. Commented that it is not logical for a lecturer to look under the sabbatical heading for that information as lecturers often do not know they have rights to sabbatical in the first place.
- i. Share that after eight years working on campus lecturer was not aware of ability to apply and have sabbatical.
- j. Not clear why the definition should be removed, this should not be seen as an adversarial interpretation of the CBA.
- k. Agreed this document should be simplified and cleared for all faculty, Deans, Chairs, or anyone who looks at it.
- l. Shared that this entire process is confusing and embarrassing.

Academic Senate voted on a motion: 23 yes, one no. Motion passes and this document will be returned to FASP committee and will not return to the Academic Senate as an action item next week.

13. Proposed new EM: [University Committee Review Committee](#) – FASP Introduction Item

FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 13:

- a. This is a FASP introduction item.
- b. This is the this is a change to attempt to activate and operationalize senate committees.
- c. Intention is to create communication with each college and have working committees.
- d. This EM should address shared communication between all the different committees on campus.

Discussion:

- a. Could this be one committee and not two? This is due to similarity with item 14. Answer: this is a very labor-intensive work. An example from Florida University was used to split work into two, one looking at the policies, while the other focusing on committees' work.
- b. If one committee is reviewing other, there should be a statement on around the committee's ability to make recommendations around suspending or updating or revising committees.
- c. This was addressed on the page 2 "RC makes recommendations on committee structure, policy recommendations, committee dissolution and reports to the executive committee of the academic senate."
- d. There is a disfunction that needs to be addressed due to which it is suggested to create an extra committee to help with the work and following the functionality of other committees, resolve recurring problems and to make the system more effective.
- e. Comment related to the bottom of page 2, last sentence mentioned above: quitting an EM seems to be an academic senate process. That is not delegated in practice to the executive committee. The statement and clause above would delegate that to the executive committee.
- f. Not opposing the above statement rather pointing out for future discussion.
- g. Support shared that when this becomes an action item, language can be proposed to clarify language here that the Academic Senate EC is actually initiating the process by which campus have established policy on policies EM.

Academic Senate voted on item 13: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 13 passed and will be back as an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting next week.

14. Proposed new EM: [University Committee Nominating Committee](#) – FASP Introduction Item
FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 14:

- a. Similar to the item 13 proposed new EM nominating committee.
- b. Focus on a coherent, systematic way to work and help the effectiveness of all the committees.

Discussion:

- a. Page 3, third staff support bullet point, constrained language that memo will come out in February. Suggestion to loosen up the language and provide more flexibility to work on a committee membership.
- b. When said "staff support" does this refer to the staff of the academic senate? Yes. Suggestion to make that a little clearer.
- c. Support shared toward the idea of effective shared governance committees.
- d. Shared opinion of confusion between the relationship of the product of the committee, and the process of the Academic Senate. Encourage the discussion about the roles of the committee versus the academic senate and the way the products of committees get moved through the academic center process.
- e. The last page paragraph may speak of the above stated concern.

Academic Senate voted on item 13: 30 yes, no opposition. Item 14 passed and will be back as an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting next week.

15. Proposed revision to [FPPP 9.1.2 and 10.2.5](#) – FASP Introduction Item
FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 15:

- a. This is an introduction item that deals with instructional ways of evaluating instruction and one section is about lecture faculty, other section is about regular faculty.

- b. Language explains how peer reviews need to be utilized according to the CBA.
- c. A list of other possibilities is added to this document.
- d. Suggested and applied language simplicity.

Discussion:

- a. Page 2 reference to FPPP 8.1.1.e which describes the article 15.14 from CBA. Suggested a change to the word university in that clause to clarify what personnel are allowed to do. Same adjustment in 10.2.5.b.
- b. Commented that it would be a challenge to have a link in FPPP. Rather suggested to have a specific language in FPPP (reference to 10.2.5.b FDEV website link).
- c. FPPP 9.1.2 and 10.2.5b both have a language around the responsibilities of department to assist candidate that can be placed in parallel with 8.1.1b and 8.1.1b-1 that provide specific directions and steps for which chair and candidate are responsible.
- d. FPPP 9.1.2.c.2 and 10.2.5.b are identical. Shared to discuss this further and asked to be less redundant.
- e. FPPP section 10.2.5b is for probationary faculty while section 9 is for lecturers. Statement under 9.1.2.c.2 "This can include reviews of teaching during the regular course of each academic year." Is something that is no longer done for lecturers on their three-year contract as per FPPP 9.1.4. This language seems to oblige review for three-year contract lecturers. Suggested to clarify this to not be every year but every contract cycle.

Academic Senate voted on item 13: 28 yes, no opposition. Item 14 passed and will be back as an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting next week.

16. Proposed revision to [FPPP Range Elevation Process](#) – FASP Introduction Item
FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 16:

- a. Introduction item on range elevation process.
- b. FASP subcommittee worked with OAPL.
- c. Clean up the deadlines for when range elevation applications are due, appealing process, and clarify the timeline for all parties.

Discussion:

- a. There are two formal and informal range elevations.
- b. CBA 12.9 refers to new appointments that want to be at the same or a higher salary placement; anyone being eligible for a new contract can apply for a range elevation. However, different agencies at the university are sending different answers across the campus and bring confusion.
- c. Lecturers deserve to be hired at the appropriate range based on their qualifications, duties, and responsibilities. Once their contract is up, lecturers have the right to petition for their range to be adjusted as well as their pay in the next contract period.
- d. Is there a way to include other type of range elevation in the FPPP? Yes. Support shared to include this in FPPP document.

Academic Senate voted on item 13: 29 yes, no opposition. Item 14 passed and will be back as an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting next week.

17. Other

- a. Stated that the number one question during lecturer's forum was range elevation.

- b. Suggested to have more clarity on what to include in application for range elevation, examples/templates. Process and deadlines exist, but true struggle and challenge is no clarity on what needs to truly be included in required documents.
- c. AVP Allen shared that OAPL is working on a form that was shared with Chair Council, Lecturer Council, CFA and recently was posted on OAPL website.

18. Adjourn at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medić

For a direct link to all agenda items in Box, click [here](#).