



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: ACADEMIC SENATORS
FROM: Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary
SUBJ: **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**
DATE: Thursday May 4, 2023, 2:00 p.m.
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/81231074627?pwd=ZWFzZVpKVENOY2pEb0drdC8vaE43dz09>
Meeting ID: 812 3107 4627 Passcode: 761594

Please note: to access linked files, users must be logged in with their Chico State credentials.

Present: Adamian, Boyd, Brundage, Bruns, Burk, Cline, Clyde, Coons, Ferrari, Ford, Gibson, Gray (Peterson), Hutchinson, Jollimore, Kralj, Lee, Magnus, McBride-Pretorius, Medic (Kaiser), Moss, Munro (Teague Miller), Musvosvi, Newell (Hidalgo), O’Conner, Paiva (Chair), Perez, Sendze, Sherman, Sistrunk, Smith, Son, Trailer, Traver, Walter, and Yeager-Struthers.

Absent: Alvarez, Bailey, Boura, Draper, Nichols, Wagner, and Zeichick.

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 2:04 pm.

1. Approve Minutes of [April 27, 2023](#)

Motion to change on page 11, item 24 instead of item 23 and on page 8, 20d to delete “my”.

Approved.

Minutes of April 27th approved as amended.

2. Approve Agenda

Chair Paiva clarified that when the academic senate approves today’s agenda, it will approve the consent agenda (FASP items).

Motion made to attach the altered collection of the amendments to item 18 the proposed revision of EM 19-023 faculty recognition and support.

Motion to include a revised proposal from the department to item 22 MS in data science and analytics introduction item. This document addresses questions raised. EPPC has not seen this document.

Commented to attach this document as a support document and make a motion to accept it as an amended document at the following meeting (action item).

Concluded to email collection of the amendments (item 18) document to senators and to leave item 22 as is but attach supporting document for senators’ view. No motion made.

Agenda approved.

3. Announcements

- a. Kathy Kaiser Award nominations are open until next Friday. Send the nomination form to the academic senate email.

Reports: Time certain: 2:10 – 2:30

4. University Reports – Hutchinson/Boura/Brundage/Clyde/Perez/Sendze

President Hutchinson:

- a. Encourage everyone to attend the University Budget Committee meeting on Monday May 15 3-5 pm. The May budget revise will be reported and the campus budget. Collected questions will be addressed during the meeting.

Interim Provost Perez:

- a. Thankful to all senators for their leadership roles at the university.
- b. Commencement is coming, including preparations.
- c. Identify strategies to increase enrollment with the current budget situation.

VP Brundage:

- a. Inviting everyone to be engaged with enrollment efforts and making students welcome on campus. Promote Chico State.
- b. Students are involved in Recruit a Cat.

VP Sendze:

- a. Working on safety and a safeguard rule from the FTC. New rules are due on June 9 with nine FTC requirements that need to be fulfilled.
- b. If not in compliance, campus will lose financial aid and Title IV funding.
- c. Working on a response plan and security assessment training.
- d. Developing and deploying new security awareness training and doing a sensitive data inventory that will require all MPPs to take.

Interim VP Clyde:

- a. The Division's budget will be reported at the UBC.
- b. Working with capital planning for FMS as well as projections for budgeting for next year.
- c. Working closely with Dr. Brundage on future planning for students' housing.
- d. Yesterday there was a transition lunch for ASR officers where they elected a brand new 17 elected officers.

5. Associated Students Report – Alvarez

6. Staff Council - Peterson

Senator Peterson presented the Staff Council report:

- a. Next week is the Staff Council meeting.
- b. Luncheon for the Staff Excellence Awards and years of service is on the 25th.

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

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

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

- a. The seminar was hosted by the Chancellor's Office and ASCSU Chair Steffel on the status of AB 928. Expecting that by November of this year the proposal will go to the Board of Trustees for initial review and then the January proposal.
- b. Making GE breath match the lower division GE Breath matches that of CalGETC. Campus concerns regarding the Area E courses.
- c. No matter what campus will have Title V changes to the transfer model curriculum that will be utilized by the community colleges for both entrance to CSU and UC. These will be discussed separately.

- d. Working on to agree what will be accepted GPA and/or letter grades from transfer students at UC and CSU. Expecting by the end of May for this to be achieved.
- e. Concern if this automatically will create an authority over general education external to the CSU and expended to the admission standards.
- f. A link to the seminar recording will be shared with the senate when link becomes available.
- g. The last plenary will be on May 17, 18 and 19. Any feedback on the resolutions is welcomed by the campus community.

8. Standing Committees Reports

- a. [Executive Committee](#) – Medic

EC had one meeting, report attached.

No questions.

President's Update: Time approximate 2:30

9. President's Update on Academic Senate Resolution

President Hutchinson provided the update on the Academic Senate resolution passed on 12/16/2023:

- a. An 11-member implementation team has been appointed to address the recommendations for Chico State in the Cozen O'Connor report, Title IX and DHR policy review. Team members were selected based on the guidance from the Chancellor's Office to include student officer, faculty member and staff member. A call for senators will come out this week.
- b. The team has met twice already with Cozen O'Connor and the Chancellor's Office Title IX team in April and is co-chaired by Dylan Saake and Seema Sehrawat. The implementation team will work during the summer and will be responsible for designing and planning the steps necessary to implement the recommendations.
- c. A report from the Cozen O'Conner team will be presented at the BoT meeting on May 24.
- d. . The Chancellor's Office systemwide Office of Human Resources has retained a consultant from an independent firm HR Results to assess the personnel processes used in situations involving a professor in biological sciences. A systemwide office is overseeing this process.
- e. The professor was placed on leave under Article 17 of the faculty collective bargaining agreement on December 9, 2022, and has remained on leave since that date. An investigation is ongoing.
- f. The temporary workplace violence restraining order remains in place which legally bars the professor from being on or near campus and from possessing firearms. The trial on the restraining order began on April 21 in the Butte County Superior Court in Chico and will resume on May 18 and 19.
- g. Community reporting for campus has created a page for submitting reports related to concerning behavior, or to help identify individuals in need of support or resources. This will be shared with the campus community via email communication tomorrow.
- h. The university is continuing to meet with the unions regarding a change in our emergency alert system, namely converting the system to an opt out service instead of an opt in and a change will occur after the meeting is done.
- i. Revised EM 1923 with revisions on the policy for faculty recognition and support is expected to go through the academic senate.
- j. Additional EMs 1225 the policy on campus behavior and violence prevention, and 2128 the interim University Police and Public Safety Advisory Committee are making progress.
- k. Holt Hall safety measures and changing push button locks & rekeying are ongoing (instructional spaces and additional doors, total 50).

- l. Chico State is no longer utilizing the Empathia counselor who had been simultaneously treating the professor and faculty and staff affected by alleged threats.
- m. The Senate Chair has been sitting in the extended cabinet.
- n. All communications can be found on the presidential communications page of the President's website.
- o. Student Affairs and University Communications have intentionally highlighted safety for the campus through monthly all announced messages this semester.
- p. The president will continue to make campus safety a priority and continue to work with the senate and the campus community to make improvements in all areas.

Discussion:

- a. Praise shared for changes made and taking the senate resolution seriously.
- b. Stated that the Union is ready to help and be involved.
- c. Stated that feedback is welcomed by all groups: students, Staff Council, Labor Council, Union, Academic Senate.
- d. Thankful and appreciated for the president's dedication to giving campus reports and updates. Hope shared this campus can become an exemplar for the CSU system.

Proposals: Time approximate 2:45

10. FASP Consent Agenda

- a. Proposed revisions to [FPPP 1.0: Instructional Faculty – Responsibilities and Ethical Requirements](#) – FASP Action Item
- b. Proposed revisions to [FPPP 5.2.1: Hiring Lecturer Faculty](#) – FASP Action Item
- c. Proposed revisions to [FPPP 11.1.1: Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#) – FASP Action Item
- d. Proposed revisions to [FPPP: Introduction](#) – FASP Action Item
- e. Proposed revisions to [FPPP 16.4.1: Faculty Personnel Files](#) – FASP Action Item
- f. Proposed deletion of [FPPP Appendix Two](#) – FASP Action Item

The Senate approved the consent agenda.

11. Proposed revision to [FPPP 5.1.2: Equivalency](#) – FASP Action Item

FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 11:

- a. This was presented last week and passed as an introduction item.
- b. Last week's version missed "prior to the position being advertised", asking the senate to include this language.
- c. In 5.1.2.b "if the equivalency standards are not approved, the provost will respond to the department Dean within 30 days of the proposal to the provost's office with a written explanation" was clarified.

Motion made to make changes stated in b. and c. Second. No objection, approved.

The Senate voted on item 11: 28 yes, no opposition. Item 11 passed as an action item.

12. Proposed revisions to [FPPP 5.2.5: Lecturer Ranges](#) – FASP Action Item

FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 12:

- a. The document clarified how lecturer ranges work when they are hired.
- b. The subcommittee worked on changes and proposed this language.
- c. The Provost and OAPL approved the changes.

The Senate voted on item 12: 28 yes, no opposition. Item 12 passed as an action item.

13. Proposed new [Undergraduate Option in Animal Science: Food Animal Production](#) (Department of Agriculture) - EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Kralj presented item 11:

- a. Items 13 and 14 are connected but voting will be done separately.
- b. Proposal coming from COA.
- c. Currently, the program is doing informal advising to help students move into a pre-veterinary route or a food animal production route. This is an undergraduate option.
- d. Dr. Phillips is available to answer any questions.

The Senate voted on item 13: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 13 passed as an action item.

14. Proposed new [Undergraduate Option in Animal Science: Pre-Veterinary Science](#) (Department of Agriculture) - EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Kralj presented item 14:

- a. Informally, 80% of incoming freshmen in animal science are interested in veterinary medicine.
- b. Chico State is the only CSU not offering this option.
- c. This is a very much wanted option and proposed here.

The Senate voted on item 14: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 14 passed as an action item.

15. EPPC Music Reorganization Agenda

- a. Proposed [significant change: BA in Music](#) - EPPC Action Item
- b. Proposed [elevation of Undergraduate Option: Recording Arts; Music Industry within Bachelor of Arts in Music](#) – EPPC Action Item
- c. Proposed [discontinuation of Option in Recording Arts: Option in Bachelor of Arts in Music](#) - EPPC Action Item
- d. Proposed [discontinuation of Option in Music Industry: Option in Bachelor of Arts in Music](#) - EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Kralj presented item 15:

- a. Items are grouped as they are connected. When approved, it will be voted on together.
- b. The Chancellor Office required 50% of units to be from core courses. Music revitalized their options and are presenting current four proposals.
- c. The BA in Music is moving out of electives into core.
- d. The elevation of the option of Recording Arts in the music industry with a Bachelor of Arts in Music.
- e. The discontinuation of the option of Recording Arts and the discontinuation of the options in Music Industry are based on the previous proposal.
- f. Dr. David Schultz is present to answer any questions.

The Senate voted on item 15: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 15 passed as an action item.

16. Proposed replacement of [EM 05-017: University Budget Committee](#) – FASP Action Item

FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 16:

- a. Work was done for several years on this EM.
- b. Discussion about how UBC can be more meaningful and include expertise and perspectives of staff and faculty.
- c. The subcommittee was chaired by Senator Boyd.
- d. The replacement document was shared in chat.

Subcommittee Chair Boyd presented further item 16:

- a. Work started in 2015, creating a transparent and consultative group that reflects the values of Chico State and its mission.
- b. Multiple people worked on this, with lately more consistent members including Dennis O'Connor, Rachel McBride-Pretorius, Patrick Newell, Ann Sherman, and Betsy Boyd.
- c. Consultation done with VP for Business and Finance and FASP. Received comments and feedback were addressed and incorporated into the document.
- d. At the end of the document included a statement that this EM will be revised as needed.
- e. Included under the EM, it authorizes faculty input through the Higher Education Employer Employee Relations Act (HEERA). Under the delegated authorities that transfer down to campuses and the shared governance practices that exist as a permanent committee of the Academic Senate, the UBC committee would answer to the same constitution and bylaws that govern Academic Senate committees.

Discussion and questions:

Question: regarding voting versus non-voting, what type of things members are expected to vote on?

Answer: the grand charge of this committee is to provide recommendations. Some expected topics may include strategic utilization of the campus budget with reflection of campus priorities. Currently, most of the budget is used for salaries and infrastructure, and a small portion for strategic initiatives discussed by the cabinet. This EM would allow those priorities to be discussed within subcommittee or committee and have broad campus input on annual recommendations of what those priorities and initiatives should be for campus. This would allow UBC to be more transparent and allow the campus community to be part of these discussions (e.g., succession planning, retirement planning).

- a. Concern shared that the five-year term may be too long a commitment for staff, and these may not easily commit to serve.
- b. Asked if a three-year commitment might be better. Stated yes.
- c. Concern shared large committee will be created and how this body will function. The opposition shared with UBC EM.
- d. Support shared to improve UBC.

Motion made to change language on page 3 “shall serve three to five year terms” instead of only “five”. Second. Rationale: to acknowledge concerns and to address the concerns previously raised by the Staff Council Chair and Senator.

Question: is there a mechanism to determine if it will be three or five years and if EC would determine this? Answer: currently this committee would follow the same mechanism, or it can be amended to clarify this language.

Amendment to the amendment: after “terms” to add “, as determined by the Executive Committee (EC) of the Academic Senate. Initial”. And editorially use acronyms in the rest of the document. Second. Rationale: clarify the process. No objections, approved.

No discussion, no objection. Motion approved.

The Senate voted on item 16: 30 yes, one no. Item 16 passed as an action item.

17. Proposed revision of [EM 15-001: Exceptional Service Assigned Time Policy](#) (ESAT revised) – FASP Action Items

FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 17:

- a. The EM was created due to contract negotiations and the intention was to award all those faculty who are doing exceptional service.

The Senate voted on item 17: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 17 passed as an action item.

18. Proposed revision of [EM 19-023: Faculty Recognition and Support](#) – FASP Action Item

Chair Paiva passed the gavel to Vice Chair Trailer during item 18.

FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 18:

- a. Changes were made due to historical events last December.
- b. Chair Paiva worked on this EM as well as FRAS Chair Hart.

Chair Paiva presented changes to item 18:

- a. Changes made regarding Interim Provost Perez's concerns regarding the reference checks on nominees and reporting back to nominators would potentially disclose confidential personnel information.
- b. The timeline was changed to address this concern.
- c. The FASP Chair introduced at the beginning of the Academic Senate meeting the collection of the amendments that reflect these proposed changes.
- d. There would be no other criteria for removal for consideration except for a personnel issue.

Discussion and questions:

Question: would the nominee and nominator be notified or just nominator? Answer: nominees do not know they were nominated unless they have won the award. Their removal from the nominee group would be disclosed to the nominee and the issue is to disclose personnel information.

- a. Chair Paiva clarified that the current vote would be only to accept the collection of the amendments to be considered within the entire document.
- b. Attention was brought to the text referring to the shortlisted candidates being discussed with the FRAS Chair to come after final recommendations are made and to be consistent with items #6&7.

The Senate voted to accept collection of the amendments: 31 yes, no opposition. Approved.

- c. OAPL supported the changes in passed collection of the amendments.

Motion made to add "shortlisted". Second. Rationale: to clarify the language and specify the process.

No objections, approved.

The Senate voted on item 18: 29 yes, no opposition. Item 18 passed as an action item.

19. Proposed revision of [EM 21-029: Policy for the Use of Digital Technologies in Teaching and Learning](#) – EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Kralj presented item 19:

- a. The new EM was reworked to clarify the mode of instruction of courses.
- b. Clarified and defined term "collective faculty" to include the faculty and potentially the curriculum committee in departments to decide what the appropriate mode of instruction is.

Discussion and questions:

- a. Stated that there are connections between EM 4.2 and first paragraph and CBA 20.2 b. Suggested to include CBA language in the EM.
- b. Stated that the CBA clause is about the assignment of faculty to courses. This EM is about MOA to be clear for students when deciding what course to take. Oppose adding a CBA clause.
- c. Additional opposition shared with adding CBA language to this EM.
- d. Asked if the first and second paragraphs of EM under 4.2 are in conflict.
- e. Stated that the senate previously ruled on this and approved the language.

- f. Stated that it should be a university decision, and not a department decision when the entire program is converted to online MOI.

Question: Is this considered a major change (to put the entire program online)? Answer: according to this policy, yes.

Question: is this an introduction or action item? Answer: This is an action item.

- g. Shared that discussion seems as this is an introduction item and asking for motions to be made.

Motion made to 4.9 Office Hours to change the word “using digital platform” to “online”. Second. Rationale: to clarify and be specific. No objections, motion approved.

Motion made to 2.1 external platforms and servers to refer to external, and to strike “tools and materials”. No objections, motion approved.

Motion made to delete text from 2.1.3 and move to the end of 4.4.2. No objection, approved.

Motion made to reword that statement approved above “any free or paid software acquisition of meeting software used in the development of software or hardware must be made through the information technology procurement review process”. Second. Rationale: this would affect engineering and computer science. The intent is to include the tools used by software engineering instructors used to teach courses. The course is making changes daily in the development of software.

- h. VP of IT confirmed this is a standard process.

- i. Concern shared that some actions are safety concerns. Asked to audit from time to time without stopping the work. Asked to revise language and that IT will periodically audit software as required.

Motion made to postpone this item for 5 minutes, move on to the next item and then return to this again after language is prepared. Second. No objection, approved.

The Senate moved on to item 20 and then returned to item 19.

Senate continued discussion:

Amendment to the motion: “Any free or paid software acquisition must be made through the information technology procurement review process. Software used in the development of software or hardware is omitted pre acquisition review but is open for ad hoc auditing.” Second. No objection, approved.

- a. Stated that the title of the EM is digital technologies while the document contains various phrases like digital platforms, digital tools, applications, and platforms. Submitted to the Senator Kralj document with all changed to reflect the name of the EM. There are a couple of dozens of locations where language change would make this document more consistent.
- b. Stated that if this is significant, then these could be editorial changes. If not, documents can contain variations of the language.
- c. Stated that variation of language is acceptable. No motion made.

Question: Regarding EM 4.2 How does “collective faculty” work in practice? How does the collective faculty as defined exercise that deliberative process and decision making in modes of instruction?

Answer: The goal was to allow the department to discuss this, and that decision is not made by one individual but rather by faculty members, the curriculum committee and finally approved by the dean/director.

- d. The language needed to be fairly general because depending on different departments’ curriculum decisions might be made by different bodies. Change of the MOI should follow regular established processes.

The Senate voted on item 19: 28 yes, no opposition. Item 19 passed as an action item.

20. Proposed reorganization of [Academic Technology](#) - EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Kralj presented item 20:

- a. This is a move in terms of reporting. There are no changes in staffing, and responsibilities, nor do they require support.
- b. Wildcat computing support and center for tech equity, and TLP would be reporting to the Division of Information Technology and VP Sendze.

The Senate voted on item 20: 28 yes, no opposition. Item 20 passed as an action item.

21. Proposed new [EM: Policy on Certificate Programs](#) - EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Kralj presented item 21:

- a. The goal was to lower the number of required units from 21 to 12.
- b. Create an option of having standalone undergraduate certificate programs. This exists in graduate but not in undergraduate programs.
- c. EM will clarify and be in compliance with GPA requirements.
- d. Allow certificate in both state-supported and self-supported options.
- e. The main goal was to make education available to students. Each department would create specific proposals that would then move through EPPC and the Academic Senate approval.
- f. Announced that the group was working on a group of amendments and suggested those to be discussed next.

Discussion:

- a. Stakeholders worked on proposed amendments shared here.

Motion made to propose language change to read as “Matriculated students may seek as part of or in addition to their academic objective students should follow any application process according to the certificate program requirements set forth by the relevant academic program or department. Second. Rationale: deleting the degree objective and replacing it with an academic objective. Taking the word “must apply” out to accommodate the fact that not all programs require an application to go into the certificate program.

- b. The Director of the office of admission supported the language.

The Senate had no objection, and the motion passed.

Motion made to strike out the language and replace it with “non degree seeking students may apply for a certificate program through established university application processes and if required to the certificate program directly applicants must meet the qualification set forth by the university and individual certificate program.” Second. Rationale: asking for more flexibility in the process when students outside of the campus, not matriculated, are able to attend a course without being in a degree seeing program. Currently, only through open university students can enroll and attend classes. Language would accommodate both options for future students.

- c. Admissions and registrars worked together and supported broad and flexible language, allowing additional students to attend Chico State courses. Gathered information showed grad programs allow this, but undergraduate programs and certificates do not. Allowing to streamline the process.
- d. Stated this should be revisited with the Chancellor’s Office who in the past provided conflicted statements that this is not possible for non-degree seeking standalone certificate programs through state support. Or yes, this is possible with some caveats. Not clear what course of action would be acceptable.
- e. Next week the enrolment management will hold a meeting where some answers will be provided.

- f. The goal is to have a process for students to apply through the Open University in an easier and more applicable way.
- g. Support shared for the language and commented to be broader rather than stricter.
- h. Stated that this language is not in conflict with current processes done on campus.
- i. Concerns shared that university would make a fundamental shift in the way student admission is done. Stated that this should have more time and not be accepted today but later.
- j. Stated that any student who goes through an admission process must meet Title V requirements and must be vetted through the full and rigorous admission process.
- k. A lot of the questions and clarity need to come from the Chancellor's Office. Concern shared that this may be something, if approved, campus will not be able to follow through. Suggested not to be approved today, instead receive more feedback from CO prior to deciding.
- l. Stated that the CO believes currently that students who would apply in this way would need to go through the full application process (Cal State Apply --- apply via the department where a certificate is offered).

Motion made to table this until the next Senate meeting to allow questions to be answered and confirm the next course of action. Second.

- m. Confirmed that if approved, the Senate would directly start with the last discussed motion.

The Senate voted: 27 yes, no opposition. Motion passed.

22. Proposed new [Graduate program: MS in Data Science and Analytics](#) - EPPC Introduction Item – time certain 4:00 pm

EPPC Chair Kralj presented item 22:

- a. At the beginning of the Academic Senate meeting, documents were shared with senators to allow enough time for its review prior to the discussion. Clarified that any motions would be made during action and not introduction item.
- b. This is a state support proposal expecting the first group of students in fall of 2024.
- c. Great need for students who understand the data, to be able to utilize it ethically and explain it and bring it forward. There is a large need in the professional world.
- d. This would be the first CSU program in the north state and would be interdisciplinary, integrating with other undergraduate programs, and with newly past undergraduate masters double counting blended programs.
- e. Two tracks: applied analytics and machine learning.
- f. The need and number of careers available at local, state, national and international levels. Great potential to include international students.
- g. Recognizing Nick Lytal who will present about the program.

Nick Lytal presented item 22:

- a. Data science is a blend of math, statistics, computer science, and several other application areas, like business.
- b. Data science programs housed in business tend to be tailored to business analytics programs, while computer science will have higher computational requirements. This opens interdisciplinary collaboration where multiple departments can jointly manage the advising, the course offerings, and other program developments.
- c. There have been interdepartmental programs and intercampus data science programs that have thrived at other universities, when they are presented from the top down e.g., as per provost initiative. Example shared: cloud computing class at Sacramento State.

- d. The intent is to attract a variety of students from multiple domains and have specific tracks in applied analytics and in machine learning. The applied analytics track appeals to domain specialists who want to use advanced statistical and computing technical skills to do computational science in their field. These students will not have a strong math background nor computer science. Machine learning would apply to students from statistics, math, and computer science majors.
- e. In the future, to collaborate with business and create a third track specialized in business analytics.
- f. Changes made since document approved by the EPPC:
 - i. Editorial changes like the master's preparation class listed twice for the machine learning track have been corrected.
 - ii. EART600 is not a spring course, and CSCI 611 is not a fall course – both corrected.
 - iii. Catalog changes clearly indicate in description CSCI 605 would not be appropriate for computer science MS students.
 - iv. Added tenure track faculty name to the list of faculty teaching courses.
 - v. Added language requesting a strategic tenure track hire with data science expertise to initiate the program be considered as part of the normal campus process.

Discussion and questions:

- a. Representatives from the computer science praised the changes and opportunities for their students to be part of these changes.
- b. Concerns shared are that not all courses listed here are approved.
- c. Stated that not all students have a strong background in computer science and that there may be some overlapping in undergrad computer science classes. These can't be allowed to be double counted (specific for students doing masters in data science and undergrad students in computer science).

Question: Comment related to the need for additional hire. Can this program run without additional hire? The previous comment stated not all coursework is available. Can the program proceed without approved courses? Answer: Some courses will not be available nor needed during year 1. However, some will be needed and currently are not approved. Plan to work on approval once this proposal is approved.

- d. Clarified by the EPPC Chair that EPPC did not have information on newly added and needed tenure track hire. Concerns shared regarding not all courses being available and how programs will run based on that. Also, not discussed at the EPPC.
- e. This was discussed earlier this week.
- f. Clarified that new courses that would have to be created would have to be available by fall 2024. One course must be refined to meet Computer Sciences standards. Expecting that courses not approved now will be approved in early fall 2023.
- g. Stated that the program could start without initial hire, however, not comfortably and would require additional work by current faculty to cover teaching these courses. New hire is a request at the current time.
- h. Commented that under the additional requirements in terms of funding should not say "none". Requested to change this to "depending on enrollment and other programs, the computer science department may need funds to support additional instructors to meet the teaching obligations of the masters in data science." This will be considered at the action next week.
- i. Provost Perez stated funds should be there if there is a need for students to be in classes. This may not be for tenure track hire, but potentially lecturer(s).

- j. Commented that letters of support from Dean Lau indicate the need for and support for additional hire and that this was discussed before. Support shared for additional language previously mentioned.
- k. Stated that high schools are offering entry level courses in data science and that campus should use the opportunity to offer these to future students.

The Senate voted on item 22: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 22 passed as an introduction item.

23. Proposed revision of [EM 21-028: Interim University Police and Public Safety Advisory Committee](#) – FASP Action Item

Chair Paiva passed the gavel to the Vice Chair Trailer.

FASP Chair Sistrunk presented item 23:

- a. Stated this is an interim policy. Six months passed, timeline for interim policies.
- b. There were editions of the Presidential Task Force on policing policy.
- c. Feedback collected and document is presented at the Academic Senate.

The Senate voted on item 23: 27 yes, no opposition. Item 23 passed as an action item.

~~24. Proposed new [EM: Interim Chico State E-mail Policy](#) – Executive Committee Introduction Item~~

Request made to remove item 24. Second.

The Senate voted on removing item 24: 28 yes, no opposition, approved.

25. Ask the Administrator

Question: Has there been an open call for the Faculty Fellow appointment? Answer: Interim Provost Perez confirmed there was no open call. The intention was to increase student enrollment and the Interim Provost decided to directly elect that person.

Question: When will the end date to the hiring freeze be? Expressed significant negative impact on the department struggling to find faculty to teach all courses. Requested that Senate in fall seek for a specific date if this is not provided earlier. Answer: at this point can't specify the date. The campus is trying to balance decreased funding with a possible increase in students enrolled to balance the decreased budget. The Academic Affairs decided to reduce expenditures by reducing faculty. Different impact on departments as some may lose more/all faculty versus others may lose none. Goal to change the workload of existing staff members; reclassification done. Interim Provost Perez confirmed he asked the President to allow hiring externally to occur when internal hire is not an option.

26. Adjourn at 5:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

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