



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 February 9, 2023, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/81231074627?pwd=ZWFzZVpKVENOY2pEb0drdC8vaE43dz09>
Meeting ID: 812 3107 4627 Passcode: 761594

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

Absent: Alvarez, Boura, Bruns, Draper, and Wagner.

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 2:33 pm.

1. Approve Minutes of [October 6, 2022](#), [November 10, 2022](#), [December 8, 2022](#), [December 14, 2022](#), and December 16, 2022

Motion made to strike “Representation from CFA usually does not involve well informed or legal representation” on page three, item h of December 14 minutes. No objections.

All minutes approved.

2. Approve Agenda

Request made to provide a report on the presidential selection process and committee. Chair Paiva stated she will report on this matter during item 4 university reports.

Agenda approved.

3. Announcements

- a. CFA is heading into contract negotiations at the end of the spring semester. Asking members to contribute as CFA will conduct meetings in the next two months.
- b. The Academic Senate will conduct elections for the Statewide Senator position and reported multiple nominations. Election will be held next week. This person will represent Chico State at the Academic Senate of CSU.
- c. The search committee from the CO, the BoT, and the campus search advisory committee held a public forum at the BMU. The purpose was to gather feedback prior to the formation of the job announcement. The committee will be able to weigh in on the job description. The search firm will then start collecting applications. It is a closed search; the candidates will be kept in confidence. Planning interviews in April and May, off campus.

4. University Reports – Hutchinson/Boura/Brundage/Sendze/Sherman

VP Brundage:

- a. The enrollment continuum group is meeting. They summarized forum feedback from faculty and staff into themes. Looking for ways to engage the community in the student enrollment process.
- b. During a statewide meeting discussed enrollment and the ways campus can receive state assistance, and long-term initiatives.
- c. Submitted a five-year enrollment plan to the Chancellor's Office.

Discussion:

- a. Asked to pay attention to the denial of the significance of four-year degrees in employment as this is partially driving enrollment down.
- b. Response shared this was discussed at the statewide level and ideas were shared how to collectively improve.

Question: Is there a way to expedite catalog changes e.g., changing course titles, class descriptions before 2024? Answer: Senator Grey, the curriculum coordinator on campus, is processing all catalog changes that happen once per year, usually in early spring. In early March 2023/24 catalog will be published. If changes are being submitted now, they will not be included in this year's catalog but next. Starting a project to implement curriculum software to improve the process.

Question: Is the five-year plan available for public view? Answer: at this moment no. Waiting to see if CO's approval is needed prior to releasing the document.

VP Sendze:

- a. This spring, the division of IT will perform major upgrades to the campus network hardware, which includes replacing the network gear that connects desktops, printers, and wireless access to the network.
- b. This project will provide faster network connection.
- c. The project will run from February 27 – March 17 and will be funded by CSU.

Question: For students, faculty, and staff connected from home equipment, will they notice any changes? Answer: Yes. Any equipment connected on campus should use VPN (virtual private network). Upgrades will insure this occurs. Internet speed will be faster and more reliable.

VP Sherman:

- a. Groundbreaking of a new BSS building happened yesterday. Next month steel will be placed. It will take about a year and a half to complete it. Building plans are available.
- b. Division is looking into ways to use limited funds.

Interim Provost Perez:

- a. The first month was welcoming and appreciation shared.
- b. Most of the career spent at CSU (22 years) was at Sac State. Held positions from faculty at the department of economics to faculty senator, executive committee member, and a vice chair. Other roles included provost and interim president.
- c. Appreciation shared toward campus mission and working together on making decisions regarding student enrollment.
- d. The Academic Affairs is looking at a \$20 million budget shortfall that needs to be closed in the next three years.
- e. Next year there will be a \$15 million budget deficit and will use \$5 million from reserves.

- f. Asking Deans to spend less money than before and to provide enough seats that students need, all 12,500.
- g. Delayed posting of a schedule until February 20th.
- h. Looking at other budget sources and being creative to present curriculum and deliver enough courses for current students.

President Hutchinson:

- a. The groundbreaking of a new BSS building had around 80 people in attendance and good media coverage. This will be the first net-neutral building on campus and is expected to be ready for students in fall 2024.
- b. The campus submitted an enrollment strategic growth plan to the CO. Encouraged everyone to attend the upcoming UBC meeting.
- c. The enrollment continuum has resources on their website and each of four groups' actions are described.
- d. Graduation rates have increased in the last few years.
- e. The COVID test site is closing at the end of a month. The county health department saw a decline in cases and decided this site is no longer necessary.

5. [Associated Students Report](#) – Alvarez
Associated Student report is linked to the agenda.

6. Staff Council - Peterson

Peterson presented the Staff Council report:

- a. Two staff members were honored for awesome work done. Nominations are ongoing for each month.

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

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

Statewide Senators Boyd and Ford presented item 7:

- a. The ASCSU had their January plenary a couple of weeks ago. The guests included the interim chancellor, the executive vice chancellor, CFA president, and the Cozen O'Connor group.
- b. First read resolutions passed and are linked in the attached report.
- c. There are campuses providing their feedback on a couple of passed resolutions: AS 3594 and AS 3596.
- d. AS 3594 is about AB 130, the qualification process for getting into teacher credentialing programs. There are mechanisms allowing to mix and match specific courses that students might take with specific domains in the subject matter competency area. The issue that is arising is whether or not the determinations of one campus and their coursework and how it matches with the competency domain should be accepted by a different campus.
- e. AS 3596 is about promoting the involvement of existing liberal studies faculty in the development of a brand-new credential that has been authorized by the CTC for PK-3 (pre-kindergarten to 3rd grade). Question: should that be the sole domain of child development faculty or should those who are disciplinary experts in the areas of kindergarten 1st – 3rd grade?
- f. Asking for feedback on this and other items.
- g. The next plenary meeting will be in March during spring break.
- h. Interim meetings will start tomorrow.

- i. Unanimously passed resolution by the ASCSU in support of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Praise shared for work done by Rachel McBride Pretorius, Director of Tribal Relations, and President Hutchinson.
- j. This really is a way to elevate knowledge about Cal NAGPRA, and NAGPRA federal regulations, and to ask for a moratorium on any non-approved research of any of the remains and family members of tribes.
- k. This was highlighted in the ASCSU Chair report to the Board of Trustees meeting.

8. Standing Committees Reports

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

EPPC report attached. One introduction item will be presented today.

FASP report attached. One introduction item will be presented today.

EC have met three times since the last Senate meeting; report attached.

No questions.

9. Ask the Administrator

Question: there are a couple of articles circulating right now about a restraining. Asking for an update on this during the next senate meeting.

10. Information: [ChicoFlex Assessment Update](#) – 3:00 pm Ferrari

Mercurio and Hanson-Lewis provided ChicoFlex Assessment update:

- a. Last spring, a group was tasked with assessing the ChicoFlex program and looked at the different modalities of instruction at Chico State.
- b. The COVID pandemic brought more instruction options used at Chico State: fully in-person, online as two options synchronous and asynchronous, HyFlex done as three options asynchronous, synchronous and in-person, and ChicoFlex model synchronous and in-person.
- c. Prior beliefs were that ChicoFlex provides flexibility and increased accessibility for students; cons included less engagement with students, unequal access to various student populations, and there were course design limitations.
- d. The group wanted to know if students' success was different in the ChicoFlex classrooms, how faculty viewed the success of ChicoFlex, and what the ideal courses and the best practices were for a ChicoFlex MOI. In addition, the group looked at student's GPA and DFW rates, the racially and ethnically minoritized populations, and 1st gen students.
- e. The statistical analysis was run on all spring 2022 classes. The undergraduate mean GPA was 2.955 across all classes on campus. See slides 6-9 for details on specific MOI analysis.
- f. There is no difference between in person, online or ChicoFlex mode of instructions on GPA for the 2022 semester. MOI was also not a significant factor as it only produced a 0.6% difference in students' GPA.
- g. The average university undergraduate DFW rates are 12.27%. See slides for details for each individual MOI analysis. The statistical model showed only 2% of the variation; this means the mode of instruction is correlated with DFW rate, but it explains the correlation 2% of the time. 98% of the variance and DFW rate is caused by other factors besides mode of instruction.
- h. There was no statistical difference between any of the MOI for minoritized populations and students. And there was no statistical difference for the first-generation students.

- i. The survey was shared between April 5 and June 6; 329 responses were received from faculty. Faculty had more satisfactory response if they participated in training compared to those that did not.
- j. 10 ChicoFlex faculty members that participated in a training were also interviewed. See slide 15 for more details.

Discussion and questions:

Question: Were questions related to the motivation of students to be in an online class? Answer: Kate McCarthy and her team simultaneously did a survey of all students while this group focused on faculty.

- a. Suggested to present student data on a different day at the senate meeting.
- b. Appreciation shared for hard work and presenting this valuable data.

Question: was data modelled based on MOI and the level of a course? Answer: 2/10 students were not able to choose MOI. The problem with looking at lower vs upper division undergraduate courses was not enough data. Lower division courses were analyzed, and no statistical difference was found here.

Question: Is there a plan to conduct research comparing one course taught in different MOI? Are there any published papers where other institutions have done those prospective designed studies? Answer: The initial plan was to have one instructor teaching different modalities. When it comes to publications, no study like that was found.

- c. Appreciation and praises shared.

11. Information: Information Technology Strategic Plan – 3:30 pm Sendze, Tucker Cutter (Berry Dunn)
VP Sendze presented IT strategic plan:

- a. This is a product of input from several campus stakeholders. A strategy will demonstrate how to empower student success, support faculty, and provide technological resources.
- b. IT strategic plan will align with the university's strategic plan and its six pillars.

Cutter presented the timeline and the process:

- a. Various surveys and assessments were done in April and June 2022.
- b. The Berry Dunn group joined in August of 2022, worked on organization, reviewed documents and conducted surveys, met with various groups on campus in September 2022.
- c. The next phase included the vision workshop whose intent was to use community feedback and start crafting the vision and mission, and guiding principles of IT.

VP Sendze:

- a. The IT created a framework that guides the work of the division of IT around the best practices, improving technology services and products for the institution.
- b. The plan also seeks to align with the university's strategic plan, priorities and enduring commitment to the campus community.
- c. The strategic plan is defined by six pillars, each of which encompass specific goals, tactics, and measures of success.
- d. The goals behind each pillar call for action, and the tactics describe the specific actions that IT will take along the way to achieve those goals.
- e. See the slide with details highlighting the IT vision, mission and the six strategic pillars.
- f. Chico State will be recognized as an innovative and dynamic campus that integrates technology into the institution. Each piece of the plan is an essential part of the whole and no pillar is designed to be more important than the other.
- g. Pillar I (goal of becoming an equity serving institution); pillar II (operational effectiveness and use of the best resources and industry practices); pillar III (governance and decision making);

pillar IV (positions IT as a strategic partner to campus); pillar V (focus on student success); and pillar VI (innovation, transformation, and agility).

- h. Suggested to check the attached document for more details of IT goals for each pillar.
- i. On March 1, IT will present a strategic plan to the campus community. There will be a public announcement, and everyone is welcome and encouraged to attend.

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

FASP Chair presented item 12:

- a. EM on how to organize 40+ permanent committees and their work.
- b. A committee on committees was created to follow the work of all other committees and track they are current and meeting.
- c. There was a suggestion during the introduction item to change the language on who and how the process should be determined and whether the committee should be suspended.

Discussion:

Motion made to add text under the quotes ... the academic senate executive committee “which will initiate a process” to determine whether they should be suspended or dissolved.

- a. Commented that the change is suggesting only two options suspend or dissolve. The intent is for the EC to be able to determine what the next step should be.
- b. Commented that EM should be vaguer.
- c. Point of order. Motion was made without second.
 - a. Motion was seconded. Discussion continued.
- d. Amendment to the motion made to change the word “will” to “may”. Second. Now reads as “the academic senate executive committee which may initiate a process to determine whether they should be suspended or dissolved”.
- e. Commented that interpretation can be if committee is not suspended or dissolved, then committee continues with work.
- f. The senate had no objections, an amendment to the motion passed.
- g. The senate had no objections, the motion passed.
- h. The senate voted on the item 12: 29 yes, no objection. Item 12 passed as an action item.

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

FASP Chair presented item 13:

- a. The EM focus is on the committee structure work.
- b. In the appendix there will be a list of all committees.
- c. In addition, there will be a repository of all policies and procedures, and committees work. IT and library are working on this.
- d. Suggested a few changes during the introduction item discussion.
- e. Language suggestion on page 3 to correct text to state administrative analyst instead of administrative staff, and later to delete “late February”.

Discussion:

Motion made to change the text on page 3, top of the first paragraph, from “the Academic Senate administrative staff support will” to “the Academic Senate administrative analyst support will”.

Motion made to amend the language on page 3 to say, “sending out memo(s)” and to delete “in late February”, and remove “s” off the “calls”. Second. “Assist Academic Senate chair and sending out memos that call for volunteers.”

Rationale: if there are multiple memos, this language will accommodate this.

Question: will this impact sabbatical leaves? Are proxy assigned for those that are absent for one semester? Answer: yes. Proxy is assigned for the entire semester.

No objection, motion approved.

- a. Suggested editorial change to replace “staff” with “analyst”. Second.
- b. Commented that in the past this position was held by other levels. If someone leaves, there is no guarantee that the new replacement will be an analyst. Suggested that maybe there is no need to change the word “staff”.
- c. Commented that the senate does need an analyst level of support.
- d. Editorial correction suggested and approved to add “specialist”; “administrative analyst/specialist”.
- e. No objections, change approved.
- f. The senate voted on the item 13: 29 yes, no opposition. Item 13 passed as an action item.

Chair Paiva left the meeting. Vice Chair Trailer takes over the meeting.

14. Proposed revision to [FPPP 9.1.2 and 10.2.5](#) – FASP Action Item

FASP Chair presented item 14:

- a. Different ways faculty can be evaluated beyond SFOTs and colleague observation.
- b. FPPP 9.1.2 is regarding lecturer evaluations.
- c. Language changes were suggested during the introduction discussion.
- d. Examples of evidence are present in the document.
- e. Brief overview covered; see attached document with highlighted text.

Discussion:

- a. Concern shared regarding departments with a very large number of lecturers. Workload appeared to be directed to the chair of the department and then dissipates its direction.

Question: shouldn't this be the chair of the department or the chair of the Personnel Committee in the department? Answer: It is the curriculum committee as suggested language was mentioned during the last senate meeting.

- b. Commented that there was a long list of equity, diversity, and inclusive practices with a hyperlink. Questioned if the hyperlink is still there.
- c. Mentioned that within third paragraph parentheses should be removed.
- d. Commented that the School of Nursing has a director instead of a chair, and a personnel committee instead of a curriculum committee. This is an example of discrepancies in terms of a process.

Motion made to include “department director or chair” and “curriculum” to be changed to “personnel curriculum”. Second.

- e. Point of order. To have these debated separately. Senate proceeds.

Motion made to include “department chair or director” within first highlighted area under 9.1.2.

Second. Rationale: to meet everyone's needs.

- f. The term unit is used in CBA and is in this document.
- g. Chair Trailer stated that school should be under the “unit”.
- h. At the beginning of FPPP document definitions clearly state what department chair is including their duties as well as for department/unit.
- i. Suggestion not to vote in favor of this motion.
- j. Motion and second withdrawn.

- k. Commented that last spring when this document was considered there was the original language including a very detailed list of practices that demonstrated an instructor's success in closing equity gaps through professional development. Question: If the intent was to collapse and shorten this section with a hyperlink which leads to the Faculty Development website, how can faculty know what those practices are?
- l. Faculty Development does list examples. If the senate is interested expanding this list, there could be a motion.
- m. Commented that hyperlink is pointing at a different location than what this used to be. Stated this is a problem when websites are changed. Suggested for a hyperlink to be removed.
- n. Commented that if this list expands, this is a suggested list based on the initial paragraph. Suggested to keep the statement broader and more open for many different possibilities for evidence.
- o. Impact and change come from faculty work in the classroom. Support shared to include examples as this is important for the RTP process.
- p. If EDI is part of the evaluation process, it should receive recognition.
- q. Concern shared that lecturers have the highest workload and the least confidence during the evaluation process. Additional concern shared faculty may think every point stated here must be done for the successful evaluation of the quality of their teaching. Suggested not to overwhelm junior faculty and lecturers.
- r. Suggested to move EDI wording on the top to give it more significance and add "see the Faculty Development website".
- s. Stated this is an action item. Motion made to postpone this item to the next senate meeting to allow more time to work on motions. Second. No objections, motion passed.

15. Proposed revision to [FPPP Range Elevation Process](#) – FASP Action Item

FASP Chair presented item 15:

- a. This is a response of the academic personnel to change deadlines when things will occur.
- b. Text in blue is suggested by OAPL. Older practices are removed.
- c. This document talks about lecturer range elevation.
- d. Lectures can apply for range elevation outside of the annual formal campus range elevation process. This is suggested in this FPPP document "annual campus range elevation process, or sooner if they qualify for a new contract during your year one through three of a three-year contract".

Discussion:

- a. Praise shared for FASP's work on this document.
- b. Motion made to add suggested language under the 12.2.2 at the end of a second line, "or sooner if they qualify for a new contract (during year one-three of a three-year contract)". Therefore, faculty do not need to wait the end of a three-year contract but sooner before three-year contract expires. Second.

Question: Part in this document stating, "eligible individuals must apply for the range elevation by March" is cancelled by this motion. Answer: every campus has a particular date. Chair and Dean have to respond during a specific period, and this is part of this FPPP.

Question: faculty that apply during different time should not wait until March, correct? Answer: yes, they can apply before that period.

- c. This process is the formal range of evaluation process under the collective bargaining agreement 12.18. Adding suggested wording is not part of a normal process. Suggested for this statement not to be included in this section of the FPPP document.
- d. Motion made to return this to the committee. Second. Rationale: Asking to clean up the document and prepare motions before bringing it back.
- e. Opposition shared and commented that if complicated lecturer policies are debated on the floor, they usually are sent back. Lecturer rights should be recognized on campus.
- f. Asked for clarification why this motion to return rather than a motion to postpone. Returning this back to a committee will initiate sequence of steps again and prolong the process. Postponement until the next senate meeting will allow time to work on proposed motions. What is the intention of the motion?
- g. Motion amendment made to postpone this item until the next academic senate meeting. Second. No objection, motion passed.

A call for adjournment was made. Second. Senate voted: 18 yes, seven no votes. This meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm. Remaining items will be on the next academic senate meeting agenda.

16. Proposed revision to [EM 19-033: Campus Sustainability Committee](#) – FASP Introduction Item
17. Proposed Name Change: [Chico Student Success Center](#) – EPPC Introduction Item
18. Other
19. Adjourn at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

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