



---

**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 April 6, 2023, 2:30 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, Coons, Ferrari, Ford, Gray, Hutchinson, Moss (Jollimore), Kaiser, Kralj, Lee, Magnus, Medic, Munro (Teague Miller), Musvosvi, Newell (Hidalgo), Nichols, O'Conner, Perez, Peterson (McBride-Pretorius), Sendze, Sherman, A., Sherman, N., Sistrunk, Smith, Son, Trailer (Chair), Traver, Walter, Yeager-Struthers (Paiva), and Zeichick (Gibson).

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

Chair Trailer (in the absence of Chair Paiva) called a meeting to order at 2:39 pm.

1. Approve Minutes of December 16, 2022, [February 23, 2023](#), and [March 23, 2023](#)  
Minutes of February 23 and March 23 approved.
2. Approve Agenda  
Item 10 will be time certain at 3:30 pm.  
Agenda approved.
3. Announcements
  - a. University Farm will have a plant sale in April & May on Thursdays & Fridays from 10 am – 3 pm. Selling succulents, veggies, and flowers, expecting different plants weekly.
  - b. Next Tuesday at 3 pm FDEV will have a workshop with teaching researchers called the healing center classroom. Focus on trauma students and how to deal with difficult conversations. Flier shared <https://www.csuchico.edu/fdev/assets/images/trsj-poster-april-11.png>
  - c. Next Wednesday, April 12, from 4 - 5:15pm, in Holt 170 research presentation on the use of force and police brutality.
  - d. Visit the next Book of common event.
4. University Reports – Hutchinson/Boura/Brundage/Perez/Sendze/Sherman  
President Hutchinson:
  - a. Book in common attract attention; author signed books after the event; great discussions.
  - b. The Choose Chico was a successful event, with over 3,000 visitors on campus.
  - c. A memo from Bot Freedman shared via email yesterday. At the Board of Trustee meeting in May, Cozen O'Connor will give a report that will be live streamed. The group announced that

each campus will be required to have an implementation team whose members must include a Title IX coordinator and DHR administrator, along with faculty, staff, and student representation. This will be presented to the EC tomorrow. Predicting to set up an implementation team in the next one or two weeks.

- d. Provost and president met with Hart, FRAS Chair. The committee worked on revising FRAS policy and adding ways to check nominated candidates. This policy is expected to be in the Senate this year. Two outstanding faculty awards were awarded to Rodney Thompson (outstanding lecturer award) and Dr. Amy Magnus (outstanding early career faculty award).

Interim Provost Perez:

- a. Praised work of those working on tenure promotions.
- b. A budget reduction of \$12.8 million is planned for next year. Using \$6 million from reserves.
- c. Schedule built to allow all students to be able to enroll in their classes.

VP Brundage:

- a. Praised work of participants during Choose Chico Day.
- b. Student Affairs is working on a strategic plan. Working on this with students, faculty, staff, and the campus community.

VP Sendze:

- a. Received a final report from the chancellor's office on a security audit.
- b. Received 14 findings and the management response team is in the works. The expectation is that we will remediate all the findings in six months.

VP Sherman:

- a. Introduced Jamie Clide who will be working with VP Sherman in the next three weeks as a part of the position transition.
- b. The library basement is experiencing water intrusion. Remediation and repairs planned after the rain.
- c. A line break occurred in Whitney Hall. Six students will be temporarily relocated.
- d. New BSS building updates: started work on a building, progress expected over the summer.
- e. Received memo from the CO with possible projections of state support for campus. The third quarter report will be done in the next couple of weeks.

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

Report attached.

6. Staff Council - Peterson

Senator Peterson introduced Staff Council report:

- a. The employee of the year award and for the MPPs nomination period is still open until next Friday.
- b. MPP award is a new award for Admin I and Admin II.

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

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

Statewide Senators Boyd and Ford introduced the statewide report:

- a. Report attached from last meeting. Hoping to receive feedback and represent campus.

- b. The next plenary meeting will be mid-May 17, 18 and 19. Elections for the next statewide senators will occur during this meeting.
- c. A new change to their bylaws constitution to allow three specific seats to be designated for occupation by lecturers. Asking for feedback on this resolution.
- d. The ratification process for a change to the Constitution involves a rare system wide faculty referendum vote. This requires both a majority of the votes system wide of the faculty that vote, and a majority of the campuses individually having a majority vote from the campus.

Question: will three lecturer faculty be elected from the existing statewide senators or will be additional three positions from campuses? Answer: Current proposal calls for a single lecturer representative to be elected from each campus. From that group of 23 lecturers, they will elect three to represent the lecturers system wide as senators on the statewide senate.

#### 8. Standing Committees Reports

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

Reports attached. No questions.

#### 9. [Ask the Administrator](#)

Clarified that questions were addressed and answered.

No questions.

#### 10. Discussion: Library Resources and Program Support (time certain 3:30 pm)

Newell introduced item 10 and the background information:

- a. Beginning the 2008 financial crisis, the library has seen budget cuts and remained very lightly funded. The current administration has never seen a properly funded library. Constant budget cuts coupled with inflation and the cost of academic materials significantly eroded the library's budget.
- b. The collection that supports the university's missions of teaching, research, learning and community service has significantly eroded over time.
- c. At the February 23<sup>rd</sup> senate meeting, it was mentioned during the introduction of the proposed astronomy minor that this was the first new program that the library could not immediately approve. Combining the CSU system's electronic resources and the local resources it was confirmed that the library has the bare minimum to support this program.
- d. Other budget impacts included librarian faculty workload, library hours and availability to students, and the types of resources and services offered.
- e. The library faculty voted to have the academic senate and the university budget committee, rather than the office of provost, to oversee an outside group to review the library budget, to research benchmarking data against other academic libraries that compare campuses and to recommend a budget for the library that allows it to meet the university's goals.

The Dean of Mariam library, John Wang provided the impact on the campus community:

- a. Started at this position in May 2020 and established a fair, transparent, and nature-oriented budget and practices.
- b. The library provides resources for faculty, staff, and to achieve students' success.
- c. Supporting a third-party review of the campus budget and allocation to the library.

- d. The total library budget is \$4.2 million to support library work and support per student per year, librarian workload, and library service coverage.
- e. A comparison made between UCLA and Chico State: UCLA invests \$1,328 per student per year; Chico State \$336 per student per year. The comparison was made based on an FTES of 12,500. Currently, the campus is funded at FTES of 15,560 which would make Chico State investments per student even lower.
- f. The library was experiencing electronic database inflation increases of 3-8%.
- g. The library has some subjects that librarian covers as their subject expertise. That means the library can only provide equitable and inclusive service to some departments, not others.
- h. The library is open during time when other buildings are not and offer students comfort, safety, and services for learning.
- i. The student work study budget was reduced from \$318,000 to \$261,000 this year. The increase of student salary to \$16 means the library can provide 93.5 weekly opening hours.
- j. The library may not be able to negotiate future copyright assistance, available scholar articles, management of the catalog and collections.

Discussion:

- a. Appreciation shared for the work done by librarian colleagues, their dedication and providing service for student success.
- b. Stated that the budget will be cut by \$12.8 million. Therefore, resources will be reduced.
- c. Support shared to have a third-party review.
- d. Commented that library operation and budget distribution is different than that of other colleges.
- e. The opposition shared with comment not to include provost office in this process.
- f. Commented the importance of providing basic needs and materials for students. Comparison made teaching lab without components of a lab available.
- g. Support shared to use senate mechanisms and engage in conversations to support library in its operation and support of faculty, staff, and student success.
- h. Stated that the library is fundamental, critical, and vital to this university's mission and to provide resources to all.
- i. Recommended to investigate ways that can restructure and align priorities in the future and support library operations.
- j. Stated that there are classes that cancelled field trips due to budget cuts. Stated that it is alarming to see that the library does not have essential resources critical to serve the mission of the university. The problem is broad and concerning.
- k. Reminded the body that EPPC and senate recently passed astronomy major with minimum library support. As more programs are ready to go through senate approval, the question is raised about how financial impact on a library will affect faculty teaching courses, doing research, and efficiently supporting programs and students. Question raised how to determine the balance of budget allocation and its implications.
- l. Appreciation for sharing this at the senate meeting and the importance of continuing to work on resolving this issue.
- m. Appreciation shared for all the support shared at the senate. Explained that in the past, provost office was responsible for funding library and the reason for which this was presented at the senate.
- n. The provost is willing to share how the budget is allocated. Next year will be challenging.

## 11. Officer Elections - [Nominees](#)

- [Academic Senate Chair Personal Statements](#)
- [Academic Senate Vice-Chair Personal Statements](#)
- [Academic Senate Secretary Personal Statements](#)
- [EPPC Chair Personal Statements](#)
- [FASP Chair Personal Statements](#)

Senator's statement shared:

"Colleagues, I share this with you all here at the Senate despite warnings that speaking to this issue might be construed in negative ways because of my gender. Nonetheless, I do so at risk to my own reputation in order to raise this important motion relating to the rights and privileges of the assembly, the Senate, or any of its members for the body to consider.

At the March 23 Senate meeting, I was nominated to stand for election to the Senate chair and in an email on March 29, the acting chair informed the executive committee that he had determined I rejected my nomination. In doing so, he failed to provide any explanation for why this required determination. To be clear, I will abide by this ruling and allow the acting chair to run uncontested for chair. However, I must set out what was omitted in the hope that members of next year's officer team will be less inclined to exceed the authority granted to them by our policies and governing documents or to leave members of the executive committee in the dark.

Our constitution vests the executive committee with the authority to conduct elections, presumably though not explicitly stated the authority extends to those policies and procedures of the election and not simply the distribution and counting the ballots. Nothing in the constitution and bylaws gives the chair or acting chair the right to create electoral policies or procedures independent of the executive committee.

And as some of you know, this year the executive committee agreed to use an entirely new nomination method and that resulted in the most nominations that the senate has ever seen for officer positions. This was a huge success. The Executive Committee did not discuss how those nominations would be handled after they were received. However, without consulting the executive committee, the chair and acting chair arrogated to themselves the right to create a new post-nomination procedure instead of defaulting to the desires of the nominating senators on Friday morning, and unbeknownst to the EC nominees were told by email that they must accept the nomination by noon on the following Monday to remain a candidate.

I wrote a quick confirmation email and failed to hit send on Friday when I felt ill. This minor oversight coupled with a tight timeline over the weekend deprived myself of the opportunity to serve. And it also deprived those who had nominated me of the right to choose between competing candidates. Meanwhile, nominees who are nominated for multiple officer roles every team the right to decline their nomination until elections proceed today.

As I said at the outset, I will abide by the acting chair's decision that I am not a candidate for senate chair. I prepared this statement because there seems to be a belief among a subset of officers that the chair's role is far more expansive than what our governing documents provide. Anything that is not explicitly laid down in policies seems to be open to fiat without consultation with the executive committee. I find that attitude unacceptable and contrary to all norms of collegial governance. I do hope that anyone stepping into new roles in the senate will reflect upon the limits of that office. Therefore, I move that beginning in the 2023-24 academic year, all processes involved in election shall be established and decided by the executive committee. Thank you."

Pause from 3:10 pm – 3:33 pm for EC to discuss and review the ballot.

The EC agreed that the motion is correct and consistent with the bylaws and there will be further discussion at tomorrow's EC meeting on this topic.

Motion second. Senate voted; motion approved.

Question: Original nominator asked if a renomination can be made? A senator nominated for the position of the senate chair accepted to be nominated at that time. Answer: Motion asked not to change the process. Therefore, no.

The Senate will discuss time certain item 10 and then return to the election.

Item 10 was finalized; the senate continued with the election process.

- a. Described the process: using Microsoft forms to vote. When there are two or more candidates, the one with more than 50% of votes (majority) will be declared the winner. If three candidates are running, and there is no majority of votes then proceed with a runoff with two candidates.
- b. Link for voting will be shared. There will be a sequence of chair, vice chair, secretary, EPPC chair, and FASP chair. An example will be shared. Some senators are nominated for multiple positions. If that person wins one position, then their names will not be included in the following election(s).

Question: Can a nomination be named now? Answer: no.

Question: How do proxy votes work during this process? Answer: Proxy votes that have not been shared previously, should be shared with secretary Medic. The ballot will include the option to cast a proxy vote. An example demonstrated this.

Question: who is eligible to vote? Answer: All voting members of senate can vote. The only non-voting members are the president, provost, and VPs.

- c. Example of a ballot shared: two questions. Q1: Senators will vote for a candidate or choose the option to abstain. Q2: Everyone will answer Q2. Senators holding a proxy will choose the candidate's name or abstain; all other senators will choose "not applicable".
- d. Proxies shared and confirmed; a total of six proxies. Counted a total of 35. The majority of casted votes will determine the winner. After everyone is done voting, the results will be shared.
- e. Two faculty members, Ferrari and Medic, will verify votes prior to confirming the winner.
- f. Link for senate chair shared. Senators voted: 25 for Jeff Trailer, ten abstained. After verifying all votes, it was confirmed Jeff Trailer had been elected as the senate chair.
- g. Medic was one of the candidates for the vice chair position, is very grateful to be considered. However, she pulled her name out of the nomination list for this position.

Question: personal statements were shared. Is there an expectation to share these? Answer: these are shared in the agenda and available in the box folder. In the interest of time, decided not to verbalize statements. They are available to all.

- h. Link for the vice chair position shared. Senators voted.
- i. Motion made to run the ballots one at a time and in the interest of time to validate and confirm results at the end of the election. Second. No opposition.
- j. Preliminary results shared. Confirmation will occur later.
- k. Link for the secretary position shared. Senators voted.
- l. Asked if all links can be shared for all positions and results shared at the end. Second. No objections.
- m. Link for the EPPC chair position shared. Senators voted.

- n. Commented that due to a repetition of names in ballots, results must be confirmed prior to moving on to vote for the FASP chair. This will determine who are the candidates for the FASP chair.

Question: will there be validation of positions before moving on to the FASP position election? Answer: yes. Medic will not be able to confirm secretary election votes as she is one of the candidates. Kralj will validate with Ferrari votes for this position.

- o. Verification was completed. Confirmed Medic as secretary, and EPPC chair is Teague-Miller.
- p. Medic confirmed and will be removed from the FASP chair nomination list.
- q. Link for the FASP chair position shared. Senators voted.
- r. The Senate moved with an agenda while verification of votes occurred.
- s. Later confirmed Kralj was elected as senate vice chair, and Walter as the new FASP chair.
- t. Raised the issue of the lack of write-in candidates on the ballots.

12. Proposed [Elevation of Option to Degree in Physical Education and Teacher Education](#) (PETE) (Dept of Kinesiology) and [Discontinuation of Option in PETE](#)– EPPC Action Item

Chair Kralj introduced item 12:

- a. This item moved through the EPPC unopposed.
- b. Editorial change on the signature page.
- c. The department is elevating an option to a full degree.
- d. Discontinuation of the option within the undergraduate program.

No discussion, no questions. No opposition. Item 12 passed as an action item.

13. Proposed changes to [FPPP 5.1.3: Recruitment process documentation](#) – FASP Action Item

Chair Sistrunk introduced item 13:

- a. The proposed change is in the last sentence and a link is added as a part of the records, retention, and disposition policy.

No discussion, no questions. No opposition. Item 13 passed as an action item.

14. Proposed changes to [FPPP Definitions: Currency in the Field, Range](#) – FASP Action Item

Chair Sistrunk introduced item 14:

- a. The subcommittee working on lecturer issues worked on this FPPP item.
- b. Defined the currency in the field.
- c. This is an idea that can be applied to different types of faculty members.
- d. Ranges, qualifications, and salary schedules were included.

No discussion, no questions. No opposition. Item 14 passed as an action item.

15. Proposed changes to [FPPP 5.1.1.e: Hiring Tenure Track \(Probationary\) Faculty](#) – FASP Action Item

Chair Sistrunk introduced item 15:

- a. This is a response to a new contract verified last spring.
- b. Qualified lecturers can apply for tenure track positions and should be interviewed using the same probationary and hiring procedures.
- c. This is in the CBA.

No discussion, no questions. No opposition. Item 15 passed as an action item.

16. Proposed changes to [FPPP 8.1.3: Evaluation of Faculty](#) – FASP Action Item

Chair Sistrunk introduced item 16:

- a. Suggested and proposed change by OAPL.
- b. The dossiers are done electronically. Language clarified this process.
- c. Corrected SET to SFOT.

No discussion, no questions. No opposition. Item 16 passed as an action item.

Question (about item passed last senate meeting): Recently language was added about equity work for lecturers. However, this language was not added for tenure-track, and probationary faculty. Is there a plan to bring this to FASP or the senate? Answer: Confirmed that the same language was added to both sections.

17. Proposed [Recommendation to discontinue written verification of serious and compelling reasons for Withdrawals from individual courses](#) – EPPC Action Item

Chair Kralj introduced item 17:

- a. This is a recommendation from the EPPC to discontinue the requirement to verify serious and compelling reasons for withdrawals from individual courses.
- b. Last time there was a discussion about what form this proposal should be. EPPC brought proposed recommendations.
- c. The senate suggestion was to bring this in the form of a resolution.
- d. Both documents are attached.

Discussion and questions:

Motion made to amend the current document and use the formatted resolution form and strike EPPC and name it an Academic Senate Resolution. Second.

Rationale: This does not change the overall language or the intention of the language. This formalizes the document as a formal resolution which becomes a formal recommendation to the administration on a university-wide issue.

Question: Is there still an option for faculty to request verification? Answer: The reason for bringing this document is to align Chico State with the Chancellor's Office and ask this to come in alignment with existing policies for the consistency purpose. This is addressed at campus level, not by individual faculty.

- a. Clarified that certain documents are asking for verification while others do not. Aligning these two is important.

Senate voted on a motion: 28 yes, no opposition. Motion passed, amended document accepted for further discussion.

Motion made to change years in the document from 2022-23 to 2023-24 as a new catalog has been published. Second.

Rationale: campus will not be able to change archived catalog. The current catalog can be updated. No opposition, passed.

- b. Concern shared that this may create additional problem to solve the problem, as the faculty may suspect a given reason by student(s) may not be valid. Cautioning the senate to be careful about approving this as is. Suggestion made that this may be discussed at a further time.
- c. Commented that individual departments may request evidence and subsequently proposed language will negate this option.



- d. Reminder that this proposed language is with the purpose of aligning campus policy with CO's policy.
- e. EPPC had a discussion on different scenarios. Also, discussed with chair council this topic. There was one vote in opposition, others approved of the current recommendation.
- f. Clarified that the catalog should include something that current policy is asking campus to do. Support for this document was shared.
- g. Stated that during the EPPC discussion there was another option to include in the policy to request evidence to be part of the policy.
- h. This was confirmed and restated that EPPC did not support that option and overwhelmingly supported the current language.
- i. Quorum checked; proxies assigned. The senate continued with business.

Senate voted: 25 yes, no opposition. Motion passed.

Announced senate election results (see page 6, item 11 s.).

Question: considering that the next set of items are FPPP items, can staff members leave the meeting considering they cannot vote for FPPP items? Answer: Considering that a staff member is holding a proxy for another senator, by leaving the meeting that would mean two fewer members. Reminded that voting members are part of the senate. A proxy is there to maintain the senate business. Losing members that hold in addition a proxy vote would mean losing the quorum and not being able to continue this meeting. Although only faculty members vote on FPPP items, all members and proxy are counted when determining quorum.

Move to adjourn. Second.

Senate voted and approved. Senate adjourned.

18. Proposed changes to [FPPP 1.0: Instructional Faculty – Responsibilities and Ethical Requirements](#) – FASP Introduction Item
19. Proposed changes to [FPPP 11.1.1: Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#) – FASP Introduction Item
20. Proposed changes to [FPPP: Introduction](#) – FASP Introduction Item
21. Other
22. Adjourn at 5:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

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