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 27, 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, Boura, Boyd, Brundage, Bruns, Burk, Cline, 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, N., Sistrunk, Smith, Son, Trailer, Traver, Walter, and Yeager-Struthers.

Absent: Alvarez, Bailey, Draper, Nichols, Sherman, A., Wagner, and Zeichick.

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 2:01 pm.
Emphasized that voting items will start at 2:30 pm. Until then, reports will be shared.

1. Approve Minutes of December 16, 2022 and April 6, 2023
   a. December 16 minutes: summary provided of main motions and discussions. Included a MyMedia recording link and a transcript of the meeting. Motions and specific discussions included time that corresponded to the specific MyMedia recording.
   b. Motion made to correct the name on the attendance list (12-16-2023) Lee instead of Sangmin.
   c. Minutes from December 16th and April 6th were approved.

2. Approve Agenda
   a. Motion made to move item 15. b proposed discontinuation of the option in the music industry to a new item 16. c. Seconds. Rationale: not to discontinue anything until another item for the elevation is approved. Approved.
   b. Confirmed that item 19 is an updated EPPC item.
   c. Agenda approved as amended.

3. Announcements
   a. Two more Academic Senate meetings until the end of a semester (May 4th and 11th).
   b. UBC meeting on May 15th.

Reports: Time certain: 2:10 – 2:30
4. University Reports – Hutchinson/Boura/Brundage/Perez/Sendze/Sherman
   President Hutchinson:
      a. Shared many awards on campus:

i.   Outstanding Academic Adviser: Michelle McConkey (Music and Theatre),
    ii. Outstanding Early Career Faculty: Amy Magnus (Political Science and Criminal Justice),
    iii. Outstanding Lecturer: Rodney Thomson (History),
    iv. Outstanding Lecturer in Bringing the Profession to the Classroom: Marci Pope (Kinesiology),
    v.   Outstanding Teacher: Kat Strand (Mathematics and Statistics),
    vi. Outstanding Research Mentor: Carly Whelan (Anthropology),
    vii. Outstanding Faculty Service: Patrick Johnson (Psychology), and
    viii. Outstanding Professor: Kevin Buffardi (Computer Science).
  b. Congratulations to all awardees and praise shared for all the work done by FRAS Chair Hart and the FRAS committee.
  c. Invited everyone to attend the UBC meeting.
  d. During the next Academic Senate meeting, the president will provide an update on campus safety.
  e. Publicly thanked VP Sherman for four years of outstanding leadership during unprecedented times. VP stabilized financial processes and introduced Lead 6 to the campus (leadership training). She will continue her career at the University of Colorado, Denver.

Interim Provost Perez:
  a. Budget cuts are producing a lower number of class sections.
  b. Registration started last Monday.
  c. The president and provost met with concrete industry management patrons, connecting students with the industry.

Question: praise shared for hard work to increase enrollment. Stated that the Governor has given a 5% raise this year, historically the highest raise. Faculty are concerned, especially lecturers, about losing jobs. What are the long-term plans on securities for lecturers on campus? How should lecturers prepare for class cuts? Answer: part of the compact plan with the governor is a 5% increase in general fund allocations towards the CSU system. 1% of that is going towards enrollment growth. Chico State is not growing, therefore, leaving only 4% of those funds. This is not the only source of funds; others are tuition and fee revenue. Once enrollment starts increasing, revenue will increase as well. This will increase the number of offered sections.

VP Boura:
  a. The University Advancement raised over $15.9 million for campus programs.
  b. The best Giving Day raised over $700,000 in 24 hours. More than 4,000 donors participated in this process.
  c. The College of Business received the first commitment of a $10 million gift for the college towards the future College of Business building.
  d. The university public engagement is working with all the stakeholders to provide students with the best possible experience during commencement and after graduating.

VP Brundage:
  a. Shared awards for students.
  b. Working with fraternities and sororities on processes shared in the news.
  c. The enrollment continuum is working on enrollment, sharing information every two weeks.
  d. The campus is with an increased (+33%) year over year intent to enroll.

e. The Recruit the Cat is a competition for student organizations (I place $1,000; II place $500 towards the organization) to recruit students to come to Chico State. Started a week ago and will run through June 1st.

f. Division is working on the strategic plan to create new key initiatives and to adjust to the new campus leadership.

VP Sendze:

a. The CHRS project is ongoing. The work started with the Chancellor's Office on April 17th and will be 18 months long. Officially scheduled to go live in November 2024.

b. Planning communication with stakeholders. VP Sendze is a co-sponsor of the project with an HR representative.

c. The division started work on a new requirement that came from the Department of Education on safeguard rules, GLBA act. This act requires all institutions to participate in Title IV. Campus must be in compliance with nine security safeguard rules by June 9th. The Department of Education reserves the right to audit any campus randomly.

5. Associated Students Report – Alvarez
Report attached.

6. Staff Council – Peterson

7. Statewide Academic Senate Report – Boyd/Ford CSU Academic Senate
   a. ASCSU Agendas, Minutes, Resolutions, & Summaries

Statewide Senators Boyd and Ford introduced a statewide academic senate report:

a. The next plenary meeting will be next month in the middle of May.

b. On May 2, the Chancellor's Office will have a listening seminar about AB 928 and the Cal GETSY program for GE transfer students. Encouraged everyone to join this session.

c. Statewide Senator Ford has been accepted into the Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association and will be serving on the Legislative Affairs Committee.

Appreciation for Senator Ford's service shared and congratulations on retirement.

8. Standing Committees Reports
   a. Educational Policies and Programs Committee (EPPC) - Kralj
   b. Faculty and Student Policies Committee (FASP) - Sistrunk
   c. Executive Committee – Medic

EPPC, FASP and EC summary reports attached.
In future Academic Senate meetings, only EC summary reports will be shared.
No questions.

The Academic Senate had a 3-minute break until 2:30 pm.

Proposals: Time approximate 2:30

9. FASP Consent Agenda
   a. Proposed revisions to FPPP 1.0: Instructional Faculty – Responsibilities and Ethical Requirements – FASP Introduction Item
   b. Proposed revisions to FPPP 5.2.1: Hiring Lecturer Faculty – FASP Introduction Item
   c. Proposed revisions to FPPP 11.1.1: Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – FASP Introduction Item

d. Proposed revisions to [FPPP: Introduction](#) – FASP Introduction Item
e. Proposed revisions to [FPPP 16.4.1: Faculty Personnel Files](#) – FASP Introduction Item
f. Proposed deletion of [FPPP Appendix Two](#) – FASP Introduction Item

Chair Paiva stated that the EC identified items that would be part of the consent agenda. Explained that if anyone would like to pull an item out of the consent item, this should be done now.

Provost Perez stated that these were not controversial items, and these are supported by him and OAPL.

No discussion, no questions. No objections. Item 9 approved as an introduction consent item.

10. Proposed revision to [FPPP 5.1.2: Equivalency](#) – FASP Introduction Item
    FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 10:
    a. The FASP subcommittee worked on equivalency document.
    b. Recognizing the existence of the equivalency and understanding some departments have faculty without a PhD having a tenure track position.
    c. This is to clarify equivalency and how departments can use it.

    No questions, no objections. Item 10 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

11. Proposed revisions to [FPPP 5.2.5: Lecturer Ranges](#) – FASP Introduction Item
    FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 11:
    a. This is a part of the FPPP document talking about lecturer hiring and lecture ranges.
    b. The FASP subcommittee worked on this and provided a proposed document.
    c. Looked at lecturer ranges and how to provide guidance when campus is hiring lecturers.
    d. Initial appointments guidance was included.

    No questions, no objections. Item 11 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

12. Proposed new [Undergraduate Option in Animal Science: Food Animal Production](#) (Department of Agriculture) - EPPC Introduction Item
    EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 12:
    a. Presenting items 12&13 as those items are connected.
    b. North state is an agricultural community.
    c. Animal Science has about 60% of College of Agriculture students serving them on campus and at the university farm.
    d. Currently, the faculty there are advising students regarding either animal production for food production or pre-vet science, which is part of this proposal.
    e. The proposal is to have two separate majors, item 12 the new undergraduate option in animal science, food animal production; these are students not interested in veterinary medicine.
    f. They have the faculty to support this proposal. Concern shared that if enrollment increases, the program will need additional faculty.

    Discussion and questions:
    a. The provost stated if student enrollment is increased, the office will provide support.
    b. Praise shared for the program's great work and providing distinctive qualities for the animal science program and aligning that with the students' needs.

Question: for provost Perez – considering the hiring freeze and overall university budget, will the university be able to hire the appropriate number of faculty to support this and other growing programs? Answer: With the increased number of enrolled students, baseline funding will increase. If this increase is seen sooner, more classes can be scheduled, and the Academic Affairs has reserves that can be used to support those growing classes.

No objections. Item 12 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

13. Proposed new Undergraduate Option in Animal Science: Pre-Veterinary Science (Department of Agriculture) - EPPC Introduction Item

EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 13:
    a. This is the other part of the redesign within the animal science program.
    b. The faculty are already doing advising with students.
    c. In an informal poll, 80% of incoming students were interested in veterinary medicine.
    d. This is the only CSU ag program that does not have this option.
    e. The program is looking for a way to serve their students.

No objections. Item 13 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

14. EPPC Consent Agenda 1
    a. Proposed change in Department name: Music and Theatre - EPPC Introduction Item
    b. Proposed change in Program name: General Music - EPPC Introduction Item

EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 14:
    a. Items 14, 15 & 16 are connected.
    b. Bringing in compliance with the Chancellor's Office.
    c. Item 14 was not controversial and is a proposed name change for the department to be music, theater, and dance, and for a program to be applied music.

No questions. Senate voted: 31 yes, no objections. Item 14 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

Motion made to suspend the rules and move item 14 as an action item. Second. Rationale: it is not controversial and will save time at the next Academic Senate meeting.

Senate voted on motion: 28 yes, motion approved.

Senate voted on item 14: 28 yes, no objections. Item 14 was approved as an action item.

15. EPPC Consent Agenda 2
    a. Proposed significant change: BA in Music - EPPC Introduction Item

EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 15:
    a. Proposing to be in compliance with the CO. Allowing students to have more specific study, e.g., performance, recording.
    b. There is support by the department and enough staff and faculty to support this proposal.

No questions. Senate voted: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 15 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

16. EPPC Consent Agenda 3

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

EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 16:
a. In the redesign, there was an option in the recording arts music industry, that wants to be elevated to a degree within the department.
b. There is a high interest in recording arts among students.
c. If elevation of the undergraduate option is approved, this means the other two options will be discontinued. There will be two separate options, one in the recording arts and the other in the music industry.
d. Therefore, all three a., b., and c. are related and in compliance with EM 10-071.

No question. Senate voted: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 16 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.
Suggested to have items 15 and 16 placed as consent agenda at the next academic senate meeting.

17. Proposed revision of [EM 15-001: Exceptional Service Assigned Time Policy](#) (ESAT revised) – FASP Introduction Items
FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 17:
a. In 2015, the union negotiations during a new contract conceived an award for exceptional service and giving assigned time for exceptional service.
b. The diversity of faculty at CSU brought the idea to create an exceptional service particularly provided for the faculty of color and underrepresented minorities.
c. The union and negotiation with the Chancellor's Office worked on renewing this exceptional service.
d. This will be an ongoing practice in the future. Cleaned dates in the policy as well as the office of provost will be responsible for the call application process and Chair will be involved in checking the work of the subcommittee.

No questions, no objections. Item 17 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

18. Proposed revision of [EM 19-023: Faculty Recognition and Support](#) – FASP Introduction Item
FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 18:
a. FRAS worked on reworking a policy to accommodate changes and a long-term plan.

FRAS Chair Hart introduced changes to the proposed policy:
a. A minor change was changing CSU, Chico to Chico State.
b. All names of the outstanding faculty awards were removed from the document to provide more flexibility with the addition of new faculty awards.
c. FRAS processes were added to the EM.
d. All nomination discussions and deliberations will be held as extremely confidential.
e. Conflict of interest statement is added to the EM. If a member can't be impartial, he/she will recuse themselves. Nominated members that recuse will be substituted by another.

    f.   There is an internal timeline that the committee operates from in terms of when its calendar is established. The timeline in the policy is strictly an external process related timeline (collaboration with Academic Senate, provost, OAPL).

    g.   In the first several weeks of the fall semester there will be submission of an intent to nominate.

    h.   Nomination can be vetted before the FASP committee starts work.

    i.   A list of nominees will be sent to the Academic Senate and OAPL for the reference check.

    j.   Then the committee will work on creating a short list of candidates who will again be checked by OAPL, after which this list will go to the president and provost. Several steps to allow vetting to occur during this process.

    k.   The process will include evaluation of the nomination packets and a final annual report that will be presented at the Academic Senate meeting.

Discussion:

    a.   Stated that in the timeline, nominations will come in. Concern shared that the individual who is going through the investigation will then be pulled out. However, the nominator will not know, and they will work on the packet. Stated this is a personnel issues and as such cannot be publicly shared.

    b.   Praise shared for the extraordinary work done on updating this policy.

Senate voted: 33 yes, no opposition. Item 18 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

Suggested that before this comes back as an action item, the answer to the concern is provided next week whether this produces a change to a document or not next week.

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

EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 19:

    a.   During the pandemic, all courses moved to an online modality.

    b.   There was a need to define modes of instruction and clarify them in a policy.

    c.   When updating EM, there was a need to look at the question of collective faculty deciding what modality they will teach in (face to face, hybrid or online). Collective faculty refers to the department, or chair, and not individual faculty member.

    d.   Another component was to clarify the MOI and what steps to follow in the case of an emergency. Broad offerings are face to face, hybrid or online. When students sign, they will know what MOI this course will be offered.

    e.   This policy is in compliance with the new definition of WASC for online programs.

Discussion and questions:

    a.   Praise shared for a great work.

    b.   States that emergency situations can happen at any time.

Question: what part of the policy states flexibility of a faculty to choose in what MOI their courses will be? Answer: In the 3.1.2 short paragraph there is a statement that faculty must teach in the specific approved MOI for the entire semester. Later language was added "unless a change is authorized by the appropriate Dean, with consultation from the collective faculty".

Senate voted: 33 yes, no opposition. Item 19 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

20. Proposed reorganization of [Academic Technology](#) - EPPC Introduction Item
   EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 20:
      a. This proposed item is coming from VP Sendze.
      b. There is no change in the job description.
      c. The goal is to move the reporting of academic technology and TLP directly to the IT Division whereas it currently goes to the AVP and Provost.
      d. My goal is to meet the needs of students that are efficient, equitable, and cost effective.

   VP Sendze introduced item 20:
      a. At the time VP joined campus, the president had commissioned an assessment.
      b. One of the recommendations was to centralize the delivery of technology services across campus.
      c. It will improve the ability to recall resources and align IT priorities with university priorities.
      d. It will integrate staffing and services to support academic technology and reduce IT costs.
      e. The technology portfolio will elevate how the IT division delivers academic technology services to the campus.

   Senate voted: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 20 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.
   Senate had a 5-minute break. Resumed at 3:51 pm.

21. Proposed new [EM: Policy on Certificate Programs](#) - EPPC Introduction Item
   EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 21:
      a. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee started revising EM document and determined starting a new document was a better option.
      b. Members included Claire Van Ness, Jennifer Gruber, Nicol Gray, Charlene Armitage, Daniel Grassian and Holly Kralj.
      c. The goal was to investigate a way a university could offer certificates.
      d. Currently, students with undergraduate degrees have graduate level courses vetted for the certificate.
      e. The question raised was how to reach out to people that are not students and could benefit from obtaining a certificate.
      f. Chair Kralj stated she considered postponing this item to next week.
      g. Considerations included how to decrease the number of units, how to make certificate manageable and available to students, using state-support funds to offer these certificates and increase the number of students?

   Dean Van Ness introduced item 21:
      a. Four primary substantial changes in the revised policy were:
         i. To reduce the minimum number of units from 21 to 12 required for an undergraduate certificate. There can be more than 12 units, this is the minimum required.
         ii. Current EM requires undergrad certificates to be offered at the upper division level. Proposing to take restrictions off and allow the pathway for certificates to be created using lower division coursework.
         iii. The revision proposed aligning undergrad grade requirements with undergrad degree requirements to be consistent with the graduate certificate grade requirements.

      iv.   The previous policy required an undergrad GPA of at least 2.5 instead of 2.0. Previous policy required every grade to be C or better for a certificate to be awarded.

      v.   The campus is currently offering 22 undergraduate certificates, and each has different requirements for students to be admitted and to obtain it.

  b. The goal was to lay a foundation pathway for future state support programs that can be offered and add FTES.

Discussion and questions:

<u>Question</u>: Asked to explain what is controversial about this proposal? <u>Answer</u>: the controversy comes in implementation. However, the goal is to look at the possibility of creating program certificates and to make these available to students that are not ready to commit to a four-year degree.

  a. Stated that the paralegal certificate is more robust undergraduate certificate on campus.

  b. Support shared for the policy changes to allow non-degree seeking students to enter a certificate program on a state-supported side.

  c. The only way to allow these students to attend was via the Open University. Otherwise, those students would attend UC or other private universities to obtain a paralegal certificate. This proposal allows students to attend Chico State instead; support shared.

  d. Asked for a proposal to address the application process for going into a certificate program when this comes as an action item. Currently, all students must apply to enter the certificate program and this may create additional workload. Non-degree seeking candidates will apply and this should be kept within the policy.

  e. Suggested to delete the section about double counting the application of credit section that was added at the end of a document.

  f. Stated that at the EPPC there were concerns raised. Suggested to have motions made to address these concerns.

  g. Stated that allowing a new group of students on campus is changing the way they are admitted and security on campus is not addressed.

  h. Additional concerns about implementation and application but also about security were raised.

  i. This policy opened an opportunity to increase access, equity and education for people who normally would not be degree-seeking or need additional opportunity to be degree-seeking. Other universities are already offering these kinds of programs successfully. Support shared for this proposal.

  j. Suggested to think about logistics and implementation of these programs when this proposal is discussed as an action item.

  k. Stated that the proposal paperwork when these certificate programs are created does ask a question about different available programs on surrounding campuses and CCC partners do offer them.

  l. Transfer students are allowed to have only 60 units of transfer work. This is about the lower division certificate coursework only. Concern shared that if transfer student can transfer only six units and take other units at Chico State, then they may potentially be excluded from this process or by taking additional courses at Chico State, it would be considered an illegal repeat. Concern shared that language should include protection for the transfer students. Suggested that Moss and Gray could work with those creating proposals to create a new certificate to be mindful of the effect this may have on transfer students and not to exclude them.

Senate voted: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 21 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

22. Proposed new [Graduate program: MS in Data Science and Analytics](#) - EPPC Introduction Item
EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 22:
    a. This is a proposal coming from a natural science from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics with a goal offering a master's program in data science and analytics in fall 2024.
    b. Larger need, especially by international students, to take a degree in data analytics.
    c. After obtaining this degree, these individuals would serve different professions and provide data analysis for them.

    Motion made to postpone this item to the next week's academic senate meeting. Second. Rationale: there are ongoing conversations between the math department and the computer science department to resolve a few issues. Their next meeting is on Monday morning when they will determine if this item is ready for the senate.
    Senate voted on the motion: 30 yes, no opposition. Motion approved; item 22 has been postponed until next week.

23. Proposed replacement of [EM 05-017: University Budget Committee](#) – FASP Introduction Item
FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 23:
    a. UBC EM has been the subject of conversation in the last several years, since 2014-25.
    b. Many have been working on this document and providing their expertise.
    c. The goal was to make the committee more active and more involved in the budget process.
    d. Faculty, and VPs were involved in the work on UBC EM.
    e. This is a replacement document due to which there are no track changes.

    Senator Boyd additionally presented item 23:
    a. The subcommittee researched what examples of similar EM can be used prior to forming this final version of good practices and different budget models.
    b. VP Sherman instituted practices in business and finance that aligned with one of the policy documents. EM follows the delegations of authority that come from the Governor to the Board of Trustees down to the Chancellor's Office and individual campuses and follows the context of faculty and administrators working together to co-govern universities.
    c. As a permanent committee of the academic senate, it would follow the Senate Constitution as well in terms of its ability to make recommendations that go to the to the university and to the vice presidents and the president.
    d. This EM documents and formalizes the processes that VP Sherman enacted with quarterly division meetings and the way UBC will engage with the campus community.

    Discussion and questions:
    a. Praise shared for the committee's work. In this proposed EM, the charge is much more detailed and comprehensive, and the structure of the committee is more specific.
    Question: what are other major changes to this EM? Answer: the committee membership is more streamlined and aligned to provide recommendations. Added subcommittees that can quickly address issues and allow administrative partners to ask questions and provide feedback.
    b. Stated that Provost Perez provided examples from Sacramento State and those were embedded in this EM.
    Question: what is the difference between the divisional review committee for Academic Affairs and the subcommittee that reviews the academic budget model and responsibilities? Answers: divisional teams

that are working directly with the entirety of Academic Affairs that work with UBC. A standing subcommittee works directly with the ABC budget model. The divisional review teams are modeled after the implementation of the processes following the CSU manual. They have a broader spectrum of work with the VP of Business and Finance and together discuss the budget allocation. The subcommittee is a smaller group of members working only on e.g., the ABC model and how funds are allocated to individual colleges.

    c. Each division would prepare a quarterly review. A place of contact can be via a couple of UBC members joining the creation and discussion on those reports. Public meetings are locations where information can be shared with the campus community.

Senate voted: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 23 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

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

Chair Paiva handed the gavel to Vice Chair Trailer.

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 24:

    a. The president had a Task Force working on creating a report and policing recommendations for reconstituting the older University Public Safety Committee.

    b. This new committee was instituted via an interim policy which should change after six months.

    c. Reorganization occurred and this interim policy is now presented as a new EM.

    d. UPPSAC is a large, central committee that has a special subcommittee working on topics e.g., campus sustainability committee.

Chair Paiva provided an overview:

    a. The Senate Chair was appointed to this committee and worked on writing an interim policy in October 2021 as a response to the task force recommendations.

    b. In fall and spring there was additional work by the subcommittee on the EM revision. Consultation with different constituents occurred. Several open hours were held to receive feedback.

    c. This EM was presented in February at FASP. The item was sent back to the subcommittee chaired by Boyd to address FASP questions.

    d. Membership was changed to address areas that needed to be improved.

    e. UPPSAC will be chaired by the Senate Chair who will convene the committee every year. In addition, there will be an UPPSAC Vice Chair and secretary. The UPPSAC secretary can assist the chair with organizing the committee and its smaller subcommittee structures.

    f. Names of subcommittees and their roles and responsibilities were discussed.

    g. Last week, this was introduced at FASP and approved as an action item.

Senator Boyd additionally presented item 23:

    a. The original subcommittee names were based on the task force recommendations. There was alignment with actual work done by individual subcommittees in the form of a matrix.

    b. The matrix showed alignment of several task force initiatives and task force principles.

    c. The item was presented at FASP and passed at the last meeting as committee members were familiar with this policy as it was previously presented.

Discussion and questions:

    a. Stated that the previous item discussed safety concerns raised with the certificate program. <u>Question</u>: where in this structure safety concerns can be answered? <u>Answer</u>: Discussion with the Chair will occur, and an appropriate subcommittee will be identified that is responsible for this type of safety concern.

    b. It was confirmed that the previous item (certificate program) discussion was regarding EPPC discussion. The admission process for future students would be done by individual departments and not university. Security questions were raised about what processes would be followed here.

    c. An Advisory Committee is looking at developing policies and programs and has received concerns.

    d. Messaging on how to promote the safety of campus is at the purview of this committee.

    e. Emergency issues will be dealt with by subcommittee #5.

    f. The question was answered as concern would have a place to be dealt with.

Senate voted: 25 yes, no opposition. Item 24 was approved as an introduction item and will be at the next academic senate meeting as an action item.

25. Ask the Administrator
    a. Restated that the governor provided more funds and asked to investigate more options to provide more flexibility for Chico State. Asked if advocacy can help to work with CO in obtaining funds for campus.
    b. Stated that this question can be shared at the upcoming UBC meeting on May 15th.

26. Adjourn at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

For a direct link to all agenda items in Box, click here.