



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: ACADEMIC SENATORS
FROM: Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary
SUBJ: **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**
DATE: Wednesday December 14, 2022, 12:00 pm – 2:00 pm
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/81231074627?pwd=ZWFzZVpKVENOY2pEb0drdC8vaE43dz09>
Meeting ID: 812 3107 4627 Passcode: 761594

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

Absent: Boura, Kaiser, Leon, and Musvosvi.

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 12:11 pm. Stated that zoom meeting is set to a 300 limit and asked senators to reach out to their constituents and collect feedback.

Asked to have a public viewing when possible.

This is a special meeting of the Academic Senate that was called at the request of not less than 10% of the voting members of the Academic Senate.

The specific topic of this meeting is to discuss protocols, procedures, and practices regarding campus safety.

Vice Chair Jeff Trailer, Statewide senator Boyd, and Secretary Ana Medic are co-hosts; reach out to them to be recognized if a guest.

1. Approve Agenda

Motion to amend the agenda to include a discussion regarding the FRAS award. Second. No objection, motion approved.

Motion to amend the agenda to have item 4 be listed as an introduction item. Second. No objection, motion approved.

Agenda approved as amended.

2. Faculty recognition and support FRAS award - Hart

FRAS Chair Hart introduced item 2:

- a. Considering the recent information, FRAS discussed and voted in support of a very strong recommendation that the Outstanding Professor award for David Stachura be revoked immediately.
- b. Explained that supported by the senate this can be sent directly to the president and provost.
- c. The FRAS committee provides awards recommendations within committee first, then recommendations are made to the provost and president.
- d. This is an information item and as such does not require a vote.

Discussion and questions:

- a. Suggestion that if the award comes with any kind of financial compensation, aside from the award, that financial compensation should be revoked.
- b. Suggestion for FRAS to reconsider awarding a runner up from that year.
- c. Question: are there any changes that are going to be made within FRAS for new awards that are going to be distributed e.g., rubric? Is there a different process so that this situation doesn't happen again? Answer: today's item can potentially include campus protocols and procedures. FRAS had an internal conversation on this topic to include clear criteria and rubrics. In addition, looking to add an external review of the processes, procedures, and policies. Hope shared that amazing applications and awardees are not tainted by these events.
- d. Appreciation shared for all the work FRAS committee has been doing for years in this area.
- e. Suggested that FRAS be suspended until those reviews of policies and procedures and the ways in which criteria for excellence are established.

3. Discussion: Campus Protocols, Procedures, and Practices Regarding Campus Safety

Chair Paiva introduced discussion item 3:

- a. The Senate looks at policies, protocols, and procedures and identifies ways in which those can be updated.
- b. Several statements were shared. These will be available under item 5 "Appendix".

Discussion and questions:

- a. Students commented that their constituents shared not feeling safe on campus and being worried about recent threats mentioned in previous meeting and published article.
- b. Commented that Holt Hall security is increased, but not on the entire campus. Commented stress and anxiety regarding coming to complete final exams; safety concerns shared by both students and faculty. Asking for full transparency about the location of Stachura and if he is detained or not.
- c. School and mass shootings are real. Asking for this situation to be seen seriously and responding to it appropriately.
- d. Shared that College of Natural Science conducted a survey and respondents shared 2/3 support in favor of no confidence if such a question arises; numerous responses asked for further investigation regarding being nonreactive and the importance of gathering more information to make informed decisions; reported numerous harassments and reporting of it being ignored.
- e. Shared that students, faculty and staff felt not secure and being placed in danger is unacceptable.

Question: can a summary of previous no confidence be shared? How transparent was this process?

Answer: There was only one no confidence vote at Chico State. An interim provost was named permanent by the current president at that time, outside of normal hiring practices at Chico State. Under the leadership of the former chair Paula Sylvester, Chico State created an ask to the CO in September of 2014 to have an independent reviewer to investigate leadership on campus. The campus was told to solve their own problems. The following year, campus created the Resolution Response Team with faculty and staff serving on it with purpose to collect information from the campus; students were not part of it due to not having confidentiality expectations and in general for their protection. The team was given information that should normally be accessible publicly but was withheld and damaging to leadership. The resolution was entered on the Senate floor in late November to ask for a vote of no confidence. This information was held secret from the senate chair. The meeting was interrupted by Chancellor White expecting the chair of that time to call him.

Resolution was entered as an introduction item, as the only item, did not have a suspension of rules and was part of an early December 2015 meeting with the media and around 600 attendees. There was a motion to postpone the item that failed. The Senate continued to address the item. If no confidence occurred in 2014, it would include only the president. After gathering more information, the 2015 no confidence vote included the president, the VP for Business and Finance, and the interim provost. VP of Student Affairs was not added to that list. In addition, the campus formed an elected leadership council that met with the CO group and discussed complaints and issues that had arisen over many years.

- f. Commented that we should have zero tolerance for EO 1096 violations, whether consensual or nonconsensual, especially when they are accompanied by findings of lack of credibility of the accused.
 - g. When faculty receive threats, two options: to file a complaint to the Chair or Dean or to file a grievance and put their name to public display, which is not a very good option. The person who filed a grievance is no longer at this university.
 - h. “Better training for CFA faculty, chairs and committees around the concept of the duty of fair representation” – what does this mean? Representation from CFA usually does not involve well informed nor legal representation.
 - i. Calling for changes in the CVCT (campus violence committee) in the way they make decisions and the way it is comprised. Their knowledge of this situation and not considering after having compelling evidence there was a threat to inform campus community is deeply concerning and requires further examination.
 - j. The letter from BSS submitted officially for the record and contained very substantial and concrete suggestions for reform to be shared with campus community. Chair Paiva will forward this letter to all senators.
 - k. The University Registrar said officially that they will move location or find a room for individual students to take their final exam(s) if they do not feel safe on campus or in Holt Hall. Asked senators to share this with their students.
 - l. Asked to add an appendix with all statements shared today if the authors are all right to share.
 - m. Support shared for the independent investigation then take action to address any unanswered questions.
 - n. Suggested to have changes to Title IX, change the definition of the term “consensual”, have a public database about Title IX offenses that includes students, staff, and faculty, and to provide greater protection for witnesses. Asked to have increased accountability. Support the CFA and campus representation to revisit the CBA and negotiating around it to ensure that violations of 1096 cannot be excluded in the future. These can be included in the FPPP document.
 - o. Understanding that the University Police and Public Safety Advisory Committee has not been meeting nor implemented the Task Force recommendations. Support shared to have committee conduct meeting and implement some changes around public safety for faculty and students.
4. Proposed Introduction item Resolution: [Academic Senate Call for an Independent Investigation of the Campus Response to a Threat of Violence](#)
- Vice Chair Trailer introduced item 4:
- a. The resolution represents a summary and response to the current situation and calls for immediate action.
 - b. The general goal of the resolution is to identify and have a path forward for the senate to make changes and make sure this never happens again.

- c. Building trust and confidence in a system requires changing the system after careful analysis. The Senate is requesting identification of critical decision points to validate the current process, to ensure ongoing safety, security, and confidence.
- d. Requesting Trustees to initiate an independent investigation, asking for a review of university communication policies to identify suitable ways to warn the public, an independent audit of the professor's threat assessment process, and revision of EM 12-025.

Discussion and questions:

- a. Suggested to add Cozen O'Connor to the distribution list. This is a group that is conducting a systemwide review of all Title IX activities and processes.
- b. Support shared for the resolution.

Questions: Reservation and concern shared about the independence of this process. Asking for more clarification about the process and what does "independent audit/investigation" means? Who would be leading this charge? Answer: The term is used to depict an independent entity that otherwise has no tie to the CSU campus. Audit would be the responsibility of the Board of Trustees and then the report would be presented to the campus.

- c. Suggested to include the Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL) in terms of reviewing the procedures related to discipline and their misstep regarding knowing about Title IX issue and still allowing them not to be included in Stachura's PAF.
- d. Stated that CSU has a history of mishandling Title IX issues. Frustration shared that this decision was made by Chico State and CSU Council based on previous cases and decisions made in the past, which were problematic. Suggested to include language that specifically warns the CSU to keep on making decisions based on solutions that we are finding now are problematic and to start breaking the cycle of problematic steps and advice.
- e. If there is an ongoing audit, why is the campus not informed about it? When is it happening? Why? Where? Asking for this to be added to the resolution with the intention to change the pattern of ill-informed steps and actions.
- f. Appreciation shared with all who worked on this resolution. Understanding this is an introduction item and that waiting until February 9th to address this as an action item is too long. Asking to consider addressing this earlier if possible.
- g. The Senate has the option of scheduling another senate meeting with not less than 10% of the voting senate members (four) or two members of the executive committee requesting a meeting before the semester ends. This meeting will have to be scheduled within five instructional days. The second option would be to set aside the rules and after passing this item as an introduction item, to discuss and pass it as an action item during the same meeting.
- h. Asking that although the resolution is focused on threats of violence, it should not lose the site on the relationship Stachura had with a student on campus. This created a hostile work environment for many people and inequitable situation across the biology department.

A motion made to call the question and vote on this item. Second. This would stop the conversation and everyone on the speaker list would not be able to talk. Clarified that this requires two thirds of votes to approve it.

The Senate voted: 27 yes. Discussion stopped.

The Senate voted on item 4 as an introduction item: 34 yes, no objection. Item 4 passed as an introduction item and will be at the next Senate meeting.

Discussion continues:

- a. Senators interested in being part of the minimum 10% stated they would like a new meeting to be scheduled before the semester ends and to organize this as a webinar to accommodate more attendees. First five senators expressed their support.
- b. Senators discussed the possibility of dates in December and January as potential new earlier Senate meeting.
- c. Support shared to have a meeting in December rather than in January. In addition, expressed concern to consider it as an action item today.
- d. Mentioned that if January 18th, this meeting should be after the Tipping point.
- e. Support shared to consider this in December to provide solutions for staff, faculty, and students.
- f. Stated that the Senate could overrule the constitution with a vote of two thirds to schedule a meeting in December that would be beyond scheduling a meeting within five instructional days as per the current constitution.
- g. If considering five instructional dates, the first available meeting could be on January 25.
- h. Suggested to have an earlier date to alert Cozen O'Conner and start the next step.

Motion made to have the next Academic Senate meeting before the upcoming Friday at 5 pm. Second.

Rationale: there is a sense of urgency and with student's presence still on campus, this step will provide guidance toward a solution. In addition, provides few days to work on the suggested language.

- i. Commented that students were the ones asking to speed up this process and not wait until spring semester.
- j. More support shared to have an earlier date and Friday as the next meeting. Met minimum requirement for the special Academic Senate meeting.
- k. Support shared to provide an inclusive and transparent process.
- l. Suggested to have a space for students to provide their feedback.
- m. Concern shared that today's discussion did not include addressing campus safety and actual things that we are going to be putting in place to immediately start fixing this situation.
- n. Comment shared that most students will be done with their finals and suggested having webinar to accommodate more attendees and not have a limit of 300 only.

Question: asked to clarify if the request is to have a webinar to hear students' recommendation for more than just the resolution? Or is the ask to have a separate meeting for students to talk about only a resolution and that will drive work on the resolution? Answer: agenda can have a discussion and resolution again. EC has a meeting on Friday and can decide on an agenda prior to the meeting.

- o. This is beginning to get bigger attention in the news as well as future students coming here. Action sooner rather than later would be better as we can eliminate many issues prior to the spring semester.
- p. Calling for immediate action and to show how things can be done fast, efficiently, and right rather than bureaucratically slow as was past practice. Support shared for students to weigh in and have the opportunity to provide feedback.
- q. Stated that the senate operates in a way that senators collect feedback from constituents and then bring comments back, discuss and vote.
- r. Additional support shared to be proactive, take initiative, provide students with solutions, and let them have a restful break knowing that this issue will not affect them as now.
- s. Support shared voting on resolution before Christmas and winter break.
- t. Concern shared that if resolution is passed this will not fire Stachura, fire the provost, nor put security guards around Holt Hall. These actions will not occur before winter break as the Senate does not have this kind of purview.

- u. Clarified that the motion was out of order. As the motion needed to be to suspend the rules of the Senate Constitution. It was confirmed that the requirement to have a special meeting was met and the same will be within five instructional days. The intent is to have a meeting as a webinar to accommodate a large number of participants. Additional tentative plan is to have an hour of open forum where guests can share their concerns, after which resolution would be discussed as an action item.
- v. Chair Paiva suggested having any senator interested working on resolution revisions to contact her.

Motion approved.

- 5. Appendix containing testimonies shared during today's meeting.
- 6. Adjourn at 2:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

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