



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: ACADEMIC SENATORS
FROM: Ana Medić, Academic Senate Secretary
SUBJ: **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**
DATE: Thursday October 27, 2022, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/81231074627?pwd=ZWFzZVpKVENOY2pEb0drdC8vaE43dz09>
Meeting ID: 812 3107 4627 Passcode: 761594

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

Absent: Larson, and Sendze.

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

1. Approve Minutes of [September 22, 2022](#), October 6, 2022, and [October 20, 2022](#)
Senator Coons attended the meeting on September 22, and this will be corrected.
Minutes from September 22 and October 20 approved.
2. Approve Agenda
Agenda approved.
3. Announcements
 - a. The search for the Chief Diversity Officer position is ongoing.
4. Ask the Administrator
Chair Paiva introduced item 4:
 - a. Questions asked during last Academic Senate meeting were shared with president and VPs.
 - b. This item was moved to the top of the agenda to secure the presence of administrators and the ability to address any question community may have.
 - c. Some questions will be addressed during item 5 presentations of the university reports.

VP Sherman addressed the following question:

Question: what is the training that law enforcement receives when there are behavioral health challenges and how are they trained to respond to that? Answer: contacted Lieutenant Bryce Davidson who shared <https://post.ca.gov/mental-health-training-in-law-enforcement> and multiple documents used for training. They receive the ongoing police officer training used across the state.

5. University Reports – Hutchinson/Boura/Brundage/Larson/Sendze/Sherman
President Hutchinson:

- a. CDO candidates are being interviewed this and next week, good pool of candidates. Praises shared for work done by EMEDC Co-Chairs Zhang and Meadows.
- b. Student enrollment is the main focus of this campus, specifically marketing, how to reduce admission barriers and make the process easier for the prospective students.
- c. Next month two videos will introduce the community to the work of the action team.
- d. Campus is seeing budget reduction, especially with tuition and fees.
- e. Graduation Initiative 2025 convening will be tomorrow 11 – 11:45 am, link shared, and all encouraged to attend www.calstate.edu/GradInitiative2025Convening

VP Boura:

- a. Wildcat weekend video shared at the Academic Senate.
- b. https://media.csuchico.edu/media/Wildcat+Weekend+2022+-+Highlights/1_tflld2h
- c. Praise shared to all those who participated in this process.
- d. Plans to share campus annual report with benefactors.
- e. Preparing endowment report; over 750 endowments and \$17.8 million received.
- f. Thanksgiving and holiday thank you cards will be shared with all benefactors.
- g. As of today, \$4.3 million has been received since July 1.

VP Brundage:

- a. Enrollment continuum team continue with frequent meetings and active work.
- b. Inviting community to the November 8th forum on enrollment efforts. Opportunity to provide feedback and ask questions.
- c. Division discussion on budget.
- d. LEED 6 focusing on student success.

Question: is there a website for the enrollment curriculum? Answer: not yet, soon will be available.

VP Sherman:

- a. CABO meeting in San Diego discussed facility management and capital planning projects.
- b. Deferred maintenance is now known as critical capital renewal and was discussed e.g., replacement/maintenance of roofs, infrastructure.
- c. Discussion on enrollment: systemwide 7% decrease, around 20,000 less students, very inconsistent (21 campuses reported enrollment decline, two reported increase).
- d. Improvements seen with first year student enrollment; retention dropped. Students are taking lesser unit load that increased difference between campus headcount and FTES.
- e. Decline in transfer and new grad students. Similar across the CSU system.
- f. Prediction if no action is taken, campus will be at ~11,000 FTES.
- g. Suggested at CABO that one campus can try to improve individual outcomes at the expense of the whole CSU or for few campuses.
- h. The state budget outlook is becoming tenuous. Campus is preparing a plan to address different budget scenarios.
- i. The Cozen group visited campus and conducted discussions on Title IX issues. They will complete a report and present it at the Board of Trustees meeting in March. Encouraging everyone to complete the survey. High level written reports will be done for each campus.
- j. A new law that came into place for the State of California around the Menstrual Equity for All Act. The Act requires to have at least one place on campus where students can get free feminine products. Chico State strategically placed these within five campus buildings. The Health Center is an additional place.

- k. Dirt removed from location where the old science building used to be. Preparing to start installing beams, steel, and girders as part of the infrastructure for a new business building.

Praises shared for providing high level reports and information with this body.

Question: was there an option for students from Chico State to provide feedback to the Cozen group like other campuses did? Contact was made with AS President Alvarez once the group was on the campus, not planned prior to their visit. Asked to observe, not provide feedback. Answer: Once the visit happened, the schedule list was given and then redeveloped by adding other constituents. Chico State was the third or fourth campus Cozen group visited and failure to include some groups in previous CSU campus visits, were corrected on the go. Clarified that the same day when Chancellor Office mentioned Cozen group work, Chico received information on the upcoming visit. This was a quick turnaround. Hope shared that following visits received more student participation based on earlier visits feedback.

6. Associated Students Report – Alvarez

AS President Alvarez introduced AS report:

- a. The Government Affairs hosted their first successful Town Hall event, which was hot chocolate and hot topics.
- b. 48 students completed the survey, more will be shared during the next Academic Senate meeting.
- c. Search for the Chief of Staff position, encouraging students to apply.
- d. Announcing search for the HFA student representative to fill in vacant college senator position.
- e. Associated Student President Alvarez will be the Chair for the next CSU Student Trustee search.
- f. Chico State will host CSSA plenary meetings.

Praise shared for great work and organizing first Town Hall meeting.
Congratulations shared.

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

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

Statewide Senators Boyd and Ford introduced item 7:

- a. Asking for feedback on the first read items that are attached to the report.
- b. Plenary meetings will be next week.
- c. Statewide Senators will be reviewing the response to the resolution asking for campus Senate feedback, specifically whether they are agreeing or not with current Cal GETC proposal or if there is no consensus.
- d. Responses are all public and can be seen by other campuses.
- e. 22 campuses responded. One campus had two responses. Six campuses responded with option C, and there was a tie between options A and B.
- f. Many campuses are submitting own resolutions to the Cal-GETC proposal. Requested those to be attached and be available at today's meeting.
- g. ICASS is expecting ASCSU to have a response on Cal-GETC.
- h. Praise and appreciation shared to work done by the Ad Hoc Committee and CAB membership involved in this process.
- i. Survey shared with the Academic Senate.
- j. CAB went through a variety of different proposals for possible options for the GE pathway for transfer students. Chico State wanted to prioritize the core competencies associated with what

is known as the Golden Four. Most CAB proposals are aligned with the idea that courses can be embedded as core competencies.

- k. Feedback from individual campus is reviewed with special interest in rationale behind those decisions and selected/created options. Then this is shared in a smaller group that provides recommendations at the ACCSU level.
- l. Final vote and decision will be made at the ASCSU meeting on what to recommend to ICASS.
- m. The focus was always on the student success of transfer students.

8. Standing Committees Reports

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

EPPC met once. Report attached.

FASP met two times. Two items will be discussed today in the Academic Senate. Report attached.

EC met once since last Academic Senate meeting. Report attached.

No questions, no further discussion.

9. [Staff Council](#) - Peterson

Senator Peterson introduced item 9:

Report attached. No questions.

10. Proposed [Academic Senate response to ASCSU regarding Cal-GETC GE Pathway](#) – Senate Action Item

- [Proposed substitute resolution](#)
- [CSU Campus Responses to Cal-GETC](#)

Chair Paiva and Vice Chair Trailer introduced the item 10:

- a. This is an action item passed as an introduction item during the last Academic Senate meeting.
- b. On Monday October 24 Senate Chair Paiva held a three-hour long session gathering feedback on the proposed resolution.
- c. On Tuesday the Ad Hoc Committee met and additionally worked on this resolution.

Discussion:

- a. Motion made to include and discuss the substitute document. Second.
- b. Support shared for the work done by the Ad Hoc Committee and vote in favor of the substitute document.
- c. No objection, motion passed, and substitute document approved. This will be discussed as a main item now; senators may make amendments regarding this document.
- d. Requested to present resolution and explain the context behind statements and reasons why they were included. General overview provided by any member of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Vice Chair Trailer provided an overview:

- a. A large number of different constituents were involved in the work on this resolution.
- b. At the top of a document is stated that the legislation is involved in the curriculum as the fundamental source. Other resolutions included the similar statement.
- c. The order of things presented was changed to provide more clarity, linkage and build more powerful resolution document. Make document more concise and to the point.

Discussion continues:

- e. Praise shared for the work done on the resolution and by being succinct making it more powerful in its language.
- f. Page 2, second to the last resolve was changed. Why did the recommendation “not to double count” changed to “recommending appropriate review with possible adjustment to system and campus policies”?
- g. Original language was “continue prohibiting double counting” which was factually incorrect. This body still does not know what the final form of Cal-GETC will be. Through consultation language was modified to be useful whether Cal-GETC is approved or not.
- h. The basic concept is that if units are reduced in an area that is currently overlapping with double counting, then recommend double counting to stop. However, that is a conditional recommendation in the sense that if the proposal were modified, and if changes were made on the number of units to areas C and D, then the urgency or the criteria for wanting to stop the double counting would not exist.
- i. Reference to dates and timeline were removed.
- j. Clarified that we have the resolution and survey response. If passed, the resolution will help inform campus response to the survey.
- k. Clarified that any additional feedback, comments, concerns and from whom they are coming from can be shared with Statewide Senators. More clarity in a response can help represent campus at statewide level.

Motion made to include “if the current proposal is adopted, we recommend prohibiting American institution courses double counting in GE areas A and/or D.” Second.

Rationale: The purpose of that adjustment is to be closer to the initial language.

- l. If the changing the double counting rules allows nothing to change, that is fine. But if the total number of GE units is going to increase, that is going to have an impact on several high unit majors in various colleges.
- m. Request made to keep old language and add new language, both to be displayed simultaneously.
- n. Request made to clarify why there is a concern with removal of double counting for high unit majors.
- o. If the number of units is increased from the current 48 units requirement (GE including upper division), this will impact biochemistry, engineering, computer science and other high unit majors.
- p. Substitutions happened across the board throughout GE with high unit majors.
- q. Opposition shared with this language as Cal-GETC proposal is for transfer students. How this currently reads, this is for all students. By stopping the double counting, this will cause adding six units to graduation requirements. This is problematic as this is very definitive.
- r. Double counting should have more discussion and broad consideration, outside of the scope of this particular resolution.
- s. The humanities and the arts have been hit at every single level of education, support shared.
- t. Clarified that the focus is on the transfer pathway that is being proposed, not necessarily about the CSU general education breath.
- u. Was the intent to ask the community colleges to separate those?
- v. If one area C is cut, and all students are getting one arts and humanities class, this reflects poor education that campus is offering to transfer students.
- w. Senate voted on a motion: 21 yes, eight no. Motion passes, language will be replaced.
- x. Senate voted on the substitute resolution: 30 yes, no objections, one abstention. Item 10 passes.

y. Appreciation shared to the Ad Hoc Committee and CAB Chair for working on this.

11. Proposed [Employee Climate Surveys](#) – Senate Introduction Item (Anderson – 3:00 pm time certain)

Chair Paiva and Anderson introduced item 11:

- a. This is an introduction item.
- b. Committee worked on this in last six months. Tiffany Anderson, Chair of the committee and Matt Thomas will present item 11.
- c. The committee was composed out of survey experts.
- d. EM calls for the response and approval from the Academic Senate.

Committee Chair Anderson introduced item 11:

- a. The committee has been diligently working in accordance with the EM 21-017 to create the three instruments and present survey today.
- b. Final proposed questions are attached in the agenda and represent surveys for faculty, staff, and for the first-time student employees.
- c. The committee included some new questions which the committee has deemed to be essential to the survey's mission.
- d. The committee gathered feedback from Chair Paiva and President Hutchinson.
- e. The committee addressed all the feedback from the pilot respondents, further refined the instruments, and the results of all of these discussions over the past six months have been addressed. The final version is attached to the agenda.
- f. The most challenging was developing the new student survey. Feedback from student employees helped to develop this survey.
- g. The demographic data or questions were kept the same for all three surveys. Language updated to be more inclusive.
- h. Campus went through several crisis situations in the past few years. The committee included a set of crisis questions to see the response of how campus managed those challenging times. These questions were embedded in all three surveys.
- i. EM calls for use of previously administered campus climate surveys to develop new survey. The reason for that is not to lose comparability over time. The challenging part was how to change wording to adapt it to current situation and whether this will affect comparability or not.

Discussion and questions:

- a. Suggestion to look at two strongly agree and only one strongly disagree option for few questions in faculty survey. Other surveys not checked.
- b. Praise and appreciation shared for a great work done with all three surveys.
- c. On the student forum questions asked a lot about jobs needed to maintain financial sustainability.

Question: was there a question or committee discussion done on students receiving financial aid?

Answer: that was not discussed. The student representative on the committee personally had to have several jobs. However, student financial aid was not discussed. This will be part of committee discussion during the next meeting.

- d. Shared that many students are eligible for financial aid and yet have one or more jobs.

Academic Senate voted, no opposition, no objections. Item 11 approved as an introduction item and will come as an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting.

12. Proposed revision of [EM 06-034: Student Privacy Rights and Student Records Administration Policies and Procedures Document](#) – FASP Introduction Item

- [Proposed Revisions](#)

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 12:

- a. This was brought by the Office of Register as a response to the federal requirements.
- b. It is the Registrar's responsibility to implement all those changes and to tell everybody about them.

Discussion:

- a. Shared that during action item discussion there will be an amendment suggested to align this with campus policy on the policies.
- b. This will lower the number of words and create a different methodology on how campus would update future changes.

No objection, item 12 approved as an introduction item and will be on the next Academic Senate agenda as an action item.

13. Proposed Revision of [EM 15-001: Exceptional Service Assigned Time \(ESAT\)](#) – FASP Introduction Item

- [Proposed Revisions](#)

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 13:

- a. Exceptional service is negotiated as part of the contract. Faculty who does exceptional service can be recognized and receive the release time to continue with their exceptional service.
- b. This is described as cultural taxation.
- c. Every time negotiation occurs, this is being renegotiated and renewed.
- d. Dates were changed.
- e. More focus on the demonstrating impact on historically underserved first generation and underrepresented populations.

Question: does the language of this prohibit that if people are not of underserved communities or people of color? Request to see where people are giving exceptional service and not being represented. Answer: Chico State is giving 10 awards for extra work that might not be characterized as cultural taxation.

No objection, item 13 approved as an introduction item and will be on the next Academic Senate agenda as an action item.

14. Other

15. Adjourn at 4:21 pm.

Submitted respectfully,
Ana Medić, Academic Senate Secretary

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