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 November 30, 2023, 2:30 p.m.

Zoom: https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/6929553877?pwd=WFNQb29hdlMrMXZMbmxuam5sZzBRdz09
Meeting ID: 692 955 3877
Passcode: shark

Present: Alaniz-Wiggins, Arisman, Boyd, Cline, Clyde, Coons, Draper, Gibson, Green, He, Kaiser, Kralj (Underwood), Lee, Lemmi, Ma, Magnus, McBride-Praetorius, Medic, Miller (Sargent), Moss, Newell, Nichols, O'Conner, Paiva, Perez, Peterson, Sherman, Sistrunk, Smith, Trailer, Traver (Jollimore), Walter, Weingartner, Windom, Yeager-Struthers, and Zeichick.

Absent: Boura, Brundage, Bruns, Lau, Sendze, and Youngblood.

Chair Trailer called a meeting to order at 2:37 pm.
1. Approve Minutes of 09Nov2023
   Correct "fishing" to "phishing".
   Minutes from November 9 approved as amended.

2. Approve Agenda
   Postpone item 3 for the next meeting.
   Agenda approved.

   Old Business
3. ~~Proposed revisions to EM 08-040 Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities~~ – FASP Action Item

   New Business
4. Proposed revisions to EM 21-029 Policy for the Use of the Digital Technologies in Teaching and Learning – EPPC Introduction Item
   EPPC Chair Miller and senator Gibson introduced item 4:
   a. EM underwent revisions last year, haven't passed and was returned to the subcommittee.
   b. Fixed links, terminology.
   c. Additional changes to the 4.2.1 on the mode of instruction and were moved to a more appropriate section on the curricular control, and 4.6 on AI.
   d. Various modes of instruction were added.
   e. EPPC suggested that a more comprehensive treatment of mode of instruction would be more appropriately handled in the FPPP and to be given to a subcommittee.

f. Determined that the collective faculty will handle the MOI. Discussion included whether the chair should have control over the decision what MOI. Determined department would be appropriate group to have that control over.

Discussion:

Question: Is the CBA 20.2b statement "instructional assignments are the purview of the appropriate administrator" in conflict with the sentence on MOI? Answer: Instructional assignments are up to interpretation. Suggested language is appropriate.

a. Stated CBA language distracts from what is important, that faculty have purview over curriculum via HEERA and the laws of the state of California. Suggested amendment at the next meeting and to remove CBA language. Support shared.
b. Discussion included who is responsible for determining MOI. If the department is not there, the Chair might be an appropriate person. Language was vague on purpose to allow for flexibility.
c. Suggested to better define the definition of collective faculty. Answered this term was defined earlier in the document.
d. Commented that the statement "student learning and students' success may be impacted" may seem anti-online. Suggested to make it more flexible by stating each MOI has pros and cons.
e. Page 4, definitions of fair use, LMS administrator, machine learning are stricken. These are more future looking, asking for rationale for the removal. Answer: these were only used in the definition section. Suggested to be removed as they do not exist in other areas. Except fair use, which was mentioned in the preamble.
f. Asked if subcommittee members consider keeping definitions.
g. Suggested to use the library definition on fair use as a reference as the current sentence conflicts with the library definition.
h. There is a federal policy about fair use and should be considered. Both supported.
i. Suggested to keep stricken definitions to provide information about what they are and who is responsible for actions.
j. Suggested to consider other resources (open educational resources, creative comments).

Senate voted: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 4 passed as an introduction item.

5. [Proposed new Program MA Education Online](#) – EPPC Introduction Item
EPPC Chair Miller introduced item 5:
   a. This was a non-controversial conversation on curriculum at the EPPC.
   b. However, there was heavy discussion about the attached letter of support by Fernandes. This applies to next item 6 and another online proposal.
   c. Concerns shared about online programs and the technological support for those programs.
   d. Fernandes provided rationale at the EPPC's meeting stating current support is fine. The letter provides warning to consider how the impact on the online programs and TLP will have in the future.

Discussion:
   a. Clarified that this was introduced as a new program (title), which this is not.
   b. Appreciation shared for recognizing growth in online programs at the university without commensurate growth in resources for TLP.

Question: EPPC suggested the EC team discuss what next steps might be or to propose how university administration can address increasing concerns about TLP and other supporting resources. Has there

been any further discussion? <u>Answer</u>: Concern was raised to chair Trailer with response this will be addressed at the administration. Concern was raised and will be addressed at another senate meeting.

    c. Stated that aside from TLP resources, library resources for the online program should be included in those conversations.

    d. Acknowledgment shared that EPPC discussion was important for their members and expectation is for response to occur. This was shared for the context purpose.

    e. Support shared to elevate the discussion on resources for the online programs.

<u>Question</u>: How was determined to go online with this program and were the students involved in this decision? How is the program dealing with AI usage? <u>Answer</u>: Department used polls which stated students' support for the online program. During pandemic hyflex MOI had very few students in person, the majority of students were online. Asking to be online certified to allow regional students to have full access to the program. Regarding AI, faculty planning on attending an AI symposium in January, being part of the program funded by the US Department of Education, on improving access to technology and with focus on AI, and including AI in the coursework, asking students to evaluate AI work at a higher level rather than forbidding it.

    f. Appreciation for EPPC discussion shared and that available resources will be discussed in the future (library, TLP).

<u>Question</u>: Are there any in-person students that will be impacted by moving to the online program and if yes, how will this be addressed? <u>Answer</u>: This is not exclusively an online program taught as asynchronous MOI. Credential courses and master's programs courses have options for students to register to attend in-person, zoom, or asynchronously. Core courses follow the pattern: one week synchronous (zoom), the second week asynchronous, then repeats throughout the semester. Senate voted: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 5 passed as an introduction item.

6. [Proposed new Program MS Computer Science Online](#) – EPPC Introduction Item
   EPPC Chair Miller and senator Zeichick introduced item 6:
   a. There was heavy discussion about the attached letter of support by Fernandes.
   b. The curriculum portion of discussion at the EPPC was non-controversial.
   c. The proposal included financial support for underfunded resources like TLP $65,000 to fund a half a position, and library resources in the amount of $3,360 for the first year up to $9,639 in the fifth year of the program.
   d. This will be the first online MS program in computer science in the CSU system.
   e. The department is working with Everspring, a company hired to help with marketing efforts. Funds used for marketing will be $325,000 in the first year up to $575,000 in the fifth year.
   f. The program does not conflict with the current master's program serving mainly international students. In person MS program doubled the numbers this year, from 30 to 70 students.
   g. Focus on students in northern California and working professionals to attend online MS.
   h. The online MS program is proposing 30 units, 10 classes, each class 8 weeks long, completion in two years. There will be 12 full time tenure track faculty teaching courses.

   Discussion:
   a. Appreciation shared for work done and information shared.
   b. Stated that efforts to attract international students are known.
   c. Concern shared about budget implications and how the current lower budget may impact the existing in-person MS program and newly proposed MS online program.

   <u>Question</u>: What conversations with faculty were done? What concerns were shared if the program grows? What support is needed/expected for a program to thrive and to support students? <u>Answer</u>:

Proposal was introduced a year and a half ago. All faculty supported it. Currently hiring a tenure track faculty position to support programs. ECC cost recovery funds will support faculty, in the first year the department will get $39,000 and that is planned to grow to $200,000 in the fifth year. Portion of courses will be taught during summertime in online modality.
Senate voted: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 6 passed as an introduction item.

7. [Proposed new EM Policy to Establish the Commencement Committee](#) – FASP Intro Item **(3 pm)**
   FASP Chair Walter and Jennings introduced item 7:
   a. This is a new policy created to establish the Commencement Committee.
   b. The document included language on changing and reestablishing the commencement process.
   c. Updates made to the existing EM in the last two years. With the enormous number of track changes, the committee decided to write a new EM instead.
   d. The document clarified the commencement policy committee's purpose, altered service term, revised outdated language on procedures, and to connect committee with UPE, making sure this is a more collaborative decision process.
   e. Clarified language about members not involved and those taking sabbatical leave.

   Discussion:
   a. Suggested adding a staff member to the committee's membership.
   b. Support shared. Jennings asked for a suggestion on what staff member or if a specific position should be involved. This can be amended at the next senate meeting.
   Senate voted: 34 yes, no opposition. Item 7 passed as an introduction item.

8. [Proposed new EM Financial Aid Advisory Committee](#) – FASP Introduction Item
   FASP Chair Walter introduced item 8:
   a. This is a new EM.
   b. The specific task of the Financial Aid Advisory Committee and the policy is to ensure that the university complies with financial aid regulatory issues that fall within the purview of the financial aid office.
   c. An audit found that there were some real issues that could result in fines for infractions. Revisions included language to fix this.
   d. Presented at EC and at FASP with additional revisions presented here.
   Senate voted: 34 yes, no opposition. Item 8 passed as an introduction item.

9. [Proposed new EM Institutional Review Board](#) – FASP Introduction Item
   FASP Chair Walter introduced item 9:
   a. This is a part of research proposed EMs.
   b. The presentation was introduced at the FASP.
   c. This is a new EM that decommissions the old EM and follows the health and human services and federal guidelines. Therefore, language follows the federal law.

   Discussion:
   a. VP Mahalley Allen, research integrity officer, Sharon Ruggirello, research compliance administrator for Chico State, Leah Vargas, research integrity and compliance officer for Sacramento State, and IRB Chair Ben Seipel worked on proposed EMs (items 9-11) and are present in the meeting.

Question: What is the reference to "members in good standing"? Answer: Members who serve on IRB must complete specific training to conduct research. Examples of a member "not being in good standing" include not attending meetings, not participating, not conducting required reviews. This exists in the procedure document.

   b. Concern shared that historically more male subjects were used in research rather than female.
   c. Stated this has not been the case at Chico State in recent years. IRB review the population of human subjects that are being studied and why. Data can support this.
   d. Clarified that the previous comment (b.) referred to the general population and not specifically Chico State.

Question: Regarding a recently released report and a previous case when a faculty member violated Title IX, would this be considered a member of not good standing? If yes, and if a faculty member has been found to have violated campus policies or any other disciplinary actions, who would be able to categorize this? Answer: any disciplinary action would come through faculty affairs, the provost, the president's office, and the legal council.

   e. Concern shared that the current language may not be as strong to prevent person with potential disciplinary actions against them not being put in a position of power over other faculty members. Suggested to propose amendments to strengthen the language to allow members to be removed and not allowed to be reappointed.
   f. Commented that the report finds that the university did not violate any of the policies, while not assessing the adequacy of those policies. Support shared to strengthen the policy.
   g. Additional support shared.

Senate voted: 30 yes, one no vote. Item 9 passed as an introduction item.

10. [Proposed new EM Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee](#) – FASP Introduction Item
    FASP Chair Walter and VP Allen introduced item 10:
    a. The new proposed EM introduced the IACUC program (the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee), and the committee's guidelines.
    b. Research on animals is reviewed by IACUC. Policy includes instructional activities, e.g., teaching protocols for farm animals.
    c. This is a new EM regulated by the federal government, specifically the US Department of Agriculture Laboratory Animal Welfare Act and the Public Health Services Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals.

    Discussion:
    a. Appreciation shared for tremendous work on these policies.
    b. Similar amendments suggested to this policy as item 9. Expecting the same amendments to be applied to item 11. Additional support shared.

    Senate voted: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 10 passed as an introduction item.

11. [Proposed new EM Institutional Biosafety Committee](#) – FASP Introduction Item
    FASP Chair Walter and VP Allen introduced item 11:
    a. This is a new research-related EM.
    b. This is a very heavily regulated area, in particular the National Institutes of Health guidelines for research involving recombinant or synthetic nucleic acid molecules.

    Senate voted: 30 yes, no opposition. Item 11 passed as an introduction item.

12. [Proposed revisions to EM-18-010 Campus Vegetation and Arboretum Committee](#) – FASP Intro Item

FASP Chair Walter introduced item 12:

    a. The document was significantly revised from the time of introduction to action at FASP.

    b. There were questions about membership and the purpose of the committee.

    c. The main revisions were regarding procedures that limited the committee and narrowed the policy to identify the scope of the committee and maintain more transparency with the campus and reporting to the senate as per the policy.

    d. The track changes document shows all revisions.

Discussion:

    a. Membership includes emeritus faculty. Suggesting being more specific e.g., from the College of Agriculture. Intention to include well versed experts in the field as members of the committee.

Senate voted: 32 yes, no opposition. Item 12 passed as an introduction item.

13. [Proposed amendment to the Academic Senate Constitution](#) – Introduction Item (Miller)

Chair Trailer stated that if item 13 passes as an introduction item, it will be presented in the spring semester's academic senate meeting as there needs to be at least 10 working days between introduction and action item discussions. This item will require 2/3 of the votes to pass. And non-voting members vote on this item.

EPPC Chair Miller introduced item 13:

    a. The intention is to make the academic senate a more equitable and inclusive space.

    b. Proposing to include university diversity officer (CFO, Chief Diversity Officer) a permanent member of the senate and a voting member of the executive committee.

    c. Proposing limiting faculty members to serve on the executive committee, senate officers, for longer than six consecutive years, except for the immediate past chair. Tried to address the concerns brought last time when this was proposed and did not pass. After six years of service, members would pause service for a couple of years prior to running again to allow more diversity of voices to be heard.

    d. Statewide senators serve three-year term limits, set by the statewide senate. There was a concern that by implementing a term limit on the senate executive committee, it would put term limits on the statewide senator service opportunities.

    e. Instead of eliminating our statewide senators from the senate executive committee, proposing to have one statewide Senator serving on the senate executive committee at a time. This would eliminate the six-year term limit conflict.

    f. "No faculty member shall serve in no more than one role in the executive committee at the same time." Purpose to allow new voices to serve on senate.

    g. Proposing an election for an executive committee position if a person cannot complete the service, e.g., missing more than six weeks - nominations will be collected to fill the absence and an election will be held by the Senate to fill the executive committee position.

    h. Proposing to expand the individual senate officer term from one to a two-year term and stagger these terms. Focus on equity and inclusion.

Discussion:

    a. Importance of having statewide senator voices heard, support shared to have two serving on the EC as they may have two different roles presenting campus. Stated that having a senate officer at the statewide level is extremely powerful and helpful, as campus voices are presented at a higher level and their role is to inform campus, collect feedback and present to the entire

campus community. Concern shared that if a single person is responsible for this work there is a great deal of stress for this role, especially if new in this role.

b. Suggested getting feedback from the EC.

c. Support shared for staggered terms. <u>Question</u>: If vice chair and chair are elected on different years for two-year terms and the vice chair runs for a chair in the middle of service and wins – vacate the vice chair position. What impact would this have?

d. Editorial suggestion "in the case that an officer will <u>be</u> absent for longer", add "<u>be</u>".

e. Suggested limiting the number of VPs on the executive committee.

f. Commented that immediate past chair had entire year to be part of important work as a chair and staying in the position for two years is concerning. Opposition to include two years for the immediate past chair.

<u>Question</u>: if inclusion and equity are the main focus of these proposed changes, why the chair of staff council is not included on the executive committee? <u>Answer</u>: Historically not done on campus. Motion can be made to add a staff member.

g. Stated there is a memorandum from the HR of the Chancellor's Office responding to the participation of staff in several service committees at San Luis Obispo. This will be shared with a chair Trailer to distribute to the senate. This can determine the ability for the Chico senate to include staff members at different levels.

h. Recognized and appreciate the addition of the chief diversity officer as a member. However, concerns are shared to allow another administrator to be a voting member in the body currently reserved for staff members, faculty members and students. Opposing the addition of CDO as a voting member.

i. Suggested having a list of officer's positions and compensations for their roles (units).

j. Current immediate past chair opposing two-year service. Suggesting for this to be an advisory role in transition for the upcoming chair, suggesting keeping it at one year as voting or non-voting member.

k. Stated that the CSU Long Beach has a chair of staff council sitting on the executive committee.

l. Suggested to start making changes to the campus policies to reflect campus changes when prioritizing diversity and inclusion.

m. Support shared to include university CDO in the academic senate.

The conversation stopped as the meeting adjourned. The speaker's list with which this introduction item will continue the discussion: senator Green, senator Paiva, senator Kaiser.
Presentation on the Title IX Cozen report implementation and the university reports were not discussed.

Communications

14. Announcements and Communications

- Title IX Cozen Report Implementation (presentation)
- [2025-26 Academic Calendar](#) & [2024-25 Faculty/Staff Calendar final](#) & [2025-26 Faculty/Staff Calendar draft](#) **(Time certain -4 pm)**

VP Allen introduced faculty/staff calendars:

a. The faculty/staff calendars present a 15-week semester, one-week break, and a final exam during the last week.

b. Faculty are paid for three days of work time prior to the start of each semester.

c. Faculty are expected to submit grades in the fall of 2025 by December 31; in spring by May 22.

d. There is a faculty workday scheduled for May 16th to accommodate participation at the commencement.

Comments on the academic calendar – email Wilson by the end of a semester.

Question: Grades due dates are listed on the academic calendar, mentioned in the faculty/staff calendar, but not included. Asking for rationale. Answer: Grades are due on the last academic workday of every semester. Grades due dates are not included in the faculty/staff calendar as they do not apply to staff.

Question: Considering that the January semester first week of classes starts with a holiday on Monday, was there any discussion on this topic and impact on students during that week? Answer: No. Historically, the spring semester starts 17 weeks before commencement, which is not scheduled to fall on Memorial Day weekend. Based on this, the start date is determined.

- Spring Library Hours

Dean Shepherd introduced spring library hours:
a. After completing an evaluation of library operating hours, it concluded the library is open 93 hours per week, with a single staff member on a 45 hours a week schedule.
b. During daytime serving 300-400 students, and at night averaging between two and eight people (after 10 pm).
c. In the spring semester, the library will close at 9:45 pm instead of 11:45 pm to utilize a staff member during the daytime rather than at nighttime.
d. Third to the last week of a semester, the library will open on the first floor until midnight. Dead week and finals week until 1:45 am.
e. The library will conduct a survey to assess their new operating hours (pilot program).

Discussion:
Question: Will the same hours apply to weekend hours during the last three weeks of a semester?
Answer: The change in hours applies from Sunday through Thursday. Friday and Saturday are unaffected.
Question: Is this the effect of a hiring chill, decrease in staffing or it always had a single staff member in the evening hours? Answer: It was always a single person in the evening hours working on safety and student access. However, in the past library had more staffing services. With the decrease in staffing, focus is more on 8 am – 5 pm hours when serving more people in the library. Pilot in the spring will help assess what students need and how to serve them better, including if extra position is needed.
a. Commented that the library is a basic to the educational experience and there should be more conversation about how CSU funds are spent.
b. Stated the upcoming UBC meeting will provide more information on the budget and plans.

15. University Reports
    1. Executive Committee Reports – Medic
        a. EC Summary 27Oct2023 & 03Nov2023
    2. Standing Committee Reports
        a. Educational Policies and Programs – Miller
        b. Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Walter
    3. Associated Students Report – Alaniz-Wiggins
    4. Staff Council Report – Peterson

5. [Academic Senate of the California State University](#) Report ([Nov Plenary Report](#)) ([Faculty Trustee Report #2 11-3-23](#)) – Boyd/Kralj (Underwood)
   a. ASCSU [Agendas](#), [Minutes](#), [Resolutions](#), & [Summaries](#)
6. Cabinet - Perez/Boura/Brundage/Clyde/Morales/Sendze /Lau
16. Ask the Administrator
17. Other
18. Adjourn at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

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