



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 December 07, 2023, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/6929553877?pwd=WFNQb29hdIMrMXZMbmxuam5sZzBRdz09>
Meeting ID: 692 955 3877
Passcode: shark

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

Absent: Arisman, Boura, Brundage, Bruns, Clyde, Sendze, and Youngblood.

Chair Trailer called a meeting to order at 2:37 pm.

1. Approve Minutes of [30Nov2023](#)
Minutes from November 30 approved.
2. Approve Agenda
Question: The last meeting item on the revisions to the code of student rights and responsibilities was postponed as Dr. Wilson was not able to attend. Will this item be presented today as it is not on the agenda? Answer: No. This item will be postponed to the next senate meeting.
Motion made to reorganize the agenda and move item 3 to item 16. Second. Rationale: huge proposal that requires diligent deliberation by the senate. In the past meetings, the senate has not completed reports or about other business done on campus, and to allow to pass more pressing action items today. Senate voted: 18 yes, 12 no votes. Motion passed.
Agenda approved as amended.

Unfinished Business

16. [Proposed amendment to the Academic Senate Constitution](#) – Introduction Item (Miller)
Changed to item 16, not discussed during today’s meeting.

Old Business

3. [Proposed revisions to EM 21-029 Policy for the Use of the Digital Technologies in Teaching and Learning](#) – EPPC Action Item
EPPC Chair Miller and senator Gibson introduced item 3:
 - a. Revisions made based on a previous meeting discussion.
 - b. Chair Trailer confirmed this document is not in the box. Gibson shared the document with proposed amendments.

Discussion:

Question: Asked to clarify if the new document is presented for consideration as senators did not have access to this document prior to the meeting. Answer: yes.

- a. Suggested that this should be introduced for consideration as a part of procedures.
- b. Stated there are minor changes to the document on the mode of instructions after the meeting with the Chair Council.
- c. Time used to allow senators to have access to the document. Not completed.

Motion made to postpone this item and move it on the agenda to new item 7. Second. Rationale: to allow business to carry while making the document available to all senators. No objection, passed.

- d. Senator Gibson shared a document with senators. Discussion continued.

Senator Gibson introduced proposed changes:

- a. Section 3.5 was amended. The sentence about online education was struck.
- b. Sections 4.2 and 4.2.1 amended sentences, restored language on the mode of instruction. Left the main paragraph with edits based on the previous discussion at the senate.
- c. Grammatical changes were made, not significant changes to the document.
- d. Motion made to consider the proposed amendments.

Discussion:

- a. Disagreement shared on the language stating that, based on the CBA, that apart from the assignment of instructional faculty to particular courses, as specified in the CBA, this does not imply mode of instruction, time of day, room assignment. Concern shared that the proposed language does not address this concern.
- b. Stated that the course assignments are different from MOI, which refers to the online, hybrid, in-person, and not a classroom assignment nor time of day.
- c. Commented that it is critical that the department and the faculty involved have a central decision making on how successful the program is going to be.

Question: Was the motion seconded prior to beginning the discussion? Answer: No. Second received, discussion continued.

- d. Support shared for the comment under a.
- e. Commented that the previously shared document had additional subheading and text that is missing today and not mentioned. Concern shared about 4.2.1 section. An additional concern shared that actual changes to a prior document and track changes are missing.
- f. An opposition shared with the proposed language under the 4.2.1 section.
- g. Language attempted to provide guidance on the question of who resolves the conflict when an individual faculty member wants to either be online or in person and the chair or the curriculum committee does not.

Motion made to postpone this item to the next senate meeting in February 2024. Second. Rationale: to provide time to work on a document and provide answers to asked questions.

Question: Is this motion to postpone the entire document until all questions are resolved, and the next meeting will start with this amendment? Question based on the collection of the amendments proposed by the new document. Answer: unclear how to proceed. After the discussion, resolved to strike down this motion and make another more specific motion.

Senate voted on a motion: 19 yes, seven no. Motion passed.

Motion made to repeat the vote due to the confusion. Second. Senate voted after the clarification: 29 no votes. Motion failed.

Motion made to table the entire item until the next senate meeting. Second. Clarified that a vote on this in the affirmative means the senate is accepting the amendment that are on the table and a vote against it means that the senate would not accept the collection of amendments, and then would have an option to potentially postpone the item. Voting this down provides the senate an opportunity to come back with a different collection of proposed amendments. Senate voted: 27 no, three yes votes. Motion made to postpone the item until the February meeting. Second. Senate voted: 28 yes, one no vote. Motion passed. The item is postponed until the next senate meeting.

4. [Proposed change to MA in Education - Online](#) – EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Miller introduced item 4:

- 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 item 5, 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 & what the impact on online programs and TLP will have in the future. Currently, TLP can provide support.

No questions. Senate voted: 30 yes, no opposition. Item 4 passed as an action item.

5. [Proposed new Program MS in Computer Science Online](#) – EPPC Action Item

EPPC Chair Miller and senator Zeichick introduced item 5 at the last senate meeting.

No questions. Senate voted: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 5 passed as an action item.

6. [Proposed new EM Financial Aid Advisory Committee](#) – FASP Action Item

FASP Chair Walter and Kentiner David introduced item 6:

- 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.
- e. This is necessary to bring the university into a better position in responding to compliance requirements that fall outside the financial aid and scholarship office.

Discussion:

- a. Praise shared for campus helping students with housing and food insecurity. Asked if this can be added to a policy. Answer: this is a narrow policy of requirements, and it is only responding to required work that is required to be done that is connected to financial aid under the federal and state regulatory matters. Basic needs fall under a different policy.

Motion: to amend the title from financial aid advisory committee to the financial aid compliance advisory committee and include this change throughout the entire document. Second. Rationale: to be aligned with the committee's work. Senate voted: 28 yes, no opposition. Motion passed.

- b. Asking to amend the word "ensure" as an advisory committee can't have that authority; authority falls on the president.

Motion: to change the word “ensure” with “assist”. Second. Senate voted: 29 yes, no opposition. Motion passed. Same motion passed for #3 under the scope.

Motion: to change the word “ensure” with “web content is accurate”. Second. Senate voted: 29 yes, no opposition. Motion passed.

Senate voted on the item 6: 29 yes, no opposition. Item 6 passed as an action item.

7. [Proposed new EM Policy to Establish the Commencement Committee](#) – FASP Action Item

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.
- 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-making process.
- e. Clarified language about members not involved and those taking sabbatical leave.

Discussion:

Motion made to add a staff member to the membership of the committee. Clarified that UPE qualifies as staff. Asked to be more specific about what staff member to add. Motion made to add language “one staff representative appointed by the Staff Council,” and in the paragraph below, to amend the language to include “faculty and staff appointees”. Second. Rationale: to be more accurate with the language and provide clarity to all members.

Question: who is the grand marshal? Answer: two people represent grand marshals, and they are faculty members. Suggested to have editorial “s” added to “marshals”.

Senate voted: 30 yes, no opposition. Motion passed.

Senate voted on item 7: 30 yes, no opposition. Item 7 passed as an action item.

8. [Proposed new EM Institutional Review Board](#) – FASP Action Item

a. [Proposed collection of amendments](#)

FASP Chair Walter and IO Allen introduced item 9:

- a. This is a part of three 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.
- d. The IRB, review board, needs to ensure that faculty who may have violated regulations or policies, will not serve on the committee. And that faculty are qualified to serve on these committees.
- e. The proposed language will apply to all three research EM documents.
- f. The Institutional Review Board was looking at human subjects research last year. The EM is a brand-new EM ensuring compliance with the highest ethical standards of research and federal regulations.

Discussion:

- a. Praise shared for work done on research EMs and for the proposed amendments to a document.
- b. Proposed collection of amendments shared.

Senate voted: 31 yes, no opposition. Proposed collection of amendments and item 8 passed as an action item.

The following items, except item 12, were not discussed during the senate meeting.

9. [Proposed new EM Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee](#) – FASP Action Item
 - a. [Proposed collection of amendments](#)
10. [Proposed new EM Institutional Biosafety Committee](#) – FASP Action Item
 - a. [Proposed collection of amendments](#)
11. [Proposed revisions to EM-18-010 Campus Vegetation and Arboretum Committee](#) – FASP Action Item ([CLEAN version](#))

New Business

12. [Proposal to Reassign Academic Publications & Scheduling Services \(APSS\) from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs](#) – EC Introduction Item, with a request to move to Action and finalize in this meeting
3:50 pm

Interim Provost Lau introduced item 12:

- a. A group of staff reside in Student Affairs known as APSS. They perform a very critical role in maintaining and helping chairs with scheduling, working on curriculum, course setup, academic and class scheduling, and academic publications.
- b. Two positions are currently vacant.
- c. Proposing the move to Academic Affairs and report here. The move requires senate approval.

Discussion:

Question: Where in the Academic Affairs would they be located? Answer: Provost's office.

- a. Support shared.

Senate voted: 30 yes, no opposition. Item 12 passed as an introduction item.

Motion made to suspend the rules and move item 12 as an action item. Second. Senate voted: 27 yes, no opposition. Motion passed.

Senate voted on item 12: 28 yes, no opposition. Item 12 passed as an action item.

Communications

13. Announcements and Communications
 - a. Title IX Cozen Report Implementation Team ([presentation](#)) **4 pm**

Seema Sehrawat introduced the Title IX Cozen report implementation team presentation (see attached document for details).

Discussion:

Question: have the subcommittees already been meeting or is that part of the plan that is now in place and then the committee is going to start meeting? Answer: Subcommittees were divided and started meeting in the fall.

Question: Related to bullet #2 subcommittee strengthening internal protocols, asking to provide updates. Answer: Each phase would last one semester. Phase 1 has started now, focusing on strengthening campus collaboration and information sharing through multidisciplinary teamwork, and evaluating the model. Looking to develop tools for consistent, informed, and effective documentation and case management, and formalize the current Title IX HR disciplinary process. Phase 2 would

include reporting, investigation and resolving evaluating barriers to reporting engagement. Phase 3 would finalize separating the support and advocacy functions from the investigation to avoid role confusion. Phase 4 would focus on developing robust outreach and case management protocols.

Question: Concern shared based on recent events. How is campus ensuring that the advice of a professional regarding what might constitute a threat of violence is taken seriously? Answer: The scope of this committee is not looking at threats of violence. That is in the purview of another committee under EM12-025 whose work is currently paused to address other issues.

Question: asking to address a series of questions asked prior to the meeting? Answer: President will address the questions below:

Question 1: How long can campus keep an employee on administrative leave? Answer: Indefinitely.

Question 2: Does the particular biology professor's salary come out of the biology department budget? Does this prevent the department from hiring a replacement faculty while being paid but not teaching?

Answer: Not clear where the salary is coming from, assuming it is college and not department funds. However, currently biology is in the process of hiring faculty. The president stated funding department in need would be a priority.

Question 3: Does student tuition in any way pay the salary of a person on administrative leave?

Answer: There are two sources of operating budget: state allocation and student fees & tuition. Salary is paid out of the operating budget, which does not separate these two sources.

Question 4: How can an employee with a three-year restraining order stay on payroll? Are they allowed to participate in remote teaching or other sorts of telecommuting? Answer: Currently, the individual is on administrative leave and is not performing any duties. If later needed, it will be determined what this individual is allowed to do. Will keep campus safe.

14. University Reports

1. [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](#)
2. Cabinet - Perez/Boura/Brundage/Clyde/Morales/Sendze /Lau
3. Executive Committee Reports – Medic
 - a. EC Summary [17Nov2023](#), [27Oct2023 & 03Nov2023](#), and [01Dec2023](#)
4. Standing Committee Reports
 - a. [Educational Policies and Programs](#) – Miller
 - b. [Faculty and Student Policies Committee](#) – Walter
5. Associated Students Report – Alaniz-Wiggins
6. Staff Council [Report](#) – Peterson

15. Ask the Administrator

16. Other

17. Adjourn at 4:29 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

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