



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 February 15, 2024, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/6929553877?pwd=WFNQb29hdIMrMXZMbmxuam5sZzBRdz09>
Meeting ID: 692 955 3877
Passcode: shark

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

Absent: Alaniz-Wiggins, Boura, Brundage, Clyde, Perez, and Sendze.

Chait Trailer called a meeting to order at 2:34 pm.

1. Approve Minutes of [07Dec2023](#) and [14Dec2023](#)
Minutes approved.
2. Approve Agenda
Agenda approved.

Unfinished Business

3. [Proposed amendment to the Academic Senate Constitution](#) – Introduction Item (Miller)
 - 3.1. [Supporting document - alternative potential amendments](#) (Miller)

EPPC Chair Miller introduced item 3:

- a. Based on previous feedback, additional changes proposed (see supporting document). Clarified that the senate will vote on the original document today; a supporting document will be presented next time this is discussed as an action item.
- b. The key points in the initial proposal and the initial amendment proposal are still the same. Making the University Diversity Officer an ex officio member, voting member of both the Senate and the Executive Committee, implementing six-year term limits for Senate leadership executive committee members, and prohibiting people from holding more than one Senate officer position at a time.
- c. Eliminate two-year service for senate executive committee members.
- d. Proposing to remove the voting option for all non-faculty members of the EC, except the University Diversity Officer.
- e. The term limit for EC members to be six years, the wait period two years. Exception statewide senators who serve three-year terms, wait period to be three years.
- f. Including mentoring new senators.

Discussion:

Starting the discussion with the previous speaker's list: Green, Paiva, Kaiser.

- a. Support shared to have the university diversity officer as a voting member as this role will be an important connection to the faculty.
- b. Appreciation shared for work done on both the original and revised documents. Support shared to have term limits. Suggested to add a cumulative limit of nine out of 12 years on the EC.
- c. Concern shared regarding the assumption that the experience that one gains in a complicated structure is leading to a negative exercise of power.
- d. Stated that the statewide representation is expressed via two or three members from each campus. Concerns shared to limit statewide position as that may create an artificial barrier to Chico State having a larger voice in terms of what happens at the statewide level and the ability of another candidate to be a faculty trustee at BoT.
- e. Commented that the power of the Senate and the power of both standing committees and the structure they have is shared governance and its committee work. Asked about the committee that worked on this and how to join the conversations.
- f. Comment shared regarding the need for more transparency with EC meetings and minutes. Clarified that the EC meetings will no longer be confidential and that the guidelines are being reviewed. Expecting these to come forward with specific recommendations.

Question: If this item passes as an introduction item, is it correct to presume that the secondary document or further modified version of that document will be introduced as a substitute document at action? Answer: Attached document is informational. The body will decide at action to accept or not the attached document.

Question: Procedural question, can the document be voted on as independent edits rather than vote on the entire document? Answer: If requested to divide the question, edits can be addressed individually.

Question: is there evidence that there have been those who had been seeking positions on the Executive Committee or leadership positions within the Senate, but were frozen out by the incumbent rerunning or is that kind of hypothetical circumstance? Answer: Previous elections can provide data on who ran vs was elected.

Question: In what capacity would the university diversity officer serve as a voting member? Would there be weekly reports?

- g. Asking about the rationale on the process and decision making about the document changes and what conversations led to addressing concerns.
- h. Stated that the statewide position is seen differently than local senate service. Support shared not to have term limits for these positions as they provide different kinds of opportunities. Example shared, current Statewide Chair Steffel served in various capacities for 10 years.
- i. Shared that in the past there were periods when no one wanted to apply for a senate officer position(s) due to which campus had one or no candidates. Concern shared what happens if term limits are installed and there is no person willing to serve?
- j. Concern shared that staff member is not considered in the proposed document although was mentioned last semester. Asked if the staff and faculty associations and the BIPOC community were part of the consultation.
- k. Support shared separating motions and treating proposed amendments separately rather than as the entire document.
- l. Suggested to have the same focus on other EC officers and request their weekly reports if the same if required from the university diversity officer.

- m. Stated that three positions are new (Senate Chair, Standing Committee Chairs) and that having some experience in the EC is welcomed. Suggested considering a two-year term for chairs of standing committees.

Question: With a tentative agreement coming up to be signed, will TA allow lecturers to gain entitlement if they add units by being a Senate officer if the tentative agreement goes forward? The ability to do this or not can impact lecturers being interested in serving at senate.

- n. Support shared in diversifying the senate, having strategic efforts to include various voices at the table to become more diverse and thoughtful. Commented that if disadvantaged and underprivileged are coming to the table not feeling like they belong, term limits will not help.
- o. Support shared for more transparency, similar to requested EC minutes and open meetings. Concern shared that some conversations that occur behind closed doors are not being transparent nor helping to disclose process. Support shared to have these disclosed to openly show what was passed/voted by EC and what was not discussed nor passed.
- p. Support shared to include affinity groups in conversations without additionally culturally taxing them. Suggested discussing term limits in a way not to weaken EC and Chico State seats at the system level.
- q. Asking to reinstate mentorship processes in the senate. Stated that the campus started having new voices at the table once the campus used ASCSU nomination process, new to the campus.
- r. Support shared to the balance of new members and experienced members. Concern shared that when conflict between admin and faculty/staff occurs, it is problematic to have inexperienced people at the table making decisions without knowing/understanding the implications and consequences.
- s. Suggested to include chairs and deans in the conversations as serving on the senate means additional changes to the teaching schedule.
- t. Support shared not to have term limits for senators and statewide senators, but to include them for senate officers. Support shared for including mentorship as an important tool.
- u. Support shared to made amendments to the document during a senate meeting rather than at the ad hoc committee.
- v. Support shared for term limits to create a culture of rotation of leadership, making the senate more equitable. Term limits are not mutually exclusive with mentorship. Example shared person coming into a position can shadow existing officer.
- w. Commented that the officer positions are open annually. However, not many were interested in running, and struggled to find people to serve. Encouraging people to self-nominate or have someone nominate others.
- x. Concern shared with shadowing proposed as this may cause inequitable situation and uncompensated work for the faculty.
- y. Suggested to have the university diversity council review suggested amendments and share their opinion on being part of the group. The committee may provide feedback, include various groups, and even state a time limit when this can come back. Support shared to reach out to constituents.
- z. Link on time limits shared with the senate.
- aa. Support shared for a full and complete discussion in a committee, based on previous long conversations and questions asked. Concern shared that further discussions at several senate meetings may delay work on proposals that are coming to the senate.

Motion made to define an ad hoc committee and define the task for the committee to discuss and work on. Intention to include those not present to be part of this group e.g., University Diversity Council, affinity groups, those with stake in diversity. Second. Rationale: in addition, to consider all

discussions done during previous and today's meeting, incorporate some of those suggestions or changes into the document as well as others that they may come up with when they consult with outside interests, and bring back another document for the senate's consideration.

Question: Asked for clarification if this includes the entire document, portion of proposed amendments, or discussion only? Answer: Clarified this would refer to the item itself, proposed constitutional amendments.

bb. Suggested having an update from the ad hoc committee at each upcoming senate meeting. Senate voted: 20 yes, 12 no. The motion passed. Suggested to make a call to the campus community.

Break 3:55 – 4:01 pm.

New Business

4. [Academic Reorganization Request METX](#) – EPPC Introduction Item (*with a request to move to Action and finalize in this meeting*).

Janell Bauer, Clarke Steinback and Senator Moss introduced item 4:

- a. Not controversial, passed in EPPC unopposed.
- b. The proposal brings Computer Animation and Game Development (CME) to be part of the School of Communication and renamed to the School of Media Entertainment, Technology, and Immersive Experience.
- c. The proposal reflects interdisciplinary work and collaborative approach, the needs of the industry, the exciting changes in technology, and professional support for students.
- d. Curriculum collaboration occurred in the past, since 2017.
- e. The faculty voted unanimously to create this proposal to support students' needs and goals.
- f. This is a unique program un the CSU, allowing opportunity for student enrollment.
- g. Students were exposed to building virtual reality of the Bidwell Mansion and Sierra Nevada.
- h. Collaboration between three colleges together.

Discussion:

Question: FPPP allows lecturers to participate in the governance process and program? Answer: Lecturers were involved.

- a. Commented that lecturers will evaluate lecturers. This will be applied.
- b. Commented that this would allow three department chairs to continue collaboration.

Question: Was AI discussed as an issue, topic, an opportunity? Answer: Yes. AI is already in some of the courses. Further opportunities will be discussed not explicitly but as part of understanding the technology.

Question: Was there any controversial? Answer: No. There was a general excitement for merger and collaboration.

Senate voted: 31 yes, no opposition. Item 4 passed as an introduction item.

Motion made to suspend the rule and consider item 4 as an action item. Second.

Senate voted on the motion: 32 yes, no opposition. Motion passed.

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

5. [Revisions](#) to [EM 07-009](#) Accessibility and Nondiscrimination Policy Regarding Individuals with Disabilities – Information Item (*Editorial changes were approved by EC.*)

Chair Trailer introduced item 5:

- a. Editorial changes proposed. Updating references to the updated policies and names of positions.

- b. Changes were approved by the EC as per the rules.
- c. Item brought to the senate for transparency reasons.
- d. The accessibility resource center that brought these editorial changes.

Discussion:

Question: Would it be more powerful if the senate voted on the item? Answer: No due to the rules.

- a. Suggested that the question alluded to the additional senate approval and ratification vote. Check and balance whether the senate agrees or not with EC's decision.
- b. Praise shared for transparency in the process and bringing this item to the senate.
- c. Clarified that the vote would approve the process and not the policy as the same was already approved.
- d. Commented to include discussion behind the approval of the policy by EC to improve the process and transparency.

Senate voted: 30 yes, no opposition. Item 5 unanimously approved and ratified by the senate.

Communications

6. Announcements and Communications

7. University Reports

7.1. Academic Senate of the California State University – [Nov 2023 Report](#) & [Jan 2024 Report](#) – Boyd/Underwood

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

Statewide Senators Boyd and Underwood introduced item 7.1:

- a. Report attached with more details. Asking for feedback.
- b. FASFA delays impacting campuses. Every student that is eligible will have a unique federal student ID. The FAFSA changes are challenging for students who have parents who do not have social security numbers.
- c. The strike has passed. However, strike action was discussed.
- d. The Deputy Vice Chancellor has reported the new budget proposal that was just released in January. Enrollment is something that campuses are still working on improving.
- e. AB 928 update: discussion about unified CSU GE pattern. Two options were presented at the Board of Trustees meeting. First, to add CalGETC, whereas first year students and most transfers would be held to different GE patterns. Second, to add CalGETC and create a unified GE pattern as well as alter CSU GE breadth. At the March meeting BoT will decide how to proceed. Trustee Adamson emphasized his opposition to any form of legislative intrusion, and it doesn't belong in higher education. The student retention has been improved by GE and lifelong learning and humanities & social sciences courses and area E.
- f. Asking for feedback to represent campus at AS CSU.
- g. Statewide Senator Boyd was at the AS CSU EC and ICASS.
- h. Discussion included the grade point average that is required for the UC to accept transfer students as complete. Students may be auto enrolled into an ADT (Associated Degree for Transfers).
- i. The community colleges are going to be limited to advising to the ICASS model and are going to be limited to certifying Cal GETC completion.
- j. CSU allows an overall grade point of 2.0. Students may be limited in receiving ADT.

- k. The community colleges are concerned about the proposal the Board of Trustees has seen which would eliminate area E, would reduce Area C by three units, and it would add one unit to area B3, which is a science lab. The overall net change was five units.
- l. Concerned about the unintended consequences.
- m. Discussed potential to have the CSU, the CCCs and the UCs as well as the Independent Colleges and Universities of California need to have an oversight body and budget decisions.
- n. The next senate meeting will be during the next AS CSU meeting. Feedback is requested prior to the next meeting.

7.2. Cabinet - *(attending an all-day Cabinet meeting with an outside consultant)*

7.3. Executive Committee Summary [Report 15Feb2024](#) – Medic
Report attached.

Update: EC meeting agendas and minutes will be posted on the EC website and will be available to the campus community.

7.4. Standing Committee Reports

7.4.1. Educational Policies and Programs [Report](#) – Miller

7.4.2. Faculty and Student Policies Committee [Report](#) – Walter

EPPC and FASP reports attached.

EPPC is forming two subcommittees working on the memo of intent process led by senator Moss and EC guidelines led by senator Underwood.

FASP working on multiple policies, see attached report and contact Chair Walter if interested in serving on any subcommittee.

7.5. Associated Students [Report](#) – Alaniz-Wiggins

AS Director of Academic Affairs Arisman presented the AS report:

- a. Looking to fill in committees.
- b. AS has a new member of our government affairs team, Commissioner of Community Affairs, Gia Monticello, that will be in charge of the moonlight safety walk. The event allows students, admin, staff, faculty, and community members to be a part of.
- c. The students' senators represent their individual colleges. AS solicited over 600 student responses.
- d. AS President is the chair of the student Board of Trustees search committee. This is the second year in a row that Chico State students have chaired that committee.
- e. The California State Student Association (CSSA) meets this weekend. These are monthly meetings.
- f. AS election is ongoing. Share with students. The applications will close on Wednesday, February 28 at 12pm.

7.6. Staff Council [Report](#) – Peterson

Senator Peterson presented the Staff Council report:

- a. The Wildcat sponsorship award - reach out to student clubs and organizations and have them apply for the Wildcat sponsorship. On Tuesday, five out of 33 groups that applied presented at the staff council meeting. The winner for this year's Wildcat sponsorship is the Black Student Union.

b. The excellence awards for staff are open now, as well as the MPP awards.

Question: What or who decides on the ability of staff to get a raise? Are they able to do that only by moving from one department/college to another? Answer: This is processed by the union, not the staff council. The question is for the labor council.

8. Ask the Administrator

Question: News shared that David Stachura is no longer employed by the Chico State. Will there be a statement by the administrator on the circumstances that led to this and if he was fired, resigned? Will there be an acknowledgment or context shared around this news? Answer: Confirmed that since February 14th Stachura is no longer employed by the university. No further information can be disclosed.

9. Other

10. Adjourn at 4:59 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

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