

California State University, Chico
Academic Senate
(530) 898-6201, Zip 020
MEMORANDUM

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
Thursday, December 10, 2020, 2:30 p.m., ZOOM

Academic Senate meetings are recorded. Traditionally the written minutes consist of a summary of topics discussed. For more detail, listen to the audio file [here](#). Time stamps for each agenda item are provided in brackets for convenience. CSU, Chico is committed to making its resources accessible for all audiences. If you have accessibility-related difficulties with any of these documents, please email oats@csuchico.edu.

PRESENT: Adamian, Allen, Altfeld (Teague-Miller), Bailey, Boyd (Chair), Buffardi, Burk, Ferrari, Ford, Gruber, Herman, Hidalgo, Holbert, Horst, Hutchinson, Karjl, Larson, Leon, McBride-Praetorius, Medic, Millard, Morales-Sanchez, Ormond, Paiva, Peterson (Gruber), Schartmueller, Seipel, Shepherd, Sherman, Sistrunk, Smith, Snyder, Son, Sparks, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood, Wright

ABSENT: Boura, Perez

Boyd began to welcome people to the ZOOM meeting and encouraged Senators to amend their names note that they are senators on the participants window and guests to note this as well. She reminded everyone that the chat should be used only for official business to facilitate the recognition of guest speakers and clarification. Guests should use chat to be recognized by a senator who will ask that for them to be recognized. Since a quorum was present, Boyd called the meeting to order at 2:34.

1. Approve Minutes [4:23-4:47]

No Minutes.

2. Approve Agenda [4:47-8:01]

Boyd noted that some links had been added to the agenda since its initial release.

Paiva moved to consider as a Discussion Item President Hutchinson's rejection of the December 3 [Resolution requesting President Hutchinson in an emergency circumstance, to exercise executive authority to allow faculty to selectively opt-in to inclusion of Student Evaluations of Teaching \(SET\) and peer observations in the CSU, Chico Faculty Personnel Action File \(PAF\) during the Academic Year 2020-2021](#) that she sent to faculty on December 9. This item will be discussed under **Item 19: Other**.

Amended Agenda was approved.

3. **Announcements** [8:03-10:09]

- Kaiser said the new Chico Unified School Board Members will be sworn in tomorrow at 4:00 and they will vote on following County Health recommendation that K-12 classes will meet only virtually and not face to face at all. They will also determine whether Spring classes will start on January 4, 2021. Public comments are being taken.
- Sistrunk reminded faculty that elections for the officer positions in the CFA Chico Chapter are still underway and they are encouraged to vote online.

4. **Chair's Prerogative** [10:10-11:03]

- Associated Students Survey and Town Hall [overview](#) – Bre Holbert, AS President
Boyd delayed this discussion until AS officers could present.

5. **Proposed [New Option in Agriculture Communication and Leadership](#)** – EPPC – **Action Item** [11:04-20:17]

- **[Revised document](#) with collection of amendments for consideration**

Allen explained that the order these proposals would be considered was altered a suggested at the last meeting, but that items 5 and 6 should be considered together.

She reminded everyone this degree program used to have two options: [Agricultural Science Education](#) and an option in [Crops, Horticulture and Land Resources Management](#). This second option was elevated to its own degree which is now the BS in [Plant and Soil Science](#). This left a degree with one option and this proposal is an attempt to address this shortcoming.

The new degree will have a second option in [Agricultural Communication and Leadership](#) in partnership with the Department of Journalism and Public Relations and college of Communication and Education. This will distinguish Chico state in California and nationally and allow students to meet standards in the field of Agricultural communication.

Allen pointed out that a revised document with amendments was attached to the agenda, and she introduced Molly Aschenbrener (College of Agriculture) and Susan Wiesinger (Journalism and Public Relations) to answer questions.

Allen moved to the collection of amendments to the revised proposal. Seconded. She explained that the amendments stemmed from discussion in EPPC about the high number of units in this degree. Molly Aschenbrener and Susan Wiesinger amended the proposal to reduce the number of units required for the degree from 91-97 units down to 81-82 units. It would remove CMST 131 from the lower division core. It reduced the elective core from 9 to 6 units.

In the Agricultural Communication option, it reduces the core from 41 to 31 units. It removed AGR 490W and JOURN 130W from the required courses and would instead designate JOURN 341W the writing course for the option.

The amendments to item 5 were accepted: 32 yeah, 0 nay.

Allen pointed out again that there are prominent Agriculture communication programs nationally like Texas Tech, Kansas State, Texas A&M, and Oklahoma State, Perdue and that adding this option to Chico State would be a wonderful development for our own reputation.

Action item passed, 32 yeah, 0 nay.

6. Proposed [BS Agriculture Significant Change](#) – EPPC – Action Item [20:17-24:37]

• **[Revised document](#) with collection of amendments for consideration**

Allen noted that this proposal accommodates the new option that we just approved and moves some units around. She moved the collection of amendments and the attached revised policy as an action item. Seconded.

Allen explained that the rationale is the same as described above and is also a response to EPPC discussion about the high numbers of units originally suggested. The new proposal contemplates reducing the number of units as already depicted in Item 5 above. The amendments to the proposal were approved: 31 yeah, 0 nay.

Action item passed, 33 yeah, 0 nay.

7. Proposed [Name Change for BS Agriculture](#) – EPPC – Action Item [24:37-26:37]

Allen brought EPPC's last action item for 2020, the proposed name change of the BS in [Agriculture](#) to the BS in [Agricultural Science](#) in order to encompass the wider options just accepted above.

Action item passed: 33 yeah, 0 nay.

Boyd explained that these changes would be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office and she would keep in touch with the proposers.

Boyd returned to **Item 4. Chair's Prerogative** [27:11-55:17]

- Associated Students Survey and Town Hall [overview](#) – Bre Holbert, AS President
Holbert described the AS Community Town Hall held on December 2 which succeeded in gathering student perspective about how they are feeling these days. The AS hoped to discern how the university and faculty could partner with students to mitigate some of the issues

students are facing. This presentation will describe the Town Hall as well as some of the results of the student survey that were to prompt discussion and alert the presenters about issues students wanted them to focus on.

[Slide 2] 201 students responded to the Climate Survey using email and Instagram. Six Organizing Themes were surveyed and Holbert and Larson worked on the questions about:

1. Online learning
2. Equity Initiatives
3. Mental Health Resources
4. Freedom of Speech and Advocacy
5. Fiscal (Fees)
6. Basic Needs

[Slide 3] The first area AS wanted to understand was how students are feeling about Online Learning. The pie chart shows the variety of responses students have had about their transition to online learning. More than half of the respondents found it difficult and more than a quarter found it terrible (the two most negative categories). The most common descriptors are also listed below the chart. The largest descriptors included: “sucks, bad, challenging, class-load is difficult, hard, struggling, stressed, etc.”

Holbert noted that the entire campus student population was surveyed over 16,000 students and only 200 responded.

[Slide 4] asked for a response to the question: “Going into the spring 2021 semester, describe your level of preparedness.” Almost half the students answered: “Somewhat Prepared” and a quarter said they were “Neutral.”

[Slide 5] Holbert thought the next few slides revealed where students are feeling the most pressure right now. The pie chart shows what students felt were the most important themes that they wanted to hear more about at the town hall. Just shy of half wanted to hear about mental health resources and more than a quarter wanted to hear about basic needs services with fiscal fees being the third most important (almost a quarter). Students responded with narrative about why they chose the categories they did. Holbert summarized many of their explanations and has the original in-depth data if anyone would like to study the responses more.

[Slide 6] Holbert explained that AS invited people who had practical experience with these areas to address a number of questions that came out of the student survey data. Many of the questions are provided in the slides. 1. Basic Needs questions included problems many students have with food insecurity and the problems some have had in needing prepare meals

on their own after the dorms closed. Has the University considered providing meal plans for those living off campus? How can the University help students maintain reliable wifi in their homes wherever they are?

2. Mental Health captured that many students are feeling overwhelmed. Students wondered how to get mental health services online. Holbert pointed out that many AS leaders and faculty might know these things, but this shows students do not know and that they are lost. This is important information.

[Slide 7] sketches student concerns about Speech and Advocacy -how can students effectively advocate and speak up in a virtual environment? Under Equity Initiatives students asked about resources and initiatives that have been started to support the academic success of first generation students and underrepresented students since the pandemic began? How are faculty and staff being held accountable to teach and lead in an inclusive the way?

[Slide 8] students' questions about AS and University fees was a huge topic. There were a lot of tough questions. Are we getting a refund on tuition or fees? Have there been budget cuts and how do these impact clubs and organizations? Will this affect graduation? Many of these questions are spelled out in the slides.

[Slide 9] Holbert concluded that the AS Community Town Hall was awesome. 86 students, faculty and staff joined the conversation in the evening. The invited speakers spoke on each area and answered the questions and more that were raised during the discussion. They provided a lot of information and links for attendees to get more information as well.

The townhall is posted on the AS website for people to refer back to. The plan is to have another Town Hall next semester to be run by the Student Academic Senate (7senators from each college and, Ella Snyder, the Director of University Affairs).

Questions were raised:

- Smith asked if there was discussion about the availability of campus resources. Holbert said data and qualitative information was presented. She said students asked about where to find this information and less about how much was available.
- Kaiser said that high school students had found going on-line completely as alienating and difficult in how they spent their time and processed information and they especially felt socially isolated. Holbert noted that AS sponsors periodic presentations about healthy cooking and life skills.
- Parsons-Ellis mentioned that the series Adulting 101 has cooking tutorials and the Chico Basic Needs pantry has also reached out about healthy cooking as well as providing a

variety of recipe cards to advise students how to prepare what happens to be available in season or at the time.

- Karjl asked if the College of Agriculture could cooperate with the Basic Needs project to create boxes of food like Hello Fresh does and put out more prepared meals and food through the university. Holbert commended this idea.
- Millard thought a survey sent to students about five weeks into the semester to alert the University and also provide information early. The survey could automatically send the student information back about their questions. This is the period when we can lose first year students especially if they don't get support.
- Smith wondered if there was student feedback about how the University can communicate about these questions and resources. Holbert said that students asked about specific areas of concern, but she thought the idea of pushing more information out earlier was a good idea.
- Hutchinson thought the Town Hall was fantastic. She said this underlines the ongoing conversations about teaching students to do a deep search for the information they need that is currently available on the University website. She thought we need to keep working together to make sure this information is communicated.
- Millard thought mental health information should be one or two clicks off the main page.
- Bailey said students have described their difficulties getting mental health information and appointments in counselling. There is student concern over the suicides on campus and the help available to their peers.
- Paiva noted that the Center for Healthy Communities already provide a lot of information about nutrition and food issues and budgeting. Students just need to be aware of these services. Holbert thought that more outreach to students on social media would be helpful and that having the resources on Chico State's social media pages ready to go would be useful (like on Instagram, areas of inquiry can be highlighted).

Boyd congratulated Holbert for a successful Townhall and for the presentation.

8. Proposed changes to [FPPP 3.1](#) – FASP – Action Item [55:17-28:25]

Underwood explained that this document is the same one presented at introduction last week. It makes the language of the FPPP consistent with that of EM-15-010. Another change redefines the day the USET committee will be reconstituted on May 15.

The alterations in the next paragraph are an attempt to change the culture around SETs by emphasizing what we hope they will truly be used for to promote the growth and development of pedagogical inclusion, innovation and best practices and improve student success based on the improvements faculty may make in their courses.

Boyd reminded attendees that only faculty vote on FPPP matters.

Action item passed: 27 yeah, and 0 nay.

9. **Proposed changes to FPPP 8.1.4.a – FASP – Action Item [28:25-1:17:11]**

Underwood explained that the changes contemplated by FASP

- continue to update the FPPP along the lines of EM 15-010 and support student participation in the process
- it encourages the use of online evaluations administered in the classroom
- adjusts the time of delivery and completion of SETs from the 11th -13th weeks to the 14th and 15th weeks of the semester

Paiva offered a set of amendments to FPPP: 8.1.4.a.2. She moved to strike the first two sentences and add three new sentences (before the very last sentence of the paragraph which is a change already brought forward by FASP):

~~Written or electronic student evaluations of teaching (SET) shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty employee with six or more enrolled students shall have such student evaluations (see CBA 15.15). “Student evaluations of teaching shall be conducted in a minimum of two (2) classes annually for each faculty unit employee who teaches, and in classes representative of each faculty member’s teaching assignment, either state-support or self-support or a combination thereof, in accordance with Article 15.15 of the CBA. The classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and their department chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select half of the total classes to be evaluated.”~~ The USET committee strongly encourages the use of online evaluations administered in class (see below).

Paiva said she had done research on these issues and discovered that the more frequently we conduct student evaluations of teaching, the more unreliable they become. There are other issues including survey burn-out, and that instructors are more likely to teach to the evaluations.

This was also the previous language of our FPPP in 2013. We have not always conducted evaluations every semester for every class. She has been at Chico State long enough to remember this time.

Boyd asked people to speak to the amendment and then after, we will speak to the main motion.

Ford spoke in favor of the amendment and recalled in the 2013-14 senate there was a long debate about whether to conduct evaluations in two classes instead of all of them. It was overwhelmingly decided to continue with the previous two course practice, but practice was changed in the FPPP anyway.

Larson noted that the changes made to the CBA in 2014 include the language of our current FPPP with an added phrase (and further procedural description after it):

“Written or electronic student evaluations of teaching (SET) shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty employee with six or more enrolled students shall have such student evaluations unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after consideration of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s).”

She thought Paiva’s amendment would make interpreting practice for our faculty more difficult down the road and that it is in conflict with CBA 15.15.

Sistrunk agreed that the CBA overrules local policies except that in this case it explicitly allows campuses to reduce the courses they evaluate with the approval of the President upon recommendation of the appropriate committee which is our Senate. If we affirm our choice, we can formally make this recommendation to the President to reduce the number of courses evaluated as called for by the amendment.

The amendment passed: 25 yeah, and 1 nay.

Seipel moved that FPPP 8.1.4.a.5, line 3 be changed to read: “...prior to the ~~11th~~ 14th week...” because some courses end after the 11th week but before the 14th week.

Since there were no objections to the amendment, it was approved.

Action item passed: 27 yeah, 0 nay.

10. Proposed changes to [FPPP 9.1.2.c](#) and [FPPP 10.2.5.a](#) – FASP – Action Item [1:17:11-1:42:29]

Underwood noted that this item is unchanged from last week. She quoted the new language from FASP which is identical in both FPPP passages because they both treat evaluating teaching. This language presents additional language about the types of documentation that can be used for review of teaching effectiveness which ay be included in the Personnel Action File (PAF).

Paiva moved to strike the first two sentences of the second paragraph of 9.1.2.c.1 and add the following language:

~~“ At least one classroom visit resulting in a peer evaluation of teaching shall take place each review year. At the discretion of the Personnel Committee, Department Chair, or upon the candidates’ petition, a classroom visit resulting in a peer evaluation of teaching performance shall occur more frequently, (see FPPP Section 8.1).~~

The candidate is not alone in this process; as stated above, it is each Department's/Unit's responsibility to assist the candidate in building the evidentiary basis, in this case by providing peer reviews of teaching during the regular course of each academic year. Colleagues should visit classes and provide developmental and evaluative feedback. The records of these visits should be included in the candidate's WPAF. Peer evaluation of instruction is not limited to departmental colleagues, of course; the candidate may request a visit by anyone who is qualified to comment on some aspect of instructional effectiveness. For example, one visitor may be well versed in classroom communication techniques, while another may focus on the content of the instructor's presentation. Classroom visitations can be initiated by the candidate or the University (see FPPP 8.1.1.e)."

Paiva said this addressed the inconsistency of language about classroom observations between Lecturer faculty and Tenure-Track faculty. For Lecturer faculty the language about Peer observations is that they shall be included in the WPAF and for Tenure-Track faculty the FPPP says they may be included.

She added that this amendment underlines that departments and colleges will be consistent between all faculty and assist all of them in adding evidence to their PAF's.

Larson said she is not concerned about the amendment's following the CBA, she was more concerned as a point of order that extensive amendments need the benefit of moving through the more deliberate process of conversation and consultation with FASP before being brought forward in the eleventh hour. Such significant changes can impact every member of the faculty.

She noted that there are these discrepancies in the way Peer evaluations are conducted relative to probationary faculty, but it is very unclear about the place of classroom visits for faculty who are Tenured Associates, but who are interested in moving up to Full Professors. This is not being addressed at all with this language.

Sistrunk noted that the last line of the amendment recognizes that the University can initiate a classroom observation which is true, but the CBA requires a five-day notice and consultation before this can happen.

Millard said he liked the language that accommodates innovative pedagogy that might be outside one's department members understanding and it promotes faculty experimenting with inclusive pedagogies in ways we would like to support.

Ford asked the FASP Chair what kind of discussion FASP may have engaged in about this topic and whether it could be brought back later if we do not pass it now. Underwood said

the inconsistency between Peer evaluations was not treated in FASP, but was uncovered at Senate in this section of the FPPP. The changes could return to FASP and go through the full process if they did not pass today.

Shepherd thought the language should return to FASP for more careful vetting since it was so significant, the first sentence did not really seem like policy language.

Underwood noted that the language Paiva suggested was the exact same language applied to evaluations of Probationary faculty elsewhere in the FPPP so there is consistency.

Underwood moved an amendment to the amendment to add more to the parenthetical at the end with a reference that will cover the procedure of notifying faculty five days before a peer observation can take place “(see FPPP 8.1.1.e).”

The amendment to the amendment to add “(see FPPP 8.1.1.e)” passed: with 15 yeah, and 11 nay.

Boyd returned to the whole amendment. The amendment to strike and replace passed: 19 yeah, and 7 nay.

Seipel asked if the plural “Colleagues” in line 2 of the second paragraph of FPPP 9.1.2.c.1 changed practice and required multiple people to visit classrooms. Underwood did not believe it did since it is the same language used elsewhere in the FPPP where it does not change practice.

Action item passed: 25 yeah, and 0 nay.

[Biobreak was called for three minutes to return at 4:15]

11. Proposed changes to [SET Form U](#) – FASP – Action Item [1:43: 22-1:50:53]

- **Supplemental information – [SET Form U messaging preamble](#) and [suggested revisions](#)**

Underwood reminded everyone that this FASP item was developed by the University Student Evaluation of Teaching Committee (USET) to revise and add to the standard university instrument. She addressed some questions and comments from the last meeting.

- A rubric was not utilized to develop this as it is an attempt to update the old form
- The USET EM has some parameters to establish process so that questions are formative and faculty can improve teaching and learning
- This instrument is supposed to gather data for inclusion in the PAF

- Some of the changes made were to accommodate faculty as we moved to fully online teaching and some questions can be used as a window onto online learning environments
- Some areas covered by the questions have been relabeled
- USET and FASP considered questions as they relate to teaching effectiveness and changing trends in teaching
- There was some consideration for maintaining consistency with the previous Form U to continue long-term measurable data of teaching
- This instrument has not been validated just as the original form U was not
- If this is approved today it will be the standard University instrument starting use in Spring 2021
- Over the Spring the USET committee will continue to evaluate and possibly emend this instrument and perhaps return through the Senate process again

Underwood noted that Kate McCarthy (Dean of Undergraduate Education) is here to help answer questions as she is also on the USET committee.

Boyd asked for any amendments to the form as it is an Action item. She called all the members to vote.

Action item passed: 32 yeah, 0 nay.

Hutchinson requested that she and Larson be allowed to comment on her rejection of the Academic Senate resolution requesting that faculty be allowed to opt out of SETs and Peer Observations this academic year as she and cabinet members had to attend other meetings today.

It was moved and seconded to move this item to item 12 on the agenda. The vote was unanimous in favor.

12. Resolution on SETs and Peer Observations follow up – Discussion Item

[Resolution requesting President Hutchinson, in an emergency circumstance, to exercise executive authority to allow faculty to selectively opt-in to inclusion of Student Evaluations of Teaching \(SET\) and peer observations in the CSU, Chico Faculty Personnel Action File \(PAF\) during the Academic Year 2020-2021](#) [1:53:41-2:43:09]

Boyd asked if Paiva wanted to speak about what she hoped to discuss. Paiva said that several of her constituents reached out to her to ask for clarification about the President's decision. Faculty found it difficult to understand why we are not being provided grace when we have worked very hard to do this for our students.

Hutchinson recognized that there was strong faculty support for this resolution to make an exception and she said that it was difficult to come back and disappoint people. She hoped that faculty would not think in any way that she is not aware of the severe challenge and struggle that is going on with our students, faculty and staff, and she is in no way trying to create a punitive action on top of something that is so significant that we are all dealing with in our lives.

She hoped people would understand that she and the Provost did not make this decision lightly and they always have the best interests of faculty in mind. She wanted to give the context in which this decision was made.

- When the ASCSU passed their resolution in support of this idea this Fall it came on her radar.
- When FASP made their recommendation to extend this exception in Chico through this academic year on October 22, she and Larson began to consider it more seriously. They decided to examine the question independently.
- Hutchinson said that she consulted with Presidential colleagues, with the Human Resources Department of the Chancellor's Office, the Chancellor and Loren Blanchard. She also examined the CBA article 15:15 and the FPPP and other information
- She focused on the first three resolution clauses that addressed her specifically. The first one suggested that she had the ability to grant a choice to faculty to include their SETs and Peer Observations in their PAF. The second clause noted that faculty could view the comments of Students in their SETs even if they were not included in the PAF. The third endorsed the ASCSU resolution to suspend inclusion of these.
- She summarized the other clauses

Hutchinson said she then consulted with the Provost who had her own recommendation which the President accepted because it coincided with her own conclusions. This is why when she issued her own response to the appeal that she included Larson's response as well.

She said she has high respect for faculty, but she was trying to comply with the CBA. She knew there would be disagreement about this. She did not want us to be in direct conflict with Article 15:15 of the CBA. She said she also gave consideration that this is a year we are in bargaining about the CBA with the CFA union.

She wanted to underline that in her experience in class and as an administrator, that the SETs are very important for us to be able to hear from students about what is actually going on. She knew that we should not give excessive weight to SETs and that everyone involved from the personnel committees, the Chair, administrators or anyone involved knows this.

She added that Peer Observations are important as well because it is easy to compartmentalize education and an outside observer can add needed perspective and provide conversation. Both of these practices are supposed to allow faculty to reflect on and improve on their practice and craft so that they can help students learn more effectively.

She said that the pandemic has spotlighted the problems with these evaluation tools and the fact that FASP is working to improve them is very positive and the way to move forward. We will continue with the SET process and Peer Observations as they are.

Beside the statement included in everyone's PAF negotiated between OPAL and CFA, Hutchinson wanted every SET and Peer Evaluation to be labeled across the top of their pages with this statement "All reviewers shall consider the context of disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic for student evaluations of teaching and peer reviews during 2020-2021 academic year." She thought this would mean that anyone reviewing the file ever after would know that during that particular SET and that particular Peer Observation that it was done in the middle of a pandemic.

This will give reviewers a heads up and remind them of context. She encouraged faculty to add information to their narratives about their teaching philosophies and reflect on their experience through this pandemic. There is an opportunity for the faculty to ground their information in a context. She asked Provost Larson to weigh in if she liked.

Larson just wanted to add a few brief comments:

- In her recommendation to Hutchinson, Larson made reference to the Student Town Hall data. She reminded everyone that there were questions about how students were adjusting to Online education and she thought this showed they were thinking deeply and being thoughtful about it.

Their description of their challenges do not blame faculty for the quality of the online classroom experiences, but there is much more emphasis on other problems like lack of access to the library, learning styles, platform issues and not having enough band-width. She thought generally speaking that their feedback would be appropriate to the context in which we all find ourselves.

- Larson reported that she had heard from the GI 2025 committee who have been putting together student and faculty experiences with online learning. Students are demonstrating similar discernment about the context we are all working in
- Larson also consulted with the Labor Relations folks in the CSU about their interpretation of CBA 15:15. The Labor experts in the CSU are dedicated to upholding the CBA and that is the administrators' job. If they do not adhere to the contract requirements our system will break down. She said she and Hutchinson tried very hard to thread the needle. She did not want to be punitive at all but wanted to find the space to be helpful.

Boyd recognized many who had comments to share:

- Paiva asked Hutchinson if she wanted the statement she read automatically appended to SETs and Peer Observations or merely “encouraged it” as the email message sent to all faculty seemed to imply. Hutchinson said that she chose her words to say that she “encouraged” the practice.
- Paiva said we need to look at the data about SETs more
- Paiva wondered if CBA 15:15 itself needed to be changed to make things easier to administer. Hutchinson thought there was a lot we could do internally with our own processes. The variation in the way SETs and Peer Observations are evaluated and the experience faculty have with them can span from a magnificent developmental opportunity to an unproductive exercise suffered through.
- Ford noted that it is a high-pressure circumstance when there is a unanimous faculty and an ASCSU state-wide sentiment making the same request. He observed that actions speak louder than words and there are not many tools in the tool-box to show appreciation to faculty. The Chico administration seems to be saying that the CBA is an impediment. He noted that SF State policy for this year is making SETs optional. Did our administrator research figure out how they were able to do this?
- Hutchinson said it comes back to the interpretation of the CBA and she believes that there would be domino effects if we vary from it. She said most campuses are not allowing this. She thought it would have been helpful to hear from the Chancellor’s Office immediately after the ASCSU resolution. She hoped our work on changing SETs and Peer Observations and RTP in general can continue with the Chairs and the Deans and the personnel committees to develop the review process as constructive and an opportunity to grow in the future.
- Holbert said that students at CSSA had expressed that they don’t feel like they have a space where they can communicate outside of the SETs. Many of her colleagues were upset as they thought this was a way for faculty to get out of improving course work. She expressed that this is a pandemic and that faculty are working very hard through this and would not have been brought this up unless faculty were trying to lessen the stress of the circumstances. Her opinion was not popular, but she thought Chico had its own culture and we will continue to look for ways to support our faculty.
- Irish noted that he is an untenured faculty member and does not have the safety of tenure. He said “disappointment” does not capture his feelings about this decision. He said he felt disregarded.
- He was concerned because we managed to join a MOU to suspend SETs and Peer Observations last Spring because we switched to online education. This semester just today, we had more people killed from COVID than on 9/11. This cannot be business as usual, but somehow we cannot figure out a way to have some understanding for our faculty.

- Hutchinson asked if the opportunity to collect SETS from students and Peer Observations from colleagues who know what you are going through makes him feel disregarded.
- Irish said this has impact on his potential for employment going forward. This information will become part of his permanent file and as she noted, these things are not always used in the fairest of manners. He explained that he had experience where they were not used fairly. He noted that senator Holbert had shared information where students were feeling extremely negative about their online experiences. He did not think helpful observations could come from these circumstances.
- Hutchinson thought that SETs could still be valuable to tell where the student is coming from how they are interpreting what the instructor hoped they would see. She hoped people would recognize that Hutchinson decided to keep closely aligned to the CBA but make sure that the exercise is useful or figure out how to improve it moving forward. She hoped people could use their narratives to capture the full context of what their circumstances were.
- Sistrunk noted that there is a lot to say, but he wanted to reiterate something he had already explained in the senate before. The SETs and the Peer Observations were already administered, and the faculty member can see them. The plan was not to include them in the PAF unless the faculty member chose it. We are not talking about silencing student voices, or the ability of faculty to learn, we were just talking about including them in the personnel file.
- Smith wanted to caution people about using the survey taken at the Town Hall as a justification for making decisions about SETS and Student opinion. The survey was about something completely different that had nothing to do with employee's jobs. It had nothing to do about how students felt about their input. Smith distributed his own survey and found that students did not know that SETS could affect faculty employment and he did not think students would want their feedback to be used this way. He said it showed how we need to think of better ways to get student input about new modalities.
- Hutchinson said that the Student survey did not affect her decision at all, and she thought that was not the way the Provost had described it either. She agreed that it is hard to get student feedback. Larson added that her point about the survey was that it made her think that students are able to effectively discern and separate out the challenges they are facing from the faculty delivering the courses. She also supported trying to find other ways for students to give feedback beyond SETs.
- Bailey did not think that any of his colleagues believe that students could not respond to appropriately, but the data shows that historically that that does not happen for other reasons. The work of changing our SET instruments because they disproportionately skew against women and faculty of color and unrepresented minorities will demonstrate how deeply we are committed to inclusion and disassembling racism and pursuing social justice. He thought continuing the use of the SETs was more than just a policy decision.

- Hutchinson said that she had decided not to allow faculty to opt in to this choice, but we can begin to have the discussions we need to be having around all of this. She said she considered this conversation the beginning of how we deal with these broader issues so that we can find inclusive pathways forward. She wanted reiterate that her decision does not mean she does not regard the faculty.

Boyd verified that we still had a quorum of 33 of the necessary 27 members

13. Proposed [Policy for the Campus Climate Survey Committee](#) – FASP – Action Item

[2:43:09-3:50:34]

- [Appendix A: Campus Climate Survey \(CCS\) response data analysis](#)
- [Revised document with collection of amendments for consideration and clean version](#)

Underwood moved to consider the collection of amendments to this policy that were prompted by comments from the last meeting. Seconded. She described the changes suggested:

- Under Membership bullet two and bullet four were altered so that there is consistency between the designation of MPP members and non-MPP members
- Under Membership Terms the phrase “~~ad-hoc~~” is removed from line three
- In the section on page 3, Developing the survey instrument, paragraph two, line six, the word “~~questions~~” is struck and the word “terms” is added.
- In the same section paragraph three, line two, the words “~~and approval~~” are struck because the second paragraph defines the approval process

The amended document was passed: 33 yeah, 0 nay.

Smith moved to change every instance where “Campus Climate Survey Committee” is used to “Employee Climate Survey Committee”. He said he did some research on other campuses and noted that they had climate committees, but they named them as treating employees. He pointed out that Sonoma State named their climate committee this and he thought it was more accurate.

Seipel asked if student employees completed this survey. Boyd said if a student was a staff employee this survey is distributed to them. Parsons-Ellis said that student employees receive all the mandatory training all employees do, and these surveys would go out to them as well.

The amendment was passed: 34 yeah, 0 nay.

Under Membership Seipel moved to add “One voting student employee member who is appointed by the Student Academic Senate”” to the bulleted list. Seconded.

The language was considered further:

- Ferrari asked if we needed to clarify the specific type of student employee because there may be those who are not employed for an entire year, for example, and it may be too vague for the choice of a student.
- Trailer wondered about how the changing number of committee members would alter the majority threshold in the committee too much, so it was easier to pass measures
- Underwood noted that FASP had already addressed this question on page 3 in the section on Developing the survey instrument in the last line of paragraph two where they only called for a simple majority to make changes and did not number this specifically
- Holbert said she was a student employee of the College of Agriculture for three years and this was typical as students are often chosen early in their education so that they are around for a while. She also thought the Student Academic Senate could make an informed decision about who was suitable to serve.
- Holbert moved to make an amendment to the amendment by moving that “Two voting student employee members who are appointed by the Student Academic Senate” be added to the committee. Seconded
- Irish pointed out that adding another member would bring the committee to ten. Mathematically, as we add more members buy-in from multiple constituency representatives will become more complex.
- Underwood noted that the student members should be plural.

The amendment to the amendment passed: 21 yeah, 7 nay.

The original amendment was considered:

- Snyder thought the senate should specify the type of employee they specifically want (like “University student employee” as opposed to “AS student employee”) if they do not want this broader language
- Seipel thought the broader language was fine
- Underwood had some concern about adding two student representatives to the committee if they are not included in the survey. If they are not, is this easily done? Who takes the survey and how it is delivered and tabulated?
- Brooke Banks (Chief of Staff) said she spoke with Matt Thomas who was integrally involved in conducting the survey in the past and he said student employees were not included. The number of staff and administrators who had the opportunity to take the survey in 2018 was 1,007. There are currently over 1000 student employees.
- Kaiser spoke against the amendment. It is made in the spirit of inclusion, but the work of this committee is often extremely technical, there can be much conflict around it, and it

may only convene every three years. Not many student employees would have the experience or framework to make informed decisions on the committee. She thought student employee feedback on the survey would be valuable but they would not normally be involved for a suitable time.

- Irish joined Kaiser in opposing the amendment. The original committee was drawn up to represent the faculty, historically recognized staff and administrators.
- Holbert thought we were missing a large group of employees if we cut this representation. Sending a survey out to student employees would render valuable information and could contribute to the type of information we have said we want to collect in this survey from diverse perspectives.
- Boyd noted that there is a student survey distributed called the NESSI though this does not necessarily ask about employment.
- Ferrari said she was impacted by the information from Brooke Banks. She was already under the impression that the survey already went to student employees and this would affect her vote.
- Smith explained that the NESSI is a national survey conducted about student engagement that is specifically directed at Freshmen and graduating Seniors. This does not necessarily point to student employees.
- Paiva said she was very disturbed that student employees have not been included in this survey. These employees are absolutely vital to his institution and are in our everyday lives. She said for over two years only student employees were running the Sociology Office day to day. They are critical to our mission and can serve for two or four years. Whatever we can do to include them in the survey should be done, and we can worry about membership on this committee later if need be.

Boyd called the vote on the amendment to add two student employees to the committee membership. This amendment did not pass: 8 yeah, 19 opposed.

Consideration returned to the amended main motion.

Allen did not understand what was meant by “staff administrators” in bullet four of the section on Membership. Underwood did not strike the phrase as she did not know if it should read “staff administrators (MPP)”. Allen asked if there were staff MPP positions. Brooke Banks said that all administrators were MPPs and all MPPPs were administrators.

Paiva moved to amend the first sentence under the section Conducting the survey (page 3) to add the designation student employees.

“The target population of the Employee Climate Survey shall be the campus staff, faculty, student employees and administrators.” Seconded.

Paiva spoke to her motion and noted that student employees are almost 1000 in number who provide critical and daily services and serve sometimes long term, so that their experiences are vital to consider.

Sistrunk said that in the survey employee types can be distinguished for analysis

Paiva's amendment passed: 31 yeah and 1 nay.

Allen moved to strike the word "staff" from bullet four of the section on Membership (page 2). Seconded. She explained that Administrators are not staff and this is confusing.

Allen's amendment passed: 30 yeah, 0 nay.

Under the paragraph titled Terms (page 2), Allen moved to strike the last sentence of the first paragraph: "Members shall serve three-year terms with the ability to serve consecutive terms." Seconded

Allen observed that this is redundant with the first sentence of the paragraph.

Allen's amendment passed: 30 yeah, 2 nay.

Under the paragraph titled Terms (page 2), Irish moved to strike the word "voting" from the first sentence. Seconded. Irish wanted to be sure the language was inclusive of voting and non-voting members.

Irish's amendment passed: 31 yeah, 0 nay.

Wright asked for clarification. We just voted to include student employees in the Climate Survey. Can we vote again on the motion to include student employees on the committee. Boyd answered that in Robert's rules, in order to avoid constant revisiting of things already determined in a meeting, once a motion is voted down it cannot be revisited then.

Paiva asked if it was a different motion if we only proposed 1 student employee representative instead of two. Boyd decided this was acceptable as a new motion. The Chair can be challenged and we would vote to uphold the Chair's decision or not.

Kaiser objected to the Chair and said that this committee can represent an extreme workload.

Boyd thought the vote needed to be a majority to overturn the Chair. The members remaining were 31. 21 favored up-holding the Chair and 9 opposed it which means the

Chair's ruling stands.

Under Membership (page 2) Wright moved to add "One voting student employee member who is appointed by the Student Academic Senate"" to the bulleted list. Seconded.

Wright argued that with this clarification that we are now assessing the student employees, it is important to have them represented on the survey committee itself.

Responses were made:

- Ferrari was still concerned as the terms of service for members of the committee are defined as three years and she did not believe this was realistic.
- Kaiser thought service on this committee could become exploitive because she thought most student employees are working to help fund their education. This committee represents a time-consuming unpaid responsibility and could put someone in a risky position.
- Irish supported Kaiser and noted that all the work of creating the survey was a very labor intensive process and interaction with the committee and data will be required for hours at a time.
- Smith said that there are a lot of unpaid responsibilities in student leadership but it is a part of getting the necessary student input into committees. If a member of the committee must drop out, they can be replaced
- Snyder did not think the argument that this is a lot of work is a valid reason for taking away a seat at the table.
- Holbert agreed with Smith and Snyder and added that she thought students were very competent in choosing the work they should be involved with.

Wright's amendment passed: 23 yeah, 8 nay.

In the section Developing the survey instrument (page 3), line 7, Irish moved to change the wording to strike the words "the majority" to add the word "2/3rds". Seconded. Irish said the design of the committee was to make sure that all the constituents represented there had a voice in changing the instrument. The committee is now nine members and this would require six people to be in accord to change things which would make sure the decision drew from at least three of the constituent groups.

The Irish amendment passed: 30 yeah, 0 nay.

The Action item passed: 32 yeah, 0 nay.

That completes the last action item of 2020!

14. Associated Students Report – Holbert/Snyder [3:50:46-3:51:02]

Holbert said that there was nothing to report.

15. [Staff Council Report](#) – Peterson [3:51:02-3:51:16]

Boyd noted that Staff Council's Report is attached.

16. Standing Committees Reports [3:51:16-3:51:22]

- **Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Allen**
- **Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Underwood**
- **Committee on Committees – Paiva**
- **[Executive Committee](#) – Sistrunk**

Sistrunk admitted that the report was attached.

17. Statewide Academic Senate [Report](#) – Ford/Boyd <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/> [3:51:23-3:51:53]

- ASCSU [Agendas](#), [Minutes](#), [Resolutions](#), & [Summaries](#)
- CSU Board of Trustees, Faculty Trustee [reports](#) and recent [Nov. 2020 report](#)

Ford said the reports are attached. There are resolutions to look at especially the resolution about pushing back on CO Ethnic Studies requirements.

18. University Reports – Hutchinson/Larson/Sherman/Boura/Parsons [3:52:02-3:52:22]

- **[17 Nov. 2020 presentation](#) of CSU, Chico Master Plan to CSU Board of Trustees Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds**

Boyd pointed out that there is a link provided to the Chico presentation of our Master Plan at the Board of Trustees.

19. Ask the Administrator [3:52:22-3:55:01]

Boyd wondered if there were any questions the Senate could collect to Ask the Administrators about later?

Kaiser said that Jason Dorsey, an expert on generational research, noted that generation Z has always grown up with social media and this aligns with the remarks our students made about expanding university communications into different types of social media. Dorsey also said that this generation does not tend to go beyond social media when looking for data and information.

This will impact vaccine distribution and information gathering.

20. Other [3:55:02-3:56:23]

Boyd hoped everyone would go and practice some self-care over the next few weeks.

She thought everyone should be proud of the complete change we have made to everything we do and how we do it at the University. We had no choice but to change, and we have.

She said: “Thank you all for your commitment to the mission and for your service and for your senate service.”

21. Adjourn [3:56:23]

The meeting adjourned at 6:29.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary