

California State University, Chico

Academic Senate
(530) 898-6201, Zip 020
MEMORANDUM

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, December 3, 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 (Gruber), Morales-Sanchez, Ormond, Paiva, Peterson, Schartmueller, Seipel, Shepherd, Sherman, Sistrunk, Smith, Snyder, Son, Sparks, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood, Wright

ABSENT: Boura, Hutchinson, Hidalgo, Musvocvi, Parsons-Elis, Perez

Boyd began to welcome people to the ZOOM meeting and encouraged Senators to note that they are senators on the participants window and guests to note that. 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 of October 22, 2020 & November 5, 2020](#) [4:10-9:50]

Attendance and proxy errors were corrected.

Both sets of amended minutes were approved

2. Approve Agenda [10:06-10:20]

Agenda was approved.

3. Announcements [10:21-11:31]

- **[Friday Forum: Podcasting for Learning & Teaching](#) – Ferrari, FDEV Director**
Ferrari noted that the Friday Forum will be held at 10:30 tomorrow and that Vice Chair Paiva will be among the presenters.
- **[FDEV Spring 2021 Programs](#) – Ferrari, FDEV Director**

Ferrari highlighted that there is an open call for all the Spring 2021 programs. This will include an FLC on closing the equity gaps that will use the faculty dash board; and FLC on digital pedagogy, a faculty writing community, and the Quality Learning and Teaching workshops.

Boyd skipped to item 4 because it was a time certain item and then returned to Announcements after the Chair's Prerogative [29:10-35:25]

- Governor Newsom announced a lockdown today that will not impact schools that are open to in person instruction.
- Mike Guzzi said the EOC will send out information about the Governor's announcement later today. It does not directly impact our staff and faculty working conditions because education is still considered part of the critical infrastructure of the region.
- **EO 1100 Revision published – Boyd**
 - i. [EO 1100R](#) and [Attachment A](#), [EO 1100 policy website](#), [LJB Letter on campus feedback](#)

Boyd explained that the links in the agenda above deal with the CO letter about how AB1460: Ethnic Studies should be implemented on the campuses. There is also a letter about how the units fall out in the General Education program in the CSU and the response of Loren Blanchard to the campus feedback received about the CO plans. This will be discussed in future Senate meetings and will have implications for senate business.

4. **Chair's Prerogative** [11:32-29:09]

- **Supporting first responders – Mike Guzzi, time certain 2:40 pm**

Boyd introduced Mike Guzzi (Associate Vice President, Facilities and Management Services) to speak about campus efforts to support the First responders fighting the North Complex Fire

Mike Guzzi explained that he is the new Chair the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) which leads the planning and operations on campus during the pandemic and for other campus and regional emergency efforts. To illustrate our community participation, he noted that up to 100 first-responders were supported in the residence halls through October and later-November.

This weekend, we also will also support drills of emergency personnel repelling off buildings and being flown by helicopter to assembly points.

Boyd was grateful for the news about our participation in helping the people responding to the disasters in our area.

- **[CSU, Chico Master Plan](#) – Mike Guzzi & Jenna Wright**

- i. **[Master Plan website](#)**

Mike Guzzi wanted to report that our Physical Master Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees November 17. He introduced Jenna Wright who is the senior capital planner for the campus, and he congratulated her for all the behind the scenes hard work she did to bring the plan across the finish line. The project started back in 2018 and endured through fire, flood and pandemic to complete this plan. The Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report aligns with the President's Strategic plan and the physical build out of the university for 10-15 years.

At the Board of Trustees, community representatives spoke out.

1. The City Manager of Chico
2. Associated Students President
3. Members from the Chico community
4. Members of CARD

55 letters of support from alumni were also offered.

It presents a unifying vision for the campus for the future and a driver of student success. [Slide 3] shows the six principles guiding our planning framework

[Slide 4] The focus of the plan is the Hub or historical core of campus with spokes out to the surrounding town and university education, culture, and student wellness areas.

[Slide 5] shows campus boundaries now and the build out to 2030. The chart shows new construction, renovation, and community partnerships (mostly 2535 Main). We hope to put in a hotel and convention center and long term, put in a residence hall in the Rio Chico neighborhood.

This plan will commence next Spring and follow in sequence.

SEQUENCE

1. Demo Physical Science Building [Slide 6]
2. Construct Butte II [Slide 7] Natural Science will be taken out of the Science Building and a new building will be designed for BSS (over the next year and 1/2 - 2022)
3. Relocate Butte Program to Butte II [Slide 8]
4. Renovate Butte (Modest Renovation) [Slide 9]
5. Relocate Glenn Hall Program
6. Demo & Build Glenn II [Slide 10]
7. Move AJH & Modoc Program to Butte [Slide 11]
8. Build Modoc II [Slide 12]

This is a long-term plan, and shorter term the old Science building will be demoed out and Butte II built in the next few years.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", First line: 0"

The full Master Plan report is linked to the agenda and on the FMS website with the accompanying EIR.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

He paused for questions:

- There was a question about the use of Neal Road for the back of campus with connections to three schools. Many private four-story housing units are going up in this neighborhood and what was the assessment of managing traffic on Highway 32? Mike Guzzi answered that Chico state cooperates with the city and will continue to work with the Chico planning commission. He said he would like to be part of the solutions to timing traffic release from the schools and campus and other projects.

Sherman wanted to publicly recognize the work that Mike Guzzi and Jenna Wright have done. This was quite complex work involving state regulators, input from the campus and surrounding community from a variety of stake-holders, the CO, and state agencies. This required a great deal of effort and they handled it masterfully.

Everyone unmuted to applaud Mike and Jenna across the virtual skies.

5. **[Proposed Resolution requesting President Hutchinson to exercise authority under CBA Article 15.15 to reduce Student Evaluations of Teaching \(SET\) inclusion in the CSU, Chico faculty Personnel Action File \(PAF\) during the Academic Year 20-21 – Action Item \[35:25-57:58\]](#)**

- **[Substitute document](#)**

Boyd noted that there is what we at Chico State call a substitute document that is actually a collection of amendments. It was move and seconded to accept the substitute document.

Sistrunk gave a rationale to accept the proposed substitute document. He pointed out that the deep

conversation we had at the last Senate meeting appear in this revised resolution and the two meetings before that when we spoke about SETs all informed the revisions to this document. Many senators will recognize their own words.

Motion passed. 36, yea, 0, nay.

Sistrunk explained that this resolution is not really to invoke the technicalities of the CBA. There is precedent to appeal to the President about mitigating SETs in particular and during

catastrophic times which are here right now. As we think about the seriousness of our teaching lives for our students, administrators, our staff, this gesture of charity that the individual faculty can decide if the SETs go into their permanent file is suitable.

Larson said that the FPPP does not actually require Peer observations (it says “when” these are used). The department Standards require these observations.

Larson said that footnote #5 of the Resolution that a number of campuses are allowing this exception is untrue because actually only two.

Underwood asked whether FPPP 9.1.2.c. which says for Lecturers at least one peer classroom visit shall take place each year resulting in a peer evaluation. It seems to be saying we must have a peer evaluation. Larson said this seems to be a conflict in the FPPP. She said FPPP 8.1.4.h says “When” peer evaluations are used which seems to say that for regular faculty this is only required when the department asserts it.

Ford thought we should leave the wording that suggests more than two campuses are offering this choice about putting SETs in the faculty PAF because his information is that other campuses are in the process of endorsing this type of deferral and the current wording is more appropriate. Larson asked that the CSU’s that are actually doing this exception can be cited in the notes. Boyd asked if there were any objections to this. She will do it after the meeting is the measure passes.

The resolution requesting President Hutchinson allow faculty the option of putting the SETs in their PAF for F20-Sp21 passed. 33 yea, 0 “nay”

Boyd skipped to the time certain Item 16.

16. 2022-2023 [Faculty/Staff Calendar](#) and [Academic Calendar](#) – EPPC – Discussion Item, Guests: Robin Yant, Tang Lor, Holly Ferguson [57:01-1:21:45]

Boyd introduced Robin Yant (Assistant Director, Academic Personnel), Tang Lor, (Office of Academic Personnel), and Holly Ferguson (Admin. Analyst, Specialist, Academic Publications & Scheduling Services).

Robin Yant discussed the current suggested revisions to the [2022-23 Faculty/Staff Calendar](#). The difficulties with scheduling are caused by several issues. On the day that grades are due, faculty must be paid. The due date for grades was December 21 or May 23. In an attempt to move this day back and give faculty more time to grade, the calendar will show two days that are not work-days (Dec 21,22/May 24/25). And then the grades can be turned in on that Friday (Dec. 23/May 26).

Departments might still schedule something on that last day (if they choose), but it is a way to pay faculty for their grading work. The Provost supports this idea.

Allen reported that EPPC was very favorable to this idea of splitting the workdays with non-workdays. The faculty would be paid on the lasy day and turn in grades in a reasonable time. Robin Yant said this change has no impact on daily rates or foundation reimbursement.

Allen also said that EPPC supported the notion of naming the older “Columbus Day” (October 10) as “Indigenous People’s Day”. Robin Yant said the President had just approved this change. She also said that if the Governor gives the extra half day before the Christmas Holiday that will be taken on the 30th of December. The date that the CSU adds to the half day the Governor grants off varies about when it will be taken off. It is not always possible to take in on the 30th of December but it will be on a Thursday or Friday

Larson reminded everyone that the last day to submit grades used to be far beyond the end of the actual faculty contracted workdays (this violates labor law). The other consequence of older practice was that students were not able to get their grades in a timely fashion and the deadline kept creeping further back. Students need transcripts for graduate programs, professional exams to be certified in certain fields and licensing.

Boyd also reminded senators that the Senate had a role to play to give faculty feedback and concerns about the calendar. Many eyes and constituent groups view these because they are complex documents.

Academic Calendar 2022-23

Holly Ferguson explained the Academic Calendar which she said describes the student life-cycle version of the calendar though HR and OPAL are closely consulted so that dates align and match all the rules we must abide by. This calendar has benefited from comments of EPPC, FASP and Senate and other groups and is in an experimental form:

- It is in actual date order (the old calendar was split into seasonal terms)
- The calendar starts in the summer which is technically the beginning of the academic year
- There is an actual monthly calendar included in the righthand margin to show the weekly days
- The most important dates are highlighted (the start and end of classes, the holidays)
- Dates when grades are due are not entered yet because this conversation is still ongoing (since we just had part of it today and senate approval will go to Cabinet for the final step)

Holly Ferguson asked for feedback and questions:

- Wright said that staff hoped “Thanksgiving” could be called “Fall Recess” or “Fall Break”. Holly Ferguson thought it was possible for Chico to call this what we like. It designates the two day period when campus is closed.
- Sparks wondered if in the grey one could designate Nov.21-25 as “Fall Break. No classes held” and in the burgundy “November 24-25. Campus Closed”. Or can the information be included on one line?
- Peterson noted that campus is closed for staff on those two days and they need this clearly demarcated
- Herman was curious about the objection to having Thanksgiving on the calendar. McBride-Praetorius explained that this appellation is not thought to be respectful to Native American communities who view the day as portrayed inaccurately.
- Schartmueller suggested using the title “Fall Campus Closure” for those two days as parallel to “Winter Campus Closure” later in the calendar.

Boyd thought the changes to the Calendars were amazing and was impressed with all the suggestions that had been so eloquently integrated into these vast improvements.

Boyd returned to the regular agenda.

6. Proposed [New Minor in Secondary Language Arts](#) – EPPC – Introduction Item [1:21:46-1:31:13]

Allen explained that the English Department’s BA degree is being revised to come into compliance with EO 1071. (That EO requires that any options within a degree, not have more units than the core of the degree). To do this the English department had to remove 18 units from its option in English Education. These units were moved into this new minor in Secondary Language Arts.

This arrangement will allow this minor to help maintain its California Credential subject matter competence accreditation. This is great news for students wanting a credential from this program. The structure of the courses will allow students to accommodate their interests. The proposal was reviewed and approved by the ORTEC committee.

EPPC discussion was very favorable with a few suggestions that were accommodated. Peter Kittle,
Chair of the English Department is here to answer questions.

Introduction item passed, (33, yea; 0 nay)

Kaiser moved to suspend the rules and consider as an Action item. Seconded. She thought students would benefit from having this option clear. (35 yea, 0 nay)

Ford asked if any of the courses double-counted between the major and the option. Peter Kittle said there were none.

Action item passed. (35 yea, 0 nay)

A Biobreak was called

7. Proposed BS Agriculture Significant Change – EPPC – Introduction Item [1:32:40-45:57]

Allen this is another change coming forward because of EO 1071. Previously in this degree program there were 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 is an attempt to address this shortcoming.

The new degree will have a new option in Agricultural Communication and Leadership in partnership with the Department of Journalism and Public Relations and college of Communication Education. Throughout the state there is demand for junior high, high school and community college teachers as well as demand for candidates working in the field of Agricultural Communication. Chico State is only one of five universities in the State of California that prepares secondary agriculture teachers.

This proposal includes credential prerequisite courses in the degree. On pages 8-9 one can read how the option is utilized (subject matter competency, single-subject credential prerequisites, agriculture special credential, GE, or college of Agriculture requirements). At this time, there are no options for students in the North State to pursue options in Agricultural Communication. This will give a distinction in California but also nationally.

EPPC discussed the issues that some thought the unit load was too high. Items 8 and 9 below are the formal steps to implement these ideas.

Molly Aschenbrener (College of Agriculture) and Susan Wiesinger (Journalism and Public Relations) are here to answer questions. Molly Aschenberger was grateful for the review of the proposal and said that if objections were too great to the number of units, they had a backup plan about moving courses. But they had streamlined the proposal and thought it was

efficient. Susan added that some courses included in the program description were perhaps overly proscriptive and not necessary to include. The GE double-count classes went from 23 to 16 for each option which gives a cushion for transfer students.

Allen clarified that these possible changes are additions to the material already presented today. They might come forward at Action.

Kaiser wondered why we were not considering item 8 first which seems to be the definitive part of the new option. Allen answered that all the paperwork was interconnected and might have been considered in another order. Discussion of items 7 and 8 do blend together.

It was asked why the educational prerequisite courses were included in this program description.

Molly Aschenbrener said that these credential prerequisites were unclear to students and served in advising. This streamlines the program for students and guides them carefully through the courses they need to complete subject matter and credential prerequisites

Introduction item passed. (35 yea, 0 nay)

8. Proposed [New Option in Agriculture Communication and Leadership](#) – EPPC – Introduction Item [1:45:57-1:50:44]

Allen noted that this is an exciting opportunity for our University as there are many great professional career possibilities for our students especially because of where we are located in the state.

Susan Weisinger said that she had been working on this program since 2014. Right now, the major is 97 units (which is larger because of double-counts). These can be streamlined and worked into advising which would get the option down to 81 units.

Allen noted that some of the changes being discussed will be coming forward next week since discussion has been ongoing.

Introduction item passed. (34 yea, 0 nay)

9. Proposed [Name Change for BS Agriculture](#) – EPPC – Introduction Item [1:50:45-1:52:54]

Allen said this proposal suggests the name change from the BS in Agriculture to the BS in Agricultural Science which will be a better fit given the new range of options.

Introduction item passed. (34 yea, 0 nay)

10. Proposed [Grading Policy Resolution](#) – EPPC – Introduction Item [1:52:59-2:18:09]

Allen explained that this is a request that policies that created a credit/no credit option for students to choose be applied to Fall 2020 and this modified grading policy be applied each semester that virtual learning is applied predominately at the university in the semesters that follow. This resolution was drafted by the Associated Students to extend the policy passed in Spring 2020 in light of the continued impact of the global pandemic and wildfires earlier this semester.

The grading policy is very similar to what was done last Spring:

- All “F” grades will be automatically replaced with a “no credit” grade that will not be calculated in the students GPA
- Students will have the option to request that the “no credit” option can be revoked within one year or until their degree is awarded (whichever comes first)
- Students will have the option to change a “D” grade to a “no credit” grade after the grades were submitted
- Grading policies will be reconsidered every semester during the global pandemic or other natural disasters

EPPC was favorable to this request and proud that our students advocated for themselves.

Bre Holbert (AS President) was asked to add anything. She noted that students, faculty and staff are struggling right now and this accommodates these challenges. She was happy to answer questions about student struggles.

This resolution grows out of conversations with the California State Students Association (CSSA) leadership modelled after the faculty calls to modify how the SETs are implemented. Students would also like this kind of protection in their own course work because of all the issues (wildfire, pandemic, moving back home, affordability issues, family issues, work/education balance). Similar resolutions are being proposed across the CSU.

Karjl will move that this policy be extended to remain in effect in the SP21 when it comes to action so we don’t have to revisit it in the Spring.

Michael Allen (University Registrar) underlined that his Office does support the resolution and is ready to implement it if it is enacted. He wanted to express some important concerns:

- University withdrawals are up 41% this year

- Many students made this decision because they thought the University had already made the decision about grading policy this semester
- It is an unintended consequence that these students might be disenfranchised who might have stuck with the university work if they had known this was going to be an option

Larson hoped she could see this data offline.

If students are given lots of information about the ramifications of this policy, Sistrunk supported the motion to give people the most options to make their way through catastrophic events.

Introduction item passed. (36, yea, 0 nay)

Motion to suspend the rules and consider the resolution as an Action item was moved and seconded.

- Holbert wanted to thank everyone for the contributions they made to the resolution and especially EPPC
- Ford wondered what the advantage was to passing this today and taking the seven days of deliberation away. Holbert said the intention was to give the Registrar time to implement this and communicate to students
- Paiva said that students are just this week submitting withdrawal requests and would like them to have complete information as soon as possible
- Teague-Miller supported what the Registrar said that students are already making the decision to withdraw and this would reduce the number of them who feel disenfranchised by such a decision without all the information
- Boyd explained that tis is a recommendation that would go to the Executive Committee briefly and ultimately to the President for implementation as soon as possible. Seipel thought these brief extra steps prompted the Senate to act today so that the measures are as timely as possible
- Teague-Miller thought the Senate vote today would express our sense of urgency about this act of compassion that we think it should be done as soon as possible

The motion passed.

Krajl moved to definitively extend this policy through the SP21 semester. She explained that COVID circumstances will not change radically. Seconded. Krajl said wherever the policy language says F20 it should be amended to read "AY20-21". She noted that we are all struggling and these are unprecedented times within our lifetimes. It seems wise to address the question now.

The motion passed (35 yea, 0 nay)

Action item passed. (36 yea, 0 nay)

11. Proposed changes to [FPPP 3.1](#) – FASP – Introduction Item [2:08:13-2:24:14]

Underwood explained that this change to FPPP3.1 reflects and is consistent with the language of EM 15-010.

- The way the USET committee is constituted annually on May 15 is addressed
- The changes to the purpose of supporting student success and inclusive pedagogy, etc. is consonant with the EM

Boyd reminded everyone that voting about the FPPP is restricted to faculty only.

Introduction item passed. (27 yea, 0 nay)

12. Proposed changes to [FPPP 8.1.4.a](#) – FASP – Introduction Item [2:24:15-2:02:53]

Underwood explained that some of the language changes in this section are supporting EM 15-010.

- There are more than two purposes to administering the SETs
- We promote inclusive pedagogy
- And meaningful student input in their education
- The USET committee strongly encourages the use of online SETs in class (this has to do with the delivery of the SETs). The USET committee did research that administering SETs in class gets return rates comparable to in class paper surveys without wasting trees.
- The dates the SETs are administered is changed from the 11th-13th weeks to the 14th and 15th weeks

Seipel was unsure if SETs really measure developing innovative and inclusive pedagogy and he was unsure students would know this. Underwood said that this language was not for the students but speaks to how faculty evaluate the information they receive and apply its lessons to what they deliver. Sistrunk added that this language is not necessarily about what the student think but is part of an attempt to change the meaning of SETs since faculty evaluate each other based on this evidence as well.

Seipel thought the actual instruments might need to be altered to get at the success of inclusive pedagogy as a construct. Boyd suggested that Seipel may want to bring language forward at Action to capture his concerns.

Paiva asked what kind of research was done about the utility of SETs and their administration (who, when, where). Sistrunk noted that the EM includes documentation about research on SETs in its appendix.

Boyd suggested that Underwood check with the USET committee about the issues that were raised today.

Introduction item passed. (27 yea, 0 nay)

13. Proposed changes to [FPPP 9.1.2.c](#) and [FPPP 10.2.5.a](#) – FASP – Introduction Item

[2:32:54-2:38:05]

Underwood pointed out that the language of these two sections of the FPPP is identical. These passages provide examples of ways that faculty can demonstrate their teaching performance consistent with department standards beyond SETs.

Sistrunk noted that these ideas come from FASP conversations about SETs and also the recommendations of Michelle Morris for the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. He hoped people would take these as suggestions for departments to develop their own processes to gain different types of insight.

Introduction item passed. (27 yea, 0 no)

14. Proposed changes to [SET Form U](#) – FASP – Introduction Item [2:38:06-2:48:41]

a. Supplemental information – [SET Form U messaging preamble](#)

Since the hour was getting late, Boyd explained that if we lose a quorum, the meeting would automatically be adjourned and the items remaining would return to Senate next week as introduction items.

Underwood explained that this instrument had been amended by the USET Committee to include information suitable for online courses and will be implemented during the SP21 semester. USET deliberations included student consultation and active student participation. FASP discussion was also informed by student input and communication encouraged from the Student Academic Senate.

The USET and FASP committees remained careful to maintain the older questions currently on Form U for consistency and familiarity. Many questions remain the same as they were. Additional questions are intended to address course design and structure, communication and engagement in learning especially based on the current learning environment.

Underwood said that the goal of the USET committee moving forward in SP21 is to continue to consider the altered Form U and the best ways to implement it in AY21-22.

She explained that Senate is considering of this Form is to make it ready to utilize next semester as more sensitive to teaching and learning in our current circumstances.

Changes include:

- Section titles applied instead of numbers to organize the instrument
- The first two questions were added by USET (course structure is explained and navigable)
- Another addition: the instructor gives feedback in a timely manner
- The question about feedback was revised to add the word “meaningful”
- Also new: the instructor communicates deadlines, tasks, etc.
- New: the instructor is accessible though other means of communication
- An open-ended question was also added to the bottom of the Form

Underwood noted that many of the new questions were suitable for in person teaching, but they are still sensitive to the needs of virtual instruction as well.

Paiva asked if there was way to tell if the courses were online, or in person. Underwood said that this Form would accommodate IR so that they can implement the SETs in the Spring. Paiva wondered if we can add a question that has students self-identify what kind of course they are taking since there will be in person lab classes in the Spring. Underwood affirmed this possibility.

Seipel thought that the language that instructors will be accessible through other means of communication, should read “through multiple means....”

Boyd explained that the front facing preamble was not included as it may need to be changed. Underwood read the preamble and quoted that there is an addendum that can be added when necessary that reminds students that we are in a pandemic and circumstances are unusual.

Boyd emphasized that we are voting on the Form, not the preamble. The preamble will eventually change as circumstances do. She said Underwood is accepting feedback on the preamble if anyone wants to forward it.

Introduction item passed. (32 yea, 0 no)

Larson told everyone that the Cabinet is leaving the meeting because they have a COVID policy meeting at 5:30.

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

a. [Appendix A: Campus Climate Survey \(CCS\) response data analysis](#) [2:49:03-3:04:54]

Underwood announced that this was a new policy meant to establish the [Campus Climate Survey Committee](#) and spell out the parameters and procedures, mission, structure and membership, terms, ways to establish surveys as well as the charge of this committee.

She invited Trailer or Peter Owens (Institutional Research) to add any thoughts since they were on the subcommittee that continued the work of writing this EM this year. Trailer gave a shout out to Peter Owens and Senator Irish for their contributions. He observed that the Campus Climate Survey has been conducted multiple times and this is a chance to make the policy that has been governing the committee official and change a few things formally. FASP modified the policy and here it is.

Larson wondered if there could be some reference about consulting, comparing or examining our climate survey with other well-established surveys used elsewhere so that we provide a foundational element as opposed to just something we have been doing on our own. Boyd and Underwood agreed this might be something to add at Action.

Boyd noted that this EM is the result of a Presidential Charge to continue work that started in FASP last year and was facilitated this year by specific individuals and finished in FASP. The hope is to create a permanent committee structure to routinely implement the surveys in the future.

Horst asked about the rationale for administering the survey once every three years. Underwood said the EM establishes a timeline that at the very least the survey will be conducted every three years but could be administered more often. Trailer noted that there is nothing scientific about the number, it is just a reasonable minimum.

Under membership, 4th bullet, Allen did not know what “Two voting staff administrators (MPP)” meant. Underwood did not feel comfortable that she completely understood the language either.

In discussing Terms, lines 3, Allen was unclear about the meaning of “Ad hoc members” since they are not designated in the Membership list as a particular type of member. Are they the three non-voting members mentioned? They can serve three-year terms and consecutive terms.

Smith asked why there were no students on the committee or in the title. Why is this called the Campus Climate Survey?

Boyd noted that there is a long running student survey that assesses climate on campus (NESSI -National Survey of Student Engagement -this is conducted by IR every Spring). Our local survey originated in 2015 as a Faculty, Staff survey that started with just three questions in response to morale issues we were experiencing on campus. This then expanded into a broader Campus Climate Survey. If this is unsuitable now, things can be amended at action.

Allen wondered about the section on developing the survey instrument (page 3). In paragraph three it says the committee will consult periodically with the President, the Chief of Staff and the Academic Senate President for feedback and approval. But in the 4th paragraph, it says the Committee will present a final set of proposed questions to the Senate for approval and then they can repeat the process. Who is actually doing the approval?

Boyd asked senators to send any other questions to Underwood for clarification before the next meeting so we can work on addressing them in advance.

Introduction item passed. (33 yea, 0 nay)

17. Associated Students Report – Holbert/Snyder [3:04:57-3:07:49]

Boyd noted that a detailed report on the Student Town Hall last night will be forthcoming next time but asked Holbert to report on anything else she liked.

Holbert was happy about attendance at the Town Hall by students, staff, faculty and community members. A survey was also conducted about holding Town Hall events and the types of issues they want to discuss. Last night there were five informational sessions with questions. The presentations will be posted on the AS website.

Things are winding down this semester. We are potentially moving forward with an outdoor REC

18. [Staff Council Report](#) – Peterson [3:08:05-3:08:32]

Boyd pointed out the Staff Council report is linked.

19. Standing Committees Reports [3:08:33-3:10:02]

a. Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Allen

Allen thankfully had nothing to add to her report and was happy to answer questions.

b. Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Underwood

Underwood said the FASP report was attached and asked for questions.

c. Committee on Committees – Paiva

Paiva noted that the Committee on Committees is still trying to fill the Student Conduct pool. Email seeking volunteers will keep coming out.

d. Executive Committee – Sistrunk

Sistrunk said the report was attached and he would answer questions.

20. Statewide Academic Senate Report – Ford/Boyd <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/>

[3:10:03-3:13:13]

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

Ford reported that he and Boyd participated in passing the ASCSU resolution in opposition to the CO's implementation of AB 1460. A week later the Board of Trustees ratified their decision to put Ethnic Studies into GE in an "Area F". This was contrary to 18 different campus resolutions beside the ASCSU resolution.

We have received the CO revisions to EO 1100 and it seems this movement is running down the track and we have not diverted anything at all.

The statewide standing committee will meet tomorrow and there will be more to report next week.

Boyd note that the ASCSU had a special extension meeting last Friday before the Trustees met and will have another tomorrow to deal with our packed agenda.

Sistrunk asked how the ASCSU will react to all the massive effort made across the CSU about Ethnic Studies implementation and it was ignored. What is the next step? Boyd said there are resolutions in the works, and we are open to other ideas. Sistrunk thought that like the salmon leaping over the dam we should keep trying.

21. University Reports – Hutchinson/Larson/Sherman/Boura/Parsons [3:13:13-3:14:37]

a. CSU, Chico Master Plan [website](#)

Boyd noticed that we outlived our “University Reports” and we also have an “Ask the Administrator”. She recognized that it is problematic that these items are so late in the agenda. She thought we had to follow our Bylaws that dictate meeting order. She invited suggestions about changing our Bylaws.

She also wanted to note that we can log questions to be addressed later by our Administrators. These are always welcomed ahead of time as well.

22. Ask the Administrator

None

23. Other [3:14:37-3:14:41]

None

24. Adjourn [3:14:44]

The meeting adjourned at 5:46.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary