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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
Thursday, April 22, 2021, 2:00 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, Boura, Boyd (Chair), Bruns, Buffardi, Burk, Ferrari, Ford, Herman (Musvosvi), Hidalgo, Holbert (Young), Horst, Hutchinson (Brooke Banks), Irish, Kaiser, Kralj, Larson, Leon, McBride-Praetorius, McKee, Medic (Ford), Millard, Musvosvi, Ormond, Paiva, Peterson, Schartmueller, Seipel, Shepherd, Sherman, Sistrunk, Smith, Snyder, Son, Sparks, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood, Wright

ABSENT: Boyd reminded everyone to update their ZOOM so that the “yes” button will remain active and not fade out. She asked people to note whether they are guests or Senators in the Participants list.

Boyd called the meeting to order at 2:04. [3:09-3:35]


Paiva moved to adjourn at a time certain of 6:00 pm. Seconded. No objection. Amended Agenda Approved.

3. Announcements [5:49-9:42]
   • Course Textbook Adoption and HEOA Compliance – Wildcat Store, Robert Bowman, Lauren Lathrop
Lauren Lathrop (Store Manager, Wildcat Store) reminded everyone that there is an obligation to post the course materials on the course schedules when students enroll on Monday (called HEOA compliance). Robert Bowman said that only 30% of courses had completed this task.
• Janet Turner Print Museum’s virtual exhibit, Earth Day 2021 – HFA
• Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Lecture Series featuring Angela Davis – 4 pm, May 6, 2021
• Spring (virtual) Play – Chico State Theater: 200Hz, We All Have A Voice – May 5-9, 2021

4. Chair’s Prerogative [9:42-14:08]
Boyd said because our agenda was so long, she would look to expedite deliberations. She reminded people that she sent a doodle poll to ask about senator availability so we can have a majority quorum available during an extra meeting if we need it. We need to be sure we have representation from across the university. The deadline is today.

She will try not to end debate if deliberation needs to continue. She will note after 20 minutes with an item that she will entertain a motion to postpone to the next meeting. She will not force the question. There are currently two senate meetings left and if we do not get to something at a particular it will come after the Action items we address. She will entertain points of order if senators feel the conversation has strayed from the motion.

The Chair’s decisions can be challenged if a member so desires.

5. Proposed Policy on University Diversity Council – FASP – Action Item, 3:30 pm time approximate [14:09-36:45]
• Supersedes EM 12-014
• Amended document for consideration
Underwood introduced the collection of amendments that are based on feedback from the last Senate meeting. She moved to consider them. Seconded
Changes include:
• Under Scope: Latinx, Asian Americans, Pacific Islander, Native Americans and International communities were added.
• The Scope also has more clarification of those impacted by the embrace of a diverse community
• Voting rights are also clarified under the discussion of Membership
Motion passed

Young moved to delete the changes the last four lines just added to the section on Scope naming specific examples of the types of people embraced by diversity. Seconded.
Young said this language was redundant and repetitious with the first sentence of the paragraph.
Underwood reported that this specific language was added because there were several questions at the last meeting about the different people included in the policy. This language is supposed to go beyond ethnicity. Tray Robinson agreed. Kaiser thought that defining the many people that a concern for diversity encompasses is important to let people know all of its aspects. Historically, we need all the detailed reminders.

Smith agreed that the language in the first sentence of the paragraph already named diversity of thought so it is not necessary to highlight all its different meanings.

Sistrunk disagreed with striking all the language about diversity as it is important to talk about all the leaves on the tree and they should be mentioned over and over again.

Sparks asked for clarification about what the writers meant by “diversity of thought”. Tray Robinson thought that the people represented by this naming of the different identities would appreciate this identification that makes them visible. Using language about intellectual diversity provides the opportunity to highlight the discussions, the curriculum, the work that happens in the classroom and on campus in conversations curricular and co-curricular. It is a term that appreciates the intellectual navigation people do as the move in an academic setting.

Young withdrew his motion. Seconder Smith did not agree. Motion failed. (27 nay, 5 yeah).

Paiva moved to amend the title of the document to “University Council on Race and Ethnicity” Seconded.

Paiva said this EM is about race and ethnic diversity it does not include other types of diversity even though the new sentence was added. The listed membership does not include others like Veterans, people accessing ARC services, or other people with different perspectives are n this committee. Bailey thought the membership did not ensure that the scope guarantees diverse membership but will only explore it.

Underwood invited Tray Robinson to speak about this because he has actually worked on this charge to affect this EM. Tray pointed out that the committee works on many different dimensions of diverse identities especially marginalized populations on this campus. This includes populations with disabilities, LGBT communities and so forth it is not strictly race and ethnicity.

Motion failed. (24 nay, 9 yeah)
Action Item Passed. (30 yeah, 2 nay)

Boyd moved to Item 24: University Diversity Council Report since Tray Robinson was present (See below)


Allen reminded senators that at Introduction there was discussion about the cost of the course fees and about inclusive teaching in the course work.

She moved to add language to page 2, line 5: “Provide essential solutions for both general and special education in educational technology” add “in the inclusive classroom setting”

On page 7, paragraph 1, line 2: “Course fees of $300/unit will cover the cost of instruction; faculty will be paid according to CSU Salary Schedule 2322.” Replace with “Course fees will be set by RCE to cover the cost of instruction”

Seconded. Motion passed.

Action Item Passed.


- Supersedes EM 14-014, and Interim EM 20-020

Underwood noted that the new policy replaces two older EMs. She repeated the language of the preamble:

“This policy sets out a flexible framework for the integration of technology and pedagogy. This framework emphasizes principles and guidelines over inscribing specific processes or describing particular technologies or platforms.”

Sistrunk offered additional language to augment section 4.4.1 page 10, after line 6 add the words: ”This training shall not constitute exceptional support from the University and shall not give it intellectual property rights to the material created.” Seconded.

Ferrari supported this change. Sistrunk explained that this kind of work is just routine ad should not be thought of as more. Kaiser moved to change the words “give it “ to “convey”

Motion passed.

Seipel thought there should be more language to emphasize the extra work to move online instruction 4.7

Knigge wondered about section 3.7. Does it require permission from students? Ferrari thought this applied to material generated by student in the class. We cannot share videos or
photographs without their permission because of privacy rules not necessarily because of intellectual property concerns

Paiva noted that the links in 4.8 are not updated. Boyd asked Paiva to email a note to fix these editorial matters.

Action Item Passed.


- Supersedes EM 18-005, EM 19-021 (revised), and Interim EM 21-002
- Summary of Proposed GE Policy Changes and Academic Senate March 25th

Feedback

Allen pointed out that a summary of the justifications for the main recommendations offered by the amended EM and answers to questions senators had at the last meeting was appended to this document. This can guide conversation today.

Boyd asked for amendments.

- Medic asked for clarification from the Summary Feedback. It states (section 6 lines 8-11) that May 21, 2021 is the deadline for any proposals requiring EPPC Academic Senate review. She remembered conversation in EPPC that the Fall semester was the last time changes could be implemented.
  Allen said the deadline in the Summary comes from the 21-22 Curriculum Deadline on the University Website. Proposals after this date might still be considered by EPPC in the Fall to go on to Senate.
- Knigge asked for clarification: the proposals could be allowed in the Fall but might not necessarily be approved. She said there was a Geography class that was given permission to finish with the Math Commission and go on to CAB in the Fall.
  Allen said that EPPC and Senate do not handle course proposals. This kind of curriculum proposal would go through the curriculum advisory board or College curriculum committee.
- Sistrunk noted that page 4, paragraph two, sentences 2-5 is confusing because it sounds like all the pathway faculty vote for the Coordinator and so do departments with classes in it. There is further procedural information on the CAB GE website about how this could work that should be developed more. The EM is inaccurate because the Pathway faculty specifically are not voting on the Coordinators directly right now.
- Sarah Cooper (MCGS) wondered if the language on page 7 Curriculum Oversight, paragraph 3, line 4 was too limiting because it only mentions “anti-Black practices”. She suggested changing this wording to "BIPOC".
Allen said the Chair of the Black Faculty and Staff Committee responded to the idea of changing this wording to “Students of Color” and said that current language echoes the language of the Senate Resolutions and policies. This language will lead to the significant development of workshops and activity. If the language is left as less specific it will be perceived as performative and not leading to concrete changes.

- Paiva asked Allen if there was other feedback from Campus students, faculty and staff of color. Allen said “no”.

Sistrunk moved that “anti-BIPOC” replace “anti-Black” just to see what people think. Seconded

- McBride-Praetorius was in favor of the amendment, but wanted to make sure that anti-Black practices continued to be foregrounded.
- Bailey supported intentional work to address BIPOC members of the university but thought the language of the Senate resolution supporting measures to combat anti-Black racism preserved this kind of specific language that must continue to be undertaken.
- Millard wondered if the language should be made clearer that racism against each BIPOC university member is intended since the language is unclear.
- Adamian noted that the Equity Gap Resolution honored URMs in general but she thought the language should remain unchanged to specifically honor Black faculty, staff and students. Our Senate Resolution against anti-Black racism foregrounded Black experience because of the particular challenges Black people encounter. She did not want to decenter them again.
- McBride-Praetorius wondered if BIPOC interests could be addressed later.
- Cooper noted that anew EM for General Education was not considered frequently and she did not want to ignore other populations.

Krajl moved that the conversation be deferred until the next Senate meeting because the issues were so important. Seconded.

The motion to postpone failed (15 aye to 20 nay)

Motion to add word anti-Black to anti-BIPOC failed (15 yeah, 18 nay)

- Snyder moved to add “or designee” after the Director of University Affairs.
  Motion passed

- Paiva moved to postpone this item until next week. Sharp thought all the consultation had already been undertaken.
  The motion failed (22 nay to 13 yeah)
• Paiva asked why there can be no overlapping between Area F and the US Diversity requirement. Ford noted that the idea to strip Area F away from US Diversity was made in CAB and subsequently all double-counted Area F courses were changed so that they did not serve both USD and area F. In order to minimize the impact that will happen because one of the area D courses will be lost to area F courses, the area F faculty agreed to not double count.

• Young wondered the division between USD and Ethnic Studies not apply to Global Cultures as well?

McKee said that area F is defining a very specific ethnic requirement (Historically identifiable racialized groups celebrated in Area F) and USD is broader and shows what US diversity looks like (as its content did not go into the area F). Global Cultures is a completely different in that it does not include US Diversity.

Susan Green noted that area F is specific to the four ethnic groups of Ethnic Studies that are US based, but we want students to experience other types of diversity (MCGS is intersectional). Area F is specifically US culturally it does not apply to Global Cultures.

• Sistrunk moved to strike the addition of an EPPC liaison as a formal member of CAB with voting privileges because it muddies the balance of CAB. This Appointment facilitates communication between two important pieces of the process that leads to full Senate consultation. Seconded.

Bailey said EPPC already discussed this issue and opposed the change because CAB makes recommendations to the Provost, which by-passes EPPC in most situations. He thought there was no balance on CAB anyway due to the way Pathway coordinators are chosen, they tend to be from certain colleges. This liaison gives a stop-gap to begin addressing some of the problems.

Altfeld said EPPC had an extensive discussion of this question. She had served in this position and noted that spending so much time participating on CAB and having no vote was disempowering. It seems important to vet what happens in CAB before it comes to EPPC.

Ford reiterated that EPPC already had an extensive discussion about this question. The liaison vote helps to off-set a very lopsided current structure. This opens up another discussion about the imbalance of the voting situation in CAB which has concerned him for a long time. This is just a tiny piece.
Motion failed (3 yeah, 33 nay)

- Sistrunk said that the recognition that CAB has a marked imbalance in voting should be fixed now when the EM is open.

Knigge moved to postpone the item until the next meeting. Seconded. Allen objected because this is an action item that has been through extensive discussion in CAB and extensive discussion in EPPC.

Medic thought the membership needed more discussion and the recognized imbalance should be addressed. There should be more representation from the STEM disciplines. We do have more Senate meetings this semester an she supported postponement.

Altfeld noted that there is an extensive conversation about the imbalance in CAB which summarizes who has been on CB and what their colleges have been. This historic perspective is helpful.

Adamian opposed postponing the issue because Jason Nice personally emailed each Senator to ask for their comments and suggestions and was willing to do anything to communicate with any individuals. Postponing this was disrespectful to him as this should have already been handled because it has been an entire month since CAB started the process. No one should punish them for our lack of contributing.

Boyd said that some senators had contacted her and felt singled out by the attempt to email them individually. (see email below)

Dear Senator Medic,

I am writing to all members of the Academic Senate as the chair of Chico State's GE Committee (CAB) to thank you for your careful consideration of the EPPC Introduction Item, "Proposed Policy on General Education." It was deeply gratifying to hear an hour of substantiative discussion of General Education on the floor of the Academic Senate. CAB appreciated EPPC's amendments to the policy and looks forward to further student-success oriented amendments in Senate.

The GE website has just been updated to include information that may answer some of the questions posed by senators during the Introduction Item on March 25. If you have any questions about CAB, its process, or the changes recommended by CAB and EPPC,
please let me know by email or send me an Outlook Calendar invitation. I'm always happy to talk GE!

As you know, the senate process often shines a bright light on the chair of the committee or department that brings forward a proposal to senate, but I wish to emphasize the extraordinary cross-college and cross-division collaboration that goes on behind the scenes. The twenty-five members of CAB (student, staff, and faculty) are incredibly hard working, student-success focused, and equity-minded. I am so proud of all members of CAB for responding to a five-year review of the Pathways Program with substantial changes, consulting widely with the campus community on revising the Pathways and GE Minors, and most recently working with the Ethnic Studies ad hoc subcommittee to implement the new Area F requirement. I have witnessed countless undercelebrated acts of kindness and self-sacrifice as CAB members look beyond their personal, departmental, college, or division interests in the broader service of achieving equitable student success in general education. CAB is comprised of an amazing group of individuals, with the highest standards of integrity and professionalism, which I would love to nominate for an "Outstanding Committee" award. I jest, but if you know a CAB member then please thank them for their exceptional service to the university.

I very much look forward to continuing the conversation about general education when the policy returns to senate, but in the meantime please feel free to reach out or consider attending one of our CAB meetings (always open to the public with agendas published in advance: our next meeting is Monday, April 5).

Sincerely,

Jason

The motion to postpone the item failed (22 nay, 8 yeah)

• Michael Allen (Registrar) wanted to change the characterization of his service on CAB on page 7, bullet 3, line 2, last word where it says (Registrar). He hoped it might read “or designee” or “Office of the Registrar”.

Allen moved to add the words “Office of the” to the parentheses. Seconded. Motion passed.

• Ford noted that the discussion about the voting balance on CAB has not been addressed by CAB, nor by EPPC. He said STEM, in particular, is very under-
represented and has been for a long time. He thought the attempt to deal with this now would necessitate CAB and EPPC consultation and he did not see a path forward. For this reason, he supported the EM as written.

- McKee seconded Ford’s comments but thought it was too difficult to stop now recognizing that we need to implement this, and we have catalog deadlines. The process to evaluate this will be too extensive.
- Sparks thought we should defer addressing the question of balance until the next iteration of the policy. She was unsure what we mean by balance. (across colleges, looking at where GE courses are taught?). As the new GE pathways arise there may be more possibilities for STEM participation. We should wait for the new minors to evolve.
- Medic thought the balance in the membership is an important topic. She thought the high-unit majors will be the ones disproportionately affected by GE and this necessitates that the membership of CAB continues to be discussed.
- Paiva said she thought we were squishing curriculum together with the structure of a committee to oversee it. Why are we revisiting membership as we revisit curriculum?
- Boyd noted that there is a document on the CAB website that tracks the historical membership of the committee.

Young called the question. Seconded.

Boyd said it needs a 2/3 vote. This ends debate and then the vote is taken on the whole measure. (The vote was 28 yes, 3 nay)

The Action item passed. (33 yeah, 3 nay)


Allen this proposal attempts to clean up the AURTEC EM by providing a better introduction to the concept of all University responsibility for teacher education. The scope of AURTEC applies to all minor and significant changes, subject matter programs, credential programs and graduate programs. It defines membership, provides terms of service where appropriate and provides more explicit procedures for curriculum proposals.

This is a heavily edited document so there is a marked version and a clean version to compare. Debbie Summers (Associate Dean, CME) is available to answer questions.

Introduction Item Passed.

Adamian moved to suspend the rules and move this to an Action Item. Seconded. Adamian noted that there were no objections and she wanted to move it forward.
Ford said this was a heavily redacted and carefully debated document and he thought it deserves more attention. He said it is an heavily reviewed document and he is personally happy with it, but when we suspend the rules it should be open and shut clear cut without controversy and this had a lot controversy at EPPC.

Boyd thought it would be useful to depict the controversy for senators who were not present at the earlier conversations. Ford explained that there were extensive revisions between introduction and final action and more revisions at action. Ford hoped his EPPC colleagues would back him up, but he thought documents with many revisions like this should be vetted more.

Allen said the item passed unanimously at intro and action. The document was heavily edited and EPPC did spend a lot of time on it.

The motion failed (16 yes, 17 nay).

Boyd said this will return to Action at the next meeting.

Allen reported that this proposal originally began only to strike the “S” designation for service learning which is being phased out by the Chancellor’s Office. The proposal gave EPPC the opportunity to do editorial house-keeping type changes. A list was made of all the reserved suffixes at the University. EPPC has earned that the letter “E” which is used for English as a second language courses is actually applied to other purposes. Allen said she will move to strike this suffix when the item moves to Action.

Introduction Item Passed.

Ford moved to suspend the rules. Seconded.
Sistrunk said these are policies that effect the entire University and people expect a kind of rhythm of introduction and action so they know when to attend and vote. He objected because he does not usually like suspending the rules in general.

2/3rds vote to suspend the rules. Motion passed. (29, yeah, 5 nay)

Allen moved that page 3, section Guidelines bullet 5 be struck “E” as a suffix for English Education” Seconded.
Allen explained that Holly Ferguson and Nicole Grey did an audit of curriculum at the University with the suffix “E” and learned that of the 17 uses of the “E” only 3 are used for English as a second language. It seems best to just strike the bullet.

Paiva asked if an alternative suffix was needed for ESL classes. Sparks said that the English department uses the “E” to distinguish certain classes of ENG 130 that are for non-native speakers. We may need something else.

Allen said this motion will just eliminate “E” from being a reserved suffix it can still be used for academic writing, ESL and even courses that are English as courses with English as a Second language in the title. So those courses can continue as the are now.

Motion to strike passed.

Action Item passed.


Underwood passed her proxy and Chair duties to Hidalgo. She explained that FASP would like to introduce this Policy for Academic Scheduling that supersedes Interim EM 20-008.

The preamble of the policy defines the intention of the EM: “In order for the institution in meeting the goals, priorities, and enduring commitments established in the Strategic Master Plan, this EM defines policies and procedures for the approval and oversight of academic scheduling policy and practice on the CSU, Chico campus, and creates the Academic Scheduling Advisory Committee (ASAC).”

The policy looks to develop cross-divisional coordination and collaboration to remain flexible to support space allocation, pedagogical needs, enrollment demand and student access.

Jonathan Day (Chair, Biology) and Jennifer Aceves (APSS scheduling) are present to answer questions.

Introduction Item Passed

12. Proposed **Significant change to Honors in General Education** (HNRS)– **EPPC** – **Introduction Item** [2:54:14-2:59:14]

Allen said the Honors program has grown immensely in the last few years. This proposal incorporates feedback from a five-year review of the GE Program and feedback from meetings with Honors students, staff and faculty so that a new mission statement was
developed to guide the proposal. The curriculum on pages 17-18 (not numbered) shows that the program will require courses in communication and social change, arts, humanities, lower division physical sciences, required courses in Ethnic Studies methodologies, and multidisciplinary science in the upper division.

The upper division courses will also include the two tracks: 1. A two course interdisciplinary thesis or creative project, or 2. A two course track on Leadership, Power and Change.

Jason Nice (Director of Honors Program) is available for questions.

Feedback from EPPC on this document was minimal and positive.

Smith wondered if the policy would continue to wave some requirements for upper division to accommodate people with high unit majors so they can stay in the program? Jason Nice did not think the major would change.

Sistrunk did not catch the relationship between the Ethnic studies requirements and the rest of the program. Allen said in upper division there will be a required Ethnic studies methodologies course.

Introduction Item Passed.

Hidalgo described the proposed changes to the FPPP treat the definition of ratings and rethinking and realigning the nature of summary evaluations. The changes impact FPPP 10.3.3; 10.5.3 and 11.1.3.

Summary evaluations as they specifically relate to the areas of instruction are summarized as follows:

- “Superior” is changed to “Exceeds Expectations” and includes an expectation of a performance in an area of evaluation has exceeded requirements for attaining tenure.
- “Effective” is changed to “Meets Expectations” and is concluded for those in a specific area of evaluation would reward them a reasonable ability of attaining tenure.
- “Inadequate is changed to “Does Not Meet Expectations” and is concluded when significant insufficiency is identified that requires immediate attention and attention.
- The summary evaluation of “Adequate” has been removed reducing the summary evaluation evaluative terms from four to three.
- These changes are reflected in the areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement and Service sections of the FPPP.10.3.3.
• The language changes in FPPP 10.5.3 and 11.1.3 support the summary evaluations
• Additionally, to support the transition to these summary evaluations the policy has an appendix added to provide guidance to the rationale of the new system
  --There are six areas in the title of summary evaluations and the RTP outcomes
  --Improved communication of the requirements and timing for accelerated promotion
  --Elimination of the tendency to assign a low evaluation in early to show improvement later on
  --regarding professional growth and achievement the inclusion of appreciable scholarship to allow a focus on quality of work rather than quantity Supports FPPP 8.1.3.e.4
  --regarding professional growth and achievement-account for those professional activities that better account for their variety beyond publication
  --regarding service-the shift from just committees, but also community work or facilitating activities that convey the multiple pathways to service to the university which my move beyond formal institutional roles

These changes may encourage departments to update their own standards to align with these summary categories. Implementation of these changes to summary evaluations will not go into effect until Fall 2022.

Jeff Trailer (BUSN) is present to assist with any questions.

Boyd asked for questions (she reminded people that only faculty vote about FPPP matters thought everyone can give advice):.
  • Shepherd wondered if other CSUs have done this? Trailer said that the subcommittee did not research practice through the system. The problem was brought to our attention by the Provost who gives us lust of things to consider. He thanked the Provost for her support.
  • Ford wondered if there were discussions about the tidal wave of workload these changes would generate. Every department will need to revise their RTP guidelines that use the old language defining four areas instead of three.

Trailer noted that we all have work to do. We have needed to work on department standards for a long time. The CBA take precedence over the local FPPP which in turn takes precedence over the department unit standards. What’s been happening is that we have defined the summary ratings and the departments have been redefining these.to suit their local preferences. This had led to confusion. What summary rating do you need for tenure? The solution is to put summary conclusions in the department level standards. The department just defines how tenure will awarded.
The appendix gives you the ability to map the old categories.

- Herman thought there might be an adjustment at the beginning but this will streamline the process over time and make us all more efficient.
- Allen wondered about page three under Service that Contributions to the Strategic Plans and Goals. She thought the phrasing of line 5 was confusing as there are too many commas included in the sentence.
- Irish explained that the intention was to create a list around Service. During the extensive vetting of these passages there was a lot of consideration around what these changes would do for the broader culture around RTP. Clear expectations will serve faculty going up for tenure (what exactly does “Mets Expectations” mean?

Introduction Item Passed.

Allen noted that when this minor was created 20 years ago the campus climate would not have supported language about “Queer” and “Trans” peoples. This change brings the name of the minor into the mainstream for MCGS. The current name is so vague it can be confused with other sexualities. The name change makes the focus of the minor clearer.

Sarah Cooper (MCGS Associate Chair) is available to answer any questions if anyone has them. Susan Green (Chair) is also here.

Introduction Item Passed

Hidalgo proposed the changes to the FPPP which impact Lecturer voting rights and participation in university, college, and department committees along with other examples of professional development. These entities are also encouraged to find financial support for such participation.

FPPP 9.0 impacts the term “Part-time” faculty by changing it to “Lecturer” faculty throughout the FPPP. FPPP 9.1.3.d adds additional explanation that service may include Department, College, or University committees.

Tim Sistrunk will answer any questions.
Alfeld was excited by the language change. She asked why the phrasing of FPPP.1.1.4.a Departments/Units and Colleges shall be encouraged to find financial support for Lecturer participation in Department, College or University committees. It sounds abstract.

Sistrunk said that some administrators do not like direct orders that they will pay for things so it is politic. The Provost herself encouraged this. They should be supported just like all the other faculty.

Knigge asked about the language the clearly states Lecturers will vote for their Chair. Is this Lecturers with a three-year contract or other time bases? Is there further definition if who would be able to vote? Sistrunk answered that there was an few arbitration decisions where Lecturers were guaranteed the right to vote for their Chair. Departments can add language to accommodate different time-bases

Medic thanked the committee for making the changes about the term Lecturers and allowing service to be recognized at all levels.

Introduction Item Passed.

   • Significant change to the Minor in Instructional Design
   • Name change from Minor in Instructional Design to Minor in Social Media Production and Analysis

Allen explained that the two proposals were interlocking. As discussed last week this minor is supposed to promote student success through the cultivation of craft-based skills through Production which is analysis of social media technology and platforms. The curriculum of this department has expended to reflect modern activity like social media. It trains students to get careers as professionals in the industry. No new courses were needed to create the minor, just some additions and deletions of older classes.

The Chair of the Department, Tom Walsh is here to answer any questions. Tom Welsh said there is growing interest among students to learn about social media The department has developed three new courses in this area. This allowed us to expand the offerings into a minor which can serve many kinds of students across the university to augment their programs or primary degree. Social media skills beyond consumer skills to be a creator.

There are many students waiting to hear.

Introduction Item Passed

Hidalgo noted that FASP is introducing this policy to work within the Campus Sustainability Committee to act as a Green Curriculum Advisory Team to help meet Chico State’s strategic priorities and goals. The subcommittee will be dedicated to cultivating interdisciplinary education and activism across the campus and throughout the curriculum about climate change and climate resilience.

The goals and objectives of the committee are articulated throughout the policy.

Tim Sistrunk will answer questions if there are any.

Allen shared some comments:

- This proposal even though it deals with curriculum did not come through EPPC.
- Under two-year term permanent members of the committee it says: “One student representative will be selected by the Student Academic Senate” but what if the student is a senior? They could not serve two semesters. Should write “(one year term renewable)”
- “The committee will hold 4 monthly meetings during each academic semester and 8 times during the academic year.” This was unclear and seems like many meetings will be required in a month.
- The two course suffixes defined in the EM “SUS” and “CCR” are in violation of item 10: Proposed Changes to EM 7-012 Course Numbering Policy that we just introduced today. These will need to be altered to a single letter
- Appendix B was not on the Agenda.

Introduction Item Passed


Hidalgo this reflects a name change from SETs to Student Perception of Teaching and Learning. This impacts the name of the Committee that considers these instruments. The USET Committee explored and researched alternative names for the SET found in other schools in the CSU and across the nation.

SETs may be influenced by a variety of actors that are not specifically related to teaching and can be biased in nature. The change of name is supposed to communicate the intention of these questionnaires. Students were active on the USET committee and in FASP.
Young said he was concerned that students might feel disempowered by this name change and might be less likely to fill out the questionnaires. He said he spoke to his friends about what their perceptions of this change were. Does this make it feel like you are not important and do not really matter. Would you be less likely to fill it out. Most people that he spoke to agreed with this.

Boyd asked why students feel disempowered. He said the terms create this feeling. Smith said this is absolutely correct. The instrument itself might be the problem as well and might need to be redone in the future.

Young objected to letting the policy go forward at introduction.

The Introduction Item Passed (yeah 29, nay 3).

Herman moved to adjourn. Seconded (passed)

**Items 19—23 were not discussed.**

19. Proposed [Changes to FPPP 3.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0, and 16.0 Student Perceptions of Teaching and Learning – FASP – Introduction Item]

20. Proposed [Changes to FPPP Introduction – FASP – Introduction Item]

21. Proposed [Changes to FPPP Definitions – FASP – Introduction Item]

22. Proposed [Changes to FPPP 17.0 – FASP – Introduction Item]

23. [Nominations open for senate officer positions; close midnight April 26th – Information Item]
   - Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, EPPC Chair, FASP Chair

24. **Annual Reports**

Tray Robinson (Interim Chief Diversity Officer) reminded everyone that the UDC is an advisory group to the President. The conversation we had above is a true reflection of EDI work were people express their differences of opinion.

It has been an active year in light of what has been happening nationally which has been reflected in conversations we have had within the UDC. The first few slides remind everyone of our scope as our University remains committed to fostering dynamic, high-quality and inclusive learning environments both within and outside of the classroom. [Slide 3] The membership is cross-divisional so that voices from across the campus have voice in what we do. He thanked the Academic Senate that has membership on the Council.
Michelle Morris gave some highlights of the year’s activities:

- [Slide 4] The work is done by workgroups centered around the UDC priorities that have been active since 2014 when the UDC was created. These include key performance indicators to measure this progress.
- [Slides 5-6] the varied workgroups have:
  - worked to institutionalize the UDC through the EM that just passed and helps fulfill one of our strategic priorities to promote inclusion
  - offered courses in how to avoid Bias in Hiring with in-person training that is mandatory for all search committee members, effective January 1, 2021
  - fostered the expectation that interviews for all positions include questions to assess for EDI capacity
  - Collaborated with OAPL on diverse faculty recruitment and retention efforts
  - Collaborated with campus stakeholders to plan for implementation of AB 1460 in GE (which has resulted in hiring faculty to teach African American Studies)
  - Received strategic funding dollars for EDI artwork on campus to reflect the diverse demographic of our campus that students have asked for. We will submit a campus plan and a list of locations to the Cabinet.
  - Launched new campus EDI website. The next steps will be to focus on current faculty and their scholarship contributions. There will be job posting and recruitment ideas and policy added.
  - Addressed Harper & Simmons 50-State Report Card that focuses on the experience and academic success of our Black/African American students. We will refine this report to address CSU issues including mental health, creating relationships with Black families of students
- UDC will continue to ask faculty to join ad hoc working groups to lend their expertise to accomplish our goals
- The full year-end report with more details will be posted at the end of May

Boyd wished Tray Robinson success as he moves to a permanent Inclusion, Diversity and Anti-Racism Officer position at Butte College next year and told him to keep in touch. Michelle Morris noted that this move will add possibilities for collaboration with Butte College where so many of our student come and we will continue working with Tray Robinson.

Items 25-29 were not discussed

25. Associated Students Report – Holbert/Snyder
26. Staff Council Report (April) – Peterson
27. Standing Committees Reports
  - Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Allen
  - Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Underwood
  - Committee on Committees – Paiva
- ASCSU Agendas, Minutes, Resolutions, & Summaries
- CSU Board of Trustees, Faculty Trustee reports

29. University Reports – Hutchinson/Larson/Sherman/Parsons/Boura [2:47:30-

Hutchinson congratulated the Senate for their work. She was grateful to see that the EM

defining the University Diversity Council had passed as it had been developing over many

years and it is time to strengthen its role to lead us forward.

Like many of us, she said she was waiting for the verdict of the Derek Chauvin trial for the

murder of George Floyd and she was relieved that the verdict came back with three guilty

pronouncements. She thought it was a moment of accountability though it cannot be justice

since George Floyd is not alive.

She is awaiting the report of the Policing Taskforce that will be delivered with significant

recommendations before the end of May. She thanked everyone who had participated in the

open forums. She said we must be mindful to keep social justice work at the forefront of

everything we are doing.

She was impressed by the presentation of Dr. Kendi last night. She though Kim Jackson and

Bree Holbert did a fabulous job working with Dr. Kendi and moderating the session. The

questions were thoughtful, insightful and forward thinking.

Around 2:00 today, she put out a message commenting on the Chancellor’s message sent at

around 1:00 today. He stated in a Press release that it is the intent of the CSU and the UC

systems to require that all students, faculty and staff be vaccinated. This will depend on

whether the Pfizer vaccine is approved by the FDA. It appears that the FDA may come out

with a statement by the end of May.

For Chico State this means that we need to take a pause. We will extend our registration to

May 5. The Provost will meet with Deans and Department Chairs to examine once again to

give consideration to maximizing in person classes and increase in person activities. The

CSU gave a heads up to all of the Unions today to work on policy and drafting policy during

meet and confer meetings. There will be more information next week.

There are many questions ahead but we shall be guided by two North Stars: 1. first is Public

Health and Safety and 2. Student Success. She said she is anxious to bring back as many

students as possible for in-person classes because she know the students really want this. She
has spoken to students who will be first-time students on the campus as advanced transfer students or upper class-people. This will be new for them.

She understands the heavy lift this will be on all of us. There will be many questions about how we require this, or verify that people have taken the vaccines and how shall we test people. There will be some exceptions to a general requirement for medical or religious reasons. We will try to uncover he answers to these questions before we open u registration on May 5.

She reminded people to give their questions to the Senate officers to present to her.

30. Ask the Administrator
   Boyd reported that President Hutchinson asked that questions be collected so that she can address when she returns.

31. Other
   Not discussed

32. Adjourn time certain of 6:00 pm. [3:44:40]
   The meeting adjourned at 6:00.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary