

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

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
Thursday, May 6, 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](mailto:oats@csuchico.edu).*

**PRESENT:** Adamian, Allen, Bailey, Barker, Boura, Boyd (Chair), Bruns, Buffardi, Ferrari, Ford, Herman, Holbert (Young), Horst, Hutchinson, Irish, Kaiser, Knigge, Krajl, Larson, Leon, McBride-Praetorius, McKee, Medic, Millard, Musvosvi, Ormond, Paiva, Peterson, Schartmueller, Seipel, Shepherd, Sherman, Sistrunk, Smith, Snyder, Smith, Son, Sparks, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood, Wright

**ABSENT:** Altfeld, Burk

Boyd reminded everyone to update their ZOOM so that the “yes” button will remain active and not fade out. Reminders were included in the chat to correct the Participants list with name changes, pronouns, and guest and member status. Send notes about proxies as well. She noted that there is an Otter transcript running if needed.

[1:38-1:47] Boyd called the meeting to order at 2:06 and moved straight to the approval of the agenda.

**1. Approve Minutes**

None

**2. Approve Agenda [1:48-13:48]**

Sistrunk moved to consider Item 5: Proposed Policy: Campus Sustainability Committee-Green Curriculum Advisory Team at the next Senate meeting, May 11, time certain.

Seconded. Sistrunk said the committee writing the policy needed to assemble to think about how to respond to colleague comments.

Ford objected to delaying the item and thought we could make time in to discuss it today. Others spoke for and against a delay.

Motion to postpone item to May 11 passed. (27 yeah, 8 nay)

Medic made a motion to move Item 11: Kathy Kaiser Academic Service Award to Item 4 after Item 3 Announcements. Seconded. No objections.

Amended Agenda Approved.

**3. Announcements [13:50-19:35]**

- **Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Lecture Series featuring [Angela Davis](#) – 4 pm, May 6, 2021**

Boyd reminded senators and guests they can still register to hear the presentation of Angela Davis which will occur after we adjourn today.

- **Spring (virtual) Play – Chico State Theater: [200Hz, We All Have A Voice](#) – May 5-9, 2021**
- **[Special On-Campus Vaccine Clinic May 11](#) – open to all students, faculty, and staff**  
Mike Guzzi (Chair of EOC) reported that a Vaccine Clinic will be held in Shurmer Gym. He added that clinic turn-out has been very high and 359 have made appointments already. He thought another clinic would be held in the near future.

He said that follow-up clinic will be held June 1 locally that will allow students or anyone to get their second Pfizer shot, or students can go to their local Rite-Aide wherever they are to get their second shot as well.

- Mike Guzzi also alerted everyone that CSU Travel Policies have been updated and we will be reverting back to policies similar to what they were before the pandemic. He will send a note to campus about how to get approval to travel before the policies change June 1.

**4. [Kathy Kaiser Academic Senate Service Award](#) nominations close May 14, 2021 – Information Item [19:36-22:18]**

Boyd reminded senators of the origins of this award that was founded to highlight service on our campus and recognize our own senators who have done great work. She described the procedure to nominate candidates.

**5. Chair's Prerogative [22:18-22:51]**

Boyd noted she will conduct the Senate meeting today so that we are ready to adjourn at 4:00. She will call a brief break at 3:00. She observed that we are all very busy and beyond burned-out and promised to be as efficient as possible.

**6. [Proposed Revisions to EM 15-010 Student Evaluation of Teaching Policy](#) – FASP – Action Item [22:51-1:11:12]**

Boyd reminded senators that we adjourned the last senate meeting in the middle of discussion of an amendment to this policy. (Technically, we were amending to an amendment offered to the policy by FASP and the USET Committees). The motion was to replace the suggested

words “Perceptions of” with “Feedback on” as the name of the instruments and the Committee that evaluates them University-wide throughout the entire document.

Debate about changing the title of the questionnaires and the committee continued:

- Student representatives did not think “feedback” has enough weight
- Perception does not have relevance in the classroom whereas feedback suggests a generative conversation
- The Chair of the USET committee explained that a great deal of research about the different titles of student evaluations was undertaken by the committee before it decided to recommend “Student Perceptions”:
  - there are many problems with the exercise: Unconscious bias, challenges outside instructor control, gender and ethnicity of instructor
  - student perceptions are colored by course material, modality, elective or required attendance -these may impact understanding of curricular design
  - the change of language is an attempt to convey the essence of the questionnaire to the students and faculty evaluators alike, to encourage constructive responses so that both students and faculty consider the nature of these responses that invokes thought and consideration as opposed to an evaluation of “effectiveness”
  - perception captures evaluation based on available knowledge and experiences
- A member of the USET committee argued that the word “Feedback” does not capture the transformation of student perceptions that is intended
  - the term “feedback” still aligns too closely to the intention and purpose of the term “evaluation” which is what we are trying to transition SETs away from
  - “feedback” means providing information about a person’s performance which is not appropriate or fair to ask a student to provide
  - providing feedback to evaluate a professor’s teaching is not part of s a student’s expertise. Their perceptions and perspectives are valuable in evaluating a teacher’s performance and is essential. Focusing on perception of learning can minimize equity bias
  - the exercise is supposed to gather the fullest, truest experience of the student as possible which can reveal the way the student is learning. The goal is to make the SETs constructive for everyone and not punitive
- No UC or CSU has adopted the term “feedback”
- It was pointed out that research of perceptions of safety do not coincide with actual safety. “Student Opinion of Teaching” seems to carry more weight and sounds more credible than “perception”.
- Context Bias in evaluations is very real. The circumstances of the global pandemic clearly explains differences in evaluations from before it until now. The term “Perceptions” accurately captures what students are bringing into the classroom based on factors beyond faculty control.

- It does not oppose the attempt to change the culture around SETs and the incredible bias that impacts professors of color and women in these surveys to recognize that students are impacted.
  - They are expert at how well they are being taught and this can help a professor learn how to teach better
  - changing the name to “perceptions” or “opinions” will give us superficial feedback
  - feedback is constructive, it is a response to a task used as a basis of improvement
- It could be argued that we are asking for more bias to use the word “Perception” (since it is superficial). “Feedback” seems proactive and get more useful information and is less prone to complaints or general bickering
  - trying to remove the notion that a professor’s career might be harmed by different language is neither good nor bad, but either word can still encourage a professor to grow, or it can just be ignored
- A member of the USET committee spoke about the limitations of the attempt to conduct “evaluations”. The name change is supposed to be a good start on reforming the exercise.
  - this feedback is definitely used to harm careers. The current ratings do not give feedback upon which the faculty can grow.
  - “Perception” is supposed to be looking at what the respondent is reacting to the instructor
  - perception captures what the observer is understanding which is not the same thing that experts would evaluate
  - We are looking at developing something that is a more supportive tool to communicate information
- The current Faculty Bargaining Agreement (CBA) calls these “Student Evaluations of Teaching” (SETs). Current contract negotiations are calling for the name to be changed to “Student Opinions of Teaching” (SOTs).
  - There is much variation in the system though the contract describes the superstructure of the requirement, individual campuses can name their own
  - the intention is to underline contractually that they are opinion.
- Both terms seem perfectly fine, but it is not clear that one word or the other will fix the problems with SETs.
  - The questions must change, the way they are taken up by departments and colleges must be altered but we are not changing the substance.
  - It may not be necessary to put so much weight on a single word, because that will not change the biases inherent in the exercise.
- “Feedback” is a word that people will recognize
- “Feedback” is a term used a lot in Education whether it is instructor feedback or soliciting feedback from students to facilitate positive change

-it is unclear how the students would perceive perceptions since they are not the subject of a study, but we need their feedback

- Ford called the question. Seconded. (28 yeah, 5 nay) Discussion ended on this motion.

Amendment to replace “Perceptions of” with “Feedback on” (20 yeah, 17 nay) Amendment passed.

Boyd called for other motions or amendments:

It was moved to add language to the appendices as a new item 9:

“Instruments and timing of implementation for student feedback should take into consideration pedagogical choices by the faculty. Pedagogies such as high impact practices require time to apply and reflect on experience which can help toward meta-cognitive gains.”

Seconded. Motion was explained: Proper feedback on high-impact practices must be timed so that the instructor has had time to implement them.

Questions were asked for clarification and comments made:

- Does this language imply that an instructor could ask when Student Feedback instrument is administered or is this different?
- It was answered that the instructor would benefit by deciding when the feedback came to them.
- There was concern that this would represent a significant increase in workload for Institutional research. It would require extra management and different timing for different courses. This is very concerning.
- Does the fact that the language is in the appendix make it more of a recommendation? It is important to attain valuable feedback that the design of the course be accounted for. Some courses require a culminating experience that would be best reflected in by the students.
- The amendment seems important to make sure the feedback is timely.
- It was pointed out that the senate already extended the timeline to administer student feedback questionnaires last Fall. This might be what was being sought: “FPPP 8.1.4.a.5: Evaluations shall be administered in an online or paper format, normally no earlier than the 14th week and no later than the 15th week of the class.”
- This motion would create a huge time commitment for the staff spread over the semester (since many faculty use paper evaluations)
- Institutional research would have to send out all the forms and we need to hear whether this is possible for them. The USET Committee should discuss this with Institutional research instead of making a decision without solid consultation before hand.

- There are other ways that we can get student feedback over the course of a class beside the formal SETs administered by Institutional research (final reflections, essays, etc.)

Motion did not pass (4 yeah, 28 nay). The USET Committee will take this up next year for discussion.

Boyd asked if there were objections to passing the EM with the name change of the instruments and the committee to Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning and University Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning Committee respectively. No objections.

Amended Action Item passed.

**7. Proposed Changes to FPPP 3.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0, and 16.0 Student Perceptions of Teaching and Learning – FASP – Introduction Item [1:11:12-1:18:37]**

Underwood explained that these FPPP changes were based on the name change we just passed to EM 15:010: Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning Policy and we will just have to move to change them at Action.

Boyd asked if there were any objections to passing the item? No objections.

Introduction Item passed.

Paiva moved to suspend the rules and consider item 7 as an Action item. Seconded.

She moved to change the title of the instruments and the committee named in the passages of the FPPP named. Underwood noted that this just works in tandem with the previous policy.

Instead of “Student Perceptions of Teaching and Learning” all the appropriate passages should read “Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning” and references to the Committee should read “University Student ~~perceptions of~~ Feedback on Teaching and Learning Committee” and the acronym will also change appropriately.

No objections.

Action Item passed.

**8. Proposed Changes to FPPP Introduction – FASP – Introduction Item [1:18:41-1:24:05]**

Underwood note that the proposed amendments offer editorial changes, clarification and assistance for incoming faculty to understand the relationship between the CBA, the FPPP and Department Unit Standards and Policies, Constitutions and Bylaws.

Allen asked about the requirement that the new department member and the Chair must sign an affirmation statement. She wondered when those were made and what happened to them. Ormond noted that this is an old requirement that within 14 days of the first day of instruction the department chair is supposed to bring the new hire up to speed on department standards including the FPPP. This form resides with OPAL. The intention is supposed to make sure this happens.

Paiva wondered if the language should read “The” policies, etc. instead of “These”

Any objections to the introduction item. There were none.

Introduction Item passed.

**9. [Proposed Changes to FPPP Definitions](#) – FASP – Introduction Item [1:14:10-1:30:37]**

Underwood introduced the changes of definitions which include:

“Department/Unit”

‘Department Unit Standards’

‘Faculty Unit Employee’

“FERP”

“FERP Faculty”

“Part-time Faculty Employees” and “Temporary Faculty Unit Employees”

The FPPP, RTP subcommittee worked on these. Allen asked about “Department/Unit Standards” and why they were described as separate from Constitutions and Bylaws, Sistrunk said that there is a sense that the department policies and procedures are the living documents of the working life of the department procedures that are less permanent than Constitutions and Bylaws. Sometimes people accidently erode the constitutional structure that articulates the qualities that maintain their departmental expertise. This can sometime lead to difficulties.

Allen noted in her department it is not easier to change any of these policies. She did not think the statement applied equally to all departments, but understood its importance.

Boyd asked if there is a different approval process for these types of policies. Underwood thought that RTP and other procedures needed Provost and OPAL input. \ Ford agreed and clarified that practices about how the department elects a Chair, or how a curriculum

committee is formed, eligibility for hiring committees, etc. do not go beyond the department level.

Boyd asked if there were any objections to the policy? There were none.

Introduction Item passed.

**10. [Proposed Changes to FPPP 17.0](#) – FASP – Introduction Item [1:30:40-1:46:04]**

Boyd noted this was the last Introduction item of the year.

Underwood introduced changes to FPPP 17.2.4.d which addresses the appointment of Chairs and their support as it pertains to time base. This time base will be determined by the Dean in consultation with the Chair in consultation about University data about typical time base support.

Jonathan Day was introduced to answer questions from the Chair's council if need be.

Ford noted that this section treats the duties and responsibilities of the Chairs in general. He noted there was not much language about encouraging participation of faculty in committees or shared governance opportunities. He noted that in the past there have been problems with scheduling of meetings when University-wide committees or activity was ongoing. Would it be appropriate when this comes to action, to add these kinds of provisions?

Paiva thought it looked like Chairs had two ways to negotiate workload, (17.2.4.d and two paragraphs above 17.2.4.b.) She wondered how the workload negotiation was being carried out between these two statements.

Jonathan Day said as he had in FASP that 17.2.4.b was about the election of the Chair and specifying the term prior to the appointment. This was designed so that someone would know what they are getting into. 17.2.4.d is a specific change made by the Chair's Executive committee and Chair's Council. This references a particular set of data collected from campus that will be updated and referenced by the Chair and Dean. If there has been a change in the size of the department or FTES, this will allow the Chair to negotiate for an additional time base perhaps. These are two different events.

The Chairs decided to put the chair policy in the FPPP because it is easier to make changes to this document. This is the first time we have proposed altering the document. He said the Chairs thought that section 17 should be tweaked, but this use of campus data appears to be unique as it is not referenced in the FPPP, the CBA or other policy to determine workload. This is just a careful beginning to changes that can be made after the Chairs' Council and

Chairs' Executive Committee has considered them.

Boyd clarified that consultation is normal but the FPPP, EMs and other policies can be amended through the normal Senate process which includes amendments during Action in the Senate as we go.

Dean Hassenzahl thought it was reasonable to consider every three years or so whether the Chair workload has changed, what does the data say, is the work more complicated or smaller, should the time base change? There may be a point of negotiation where one chair wants a 12 month appointment, or another a 10 month appointment. He did not think these few passages managed negotiating time base in the best way.

Medic asked about page one 17.1.1.b faculty; and 17.1.1.7; and 17.1.1.2 which mentions University policies. Aren't all of these University policies? Underwood said that it looks like this is true. Jonathan Day thought this was just an oversight in the document and can be changed.

Provost Larson responded to 17.1.1.c.2 to note that there are policies we follow when we hire someone when we work relative to HR policies, CSU policies, federal regulations, the Fair Labor Act and State laws. The term University policies is supposed to allude to all of these.

Boyd asked if there were any objections to this item as an introduction item? There were none.

Introduction Item passed.

**11. Associated Students Report – Holbert/Snyder [1:46:08-1:46:12]**

No report.

**12. Staff Council Report ([April](#)) – Peterson [1:46:12-1:46:30]**

Peterson said the report was attached and asked for questions.

**13. Standing Committees Reports**

- **[Educational Policies and Programs Committee](#) – Allen [1:46:30-1:47:16]**  
Allen offered to answer questions.
- **[Faculty and Student Policies Committee](#) – Underwood**  
Underwood note that her report was attached, and she welcomed any questions.
- **Committee on Committees – Paiva**  
Paiva said the Committee on Committees was in the midst of making committee appointments.

- **Executive Committee (3/26/21 & 4/9/21) – Sistrunk**  
Sistrunk asked if there were any questions.

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

[1:47:15-1:48:58]

- **ASCSU [Agendas](#), [Minutes](#), [Resolutions](#), & [Summaries](#)**
- **CSU Board of Trustees, Faculty Trustee [reports](#)**

Ford noted that the Admission Advisory Council will be thinking about dealing with the elimination of the SAT and ACT for admissions. They will also look at admissions policies similar to the UC's for the top 9% of students.

Boyd said that the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Council just finished two weeks of legislative review of all the bills including those about student housing and financial security and policing. We spent the time advocating for the CSU.

**15. University Reports – Hutchinson/Larson/Sherman/Parsons/Boura [1:48:58-1:51:40]**

Hutchinson reported that nearly 60% of our enrolled classes will be in person next Fall. She thanked the faculty and Chairs for their planning. She said students are looking forward to in person classes.

Commencement is just around the corner, and we are excited to offer our students an in person opportunity. She said they need volunteers.

The policing task force is writing their report which she will deliver her recommendations before the end of the semester.

We are starting a national search for the Vice President of Informational Technologies. The committee on Committees completed their work and the Senate Executive agreed to the EMEDC membership with alacrity. The search committee has been assembled and we will deliver a charge next week.

There will be a search for an Interim Chief Diversity Officer and an announcement next week. She hoped many would apply. Tray Robinson will be leaving, and celebrations will be held for him to remember his stellar career. We will work next to fill the directorship of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, but that may wait until we have hired our CDO first.

Restrictions on travel will be lifted on June 1 and June 7 there will be a significant return of Staff to campus.

Larson thanked everyone on the call for helping finalize and deliver a Fall 2021 course

schedule. It was an incredible amount of work that underwent many changes. She thought it was reworked five or six times in all.

Boyd hoped everyone could join in attending the Angela Davis Lecture at 4:00.

**16. Ask the Administrator**

**17. Other**

**18. Adjourn, 4:00 pm time certain**

Boyd adjourned the meeting at 1:51:41]