

California State University, Chico

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, September 17, 2015, 2:30 p.m., K-207/209

PRESENT: Boyd, Cross, Crofts, Elrod, Ford, Gray, Heilesen, Janos, Jarquin, Kipnis, Kirchhoff (Kipnis), Livingson, McConkey, Meadows, Nichols, Ponarul, Pratt, Ratekin (Roll), Roll, Rowberg, Sager, Schierenbeck, Scholz, Schulte, Seipel (Selvester), Selvester, Sistrunk, Stapleton, Thompson, Traver, Zingg

ABSENT: Calandrella, Hoffman

Chair Boyd called the meeting to order and described the general customs that guide our meetings; modified Robert's rules, speakers' list, how to recognize speakers in the gallery. There was some question about how to access the minutes on line with varied strategies explained.

1. Approve Minutes of May 7, 2015.

The minutes were approved.

2. Approve Agenda.

Crofts moved to amend the agenda under section 5: Chair's Prerogative to add an item C.: Response of Chancellor White to Letter Subsequent to the Open Forum.

Amended agenda was approved.

3. Announcements.

- Schulte announced that scholars from across the globe will be attending The National Network for Educational Renewal 2015 Annual Conference which is to be held at Chico October 1- Another example of national distinction for our campus.
(<http://www.nnerannualconference.org/>)
- Boyd exclaimed the virtues of the coming 10th Annual Sierra Ora Farm Trail Passport Weekend October 10-11, 2015 (<http://www.sierraoro.org/passport-weekend>). Tours to appreciate local wine and cuisine and exploration of the University Farm are included in the fantastically low ticket price.

4. Presentation of new and continuing senators.

Boyd welcomed the new and returning Senators and encouraged everyone to mingle and introduce themselves. The new Senators were then applauded:

Jim Sager (BUSN), Jennifer Wilking (BSS), Melody Stapleton (ECC), David Scholz (HFA).

5. Chair's Prerogative.

A. Campus Presidential Search Advisory Committee election & resolution.

Election:

Boyd explained that the election to select the two faculty representatives to serve on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee will close at 5:00 Friday, September 25 and that nominations needed to be made by the end of the day September 17.

Boyd pointed out that the Board of Trustees policy guiding the conduct of presidential searches required that they be closed to general public participation. There is wide-spread concern across the system in support of public searches despite this directive (which was linked in the agenda):

“Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents

Responsibility for Appointment of Presidents

The Board of Trustees of the California State University, in partnership with the Chancellor, is responsible for the recruitment, selection and appointment of CSU campus presidents. There is a deep commitment throughout the process to the principles of consultation with campus and community representatives and diversity. The ultimate decision and responsibility for the transition of executive leadership rests with the Board. The Chancellor designates staff to support the process.

The Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President

The Chair of the Board appoints a Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP) for any campus with an impending vacancy. The TCSP is composed of the Chair of the Board, four Trustees, and the Chancellor. The Chair designates a Trustee as chair of the TCSP.

The TCSP determines the attributes desired for a successful candidate, approves the final campus and job descriptions, and any advertising copy, and reviews and interviews candidates. Although the TCSP is the ultimate body to make the final decisions, including the advancement of candidates to the full Board, the process is to be conducted in a manner that includes the campus representatives. The Chancellor may indicate his or her ranking of final candidates before the Board. The Board Chair and the Chancellor may use executive search firms to assist on specific tasks related to the selection process. The Chancellor is responsible for background and reference checks of the final candidates advanced to the Board.

The Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President

The Chair of the Board also appoints an advisory group to the TCSP, known as the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP). The ACTCSP is composed of the Chair of the Academic Senate on the campus, two faculty representatives selected by the campus faculty, one member of the campus support staff selected by the staff, one student selected by the duly constituted representatives of the campus student body, one member of the campus

Advisory Board selected by that board, one alumnus/alumna of the campus selected by the campus Alumni Association, and one Vice President or academic Dean from the campus, and the President of another CSU campus selected by the Chancellor. Each of the campus representatives shall be determined according to procedures established by the campus. If the campus has a standing policy on campus representation to the ACTCSP that does not call for open election by each constituency, that policy shall be reviewed at the start of a new presidential search, and ratified or amended. The Chair of the Board or the Chancellor may appoint up to two additional members from constituent groups to the ACTCSP to strengthen its capacity to cope with the complex requirements of a specific search, including diversity of the campus, the service area or the state.

The ACTCSP provides advice and consultation regarding the position and campus descriptions and any advertisement of the position. Members of the ACTCSP may also suggest potential candidates with the leadership qualities, administrative ability, academic qualities and other talents appropriate to the position. The ACTCSP reviews and comments on all candidate applications, participates in candidate interviews and the deliberations that lead to the selection of the final candidate(s). The consultative procedures are to be conducted in a manner designed to generate confidence in the selection process and garner local support for the eventual appointee.

Confidentiality and Professionalism

To ensure that the search process respects the professional needs of candidates and is conducted with integrity, strict confidentiality must be maintained by members of the TCSP and the ACTCSP, the Chancellor and staff. Only the Chair of the TCSP or the Chancellor will act as spokesperson for the committees during the presidential search.”

Selvester explained how CSU Sonoma was leading a state-wide effort to call on the Board of Trustees to utilize public searches (especially since there are four Presidential searches ongoing in the CSU this year). She also noted that this was an idea particularly called for at our Senate Open Forum (August 27) and by the Action Council of elected leaders that met the day after this large meeting. The entire Executive Council (which includes President Zingg and the cabinet) also agreed to support this notion. Sonoma State had just passed a resolution that Selvester offered as a worthy way for us to join the general call for public searches that cultivate faculty, staff, student and community input.

In case Senators did not have access to this Resolution because of computer difficulties, Boyd read out loud the complete Resolution and its rationale that had been modified to name CSU Chico especially.

Resolution:

**California State University, Chico Academic Senate Resolution
California State University, Chico
2015-16 Presidential Search**

Resolved: That the California State University, Chico (CSUC) Academic Senate calls for an open and transparent search process for the next president of the university, in which finalists' names are publicly announced and official campus visits for them are scheduled; and be it further

Resolved: That the CSU, Chico Academic Senate strongly urges that community members appointed to the campus Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) be from groups with strong ties to the local community and individuals who have made significant contributions to the university's local service area; and be it further

Resolved: That the CSU, Chico Academic Senate strongly encourages the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees to revise their September 2011 Policy for the Selection of Presidents to include mandatory public visits to campuses for finalists in presidential searches; and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed to the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the Chair of the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP) for CSU, Chico, the Academic Senate CSU and campus senate chairs.

Rationale

We at CSU, Chico agree with and restate the rationale written by Sonoma State University in their resolution:

“CSU presidential searches are governed by the Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents. That policy creates a two-tiered committee process for a presidential search. The Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP) ultimately recommends final candidates to the Board. The campus Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) participates in the search process, including interviews and deliberations that lead to the selection of a final candidate(s).”

“Several provisions of the policy have significant implications for the nature of a presidential search. On the one hand, the policy expresses a welcome “ deep commitment” to consultation with campus and community representatives and diversity. On the other hand, rather than mandating an open search process, the policy provides that the Chancellor and the Chair of the TCSP together decide whether to schedule campus visits for presidential finalists. They may also appoint up to two additional members from constituent groups to the ACTCSP “...to strengthen its capacity to cope with the complex requirements of a specific search, including diversity of the campus, the service area or the state.”
(<http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/PresidentialSearch.shtml>)”

“SSU strongly urges that the TCSP conduct an open and transparent search process. Forgoing announcing finalists' names publicly and scheduling official campus visits for them would be behavior more characteristic of a private corporation than a public university. Doing so would also mean a less transparent search process and less confidence in the outcome on the part of the university community and public. The thoughts of the new president at CSU Sacramento are instructive in this regard. In his Fall 2015 Address, President Robert S. Nelsen frankly expressed his dislike for the search process for new presidents. He spoke to the absence of an on-campus

interview and who actually selects the president. In his words, “I hate that I didn’t get the opportunity to meet all of you during the search and that I am only meeting you now. And I don’t like it that you are only meeting me now and that the huge majority of you had no say in whom [sic] your next president would be.”

(http://csus.edu/sacstatenews/Articles/2015/08/documents/FallAddress2015_AsPrepared.pdf)

“Meaningful consultation means open campus visits where all members of the university community have the opportunity to meet finalists and ask them questions in a public forum. Such visits give the university and public insight into finalists’ knowledge of the campus and their ability to unify and lead the students, faculty, staff and administration of SSU. They also give finalists insight into the university community they aspire to lead.”

“A deep commitment” to consultation and diversity extends to the membership of the ACTCSP, too. Members appointed from local constituent groups should live and work in the region, and have made significant contributions to the university’s service area. Such individuals would add an important depth of insight and perspective to the campus advisory committee. Their appointment would also demonstrate the CSU’s commitment to consultation with the local community and acknowledgement of the contribution that local constituencies make to the university’s mission.”

Crotts raised a Point of Order. He pointed out that the Senate could decide that it wanted to revise the agenda again to describe the Resolution as an Action Item, it could therefore pass this item right away, if it wished.

Schierenbeck asked how someone could nominate another to serve on the Campus Presidential Search Advisory Committee and asked that more time be given to do that. Elrod suggested extending the deadline, and Boyd determined that candidates could present themselves electronically until noon September 18.

Zingg suggested we not just put a ditto on Sonoma’s resolution, but make it uniquely our own because since 1887, the University has had a strong relationship with the community and the strength of the campus is in its diversity within the rest of the system. It was asked what happens if the Board of Trustees just refuses our plea? Selvester explained that a resolution is just a way of saying what we desire and gives a voice to our general support. The important part is that across the system we will all contribute to the call to change policy. Stapleton thought it would be wise to expedite our vote to support the spirit of the resolution, and Roll agreed by supporting the measure as written.

Resolution as an Introduction Item carried.

Crotts moved to suspend the rules and bring the motion forward for action.

Motion carried.

Action Item passed.

Boyd explained how we will utilize the process to elect at-Large senators

electronically and that this did not preclude allowing us to extend the deadline to submit candidate nominations to 12:00 Friday. The voting will begin online with a “Faculty All Announcement” on September 10.

B Resolution Response Full Committee update.

Boyd described how the Resolution Response Full Committee (faculty, staff, and cabinet) met twice during the summer and approved the following synopsis of the June meeting. (the synopsis of the August meeting will be approved when the committee meets again):

SUBJ: RESOLUTION RESPONSE FULL COMMITTEE RETREAT SYNOPSIS
Thursday, 11 June 2015, 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Colusa 100A

Attendees:

Betsy Boyd	Annette Heileson	Ann Schulte
Drew Calandrella	Lori Hoffman	Timothy Sistrunk
Joe Crotts	Kathy Kaiser	Matt Thomas
Susan Elrod	Jennifer Meadows	Rick Ford
Rollin Richmond	Paula Selvester	

“We affirm that we are "One University" where collaboration, mutual support and trust, and common goals define our work together and the spirit of its engagement.”

1. Synopsis of 22 April 2015 meeting was approved
2. Kathy Kaiser agreed to take notes.
3. Agenda was approved
4. Discussions.
 - i. Succession Planning – issues raised included need and duration for interim positions (vs permanent), the role of EMEDC, the high degree of turnover, future turnover and the observation that student affairs has many vacancies pending due to retirements.
 - ii. Facilities and Space; EO 1000: The revised facilities EM 13-78 appears inadequate. Several spaces not identified in the Facilities EM are apparently (in practice) excluded from facilities reservations, (e.g. the library, Warren Center) The proper roles of SAC and CFU need better articulation. Better communications may be needed as are mechanisms for generating better campus buy-in to the facilities reservations policies and fees. Academic Affairs space use policies and assignment processes need clarification. If adequate processes are in place they need to be better communicated to the campus. EO1000 implementation needs re-evaluation and

broader campus input with attention to the university mission and north state community/campus relationships. Process could include reviewing other campus implementations.

- iii. RESP & RF, Staffing and MOUs: Searches are underway and nearing completion. Charges and uses of indirect and F&A were discussed. Questions about the logic and justification for charging for research space were raised. All seemed to agree that more indirect needs to be returned to faculty and the colleges. Various charges were discussed. Some called for reviewing practices at other CSU's that return more indirect to faculty and colleges.
- iv. Budget Transparency; Cost Allocation Plan: The EM governing UBC is being revised with an eye toward emulating the model at CSU Sacramento. The role and constituency of FAC was questioned and the idea of disbanding FAC was brought up. All seemed to be in agreement with this idea. It was stated that the current budget model had not changed in 15 years. Use of "opengov.com" was proposed.
- v. Equity Program: Faculty implementation completion, criteria, appeal contacts, corrections (50) were discussed. The pending staff program was discussed including the projected costs involved. Awards would be generally based on longevity. Earlier tentative program was rejected due to compliance issues with the CBA. Total investment including benefits projected at \$175K. Announcement will occur soon.
- vi. HR, IRP, Reclassifications were discussed. It was observed that HR staffing has grown by 7 positions since HR moved from AA to B&F. Perception has been that IRP's and reclassifications are rare, but data seems to contradict this. Turnover rates were discussed and it was observed that staff turnover is similarly high many institutions.
- vii. Reorganizations: Moves of HR from AA to B&F and Enrollment Management from AA to SA were observed and discussed briefly. Many felt that reorganizations crossing divisions should enjoy full consultation and the benefits of shared governance.
- viii. Other: Concerns about the MOU with RCE were expressed relative to the issue of the primacy of academic affairs. What role should the provost play in the development of that MOU?
- ix. Cabinet passed out their prioritization list draft and it was discussed. Items included affirming the provost as first among equals, presidential communications and consultation regarding major decisions, management personnel issues, structure of senate executive committee, the number of campus committees, regular meetings between cabinet and deans, a campus policy hub, and an ombudsman program.
- x. It was agreed that final prioritization of the issues should occur in August after the climate survey results are released.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick Ford & Kathy Kaiser

C. Response of Chancellor White to Letter Subsequent to the Open Forum

Copies of the Chancellor's response to the letter sent by the Academic Senate Officers on behalf of the elected campus leaders asking the Chancellor to provide support for our efforts to address the issues identified in the Campus Climate Survey and at the Open Forum were passed out to the senators and the gallery. Boyd read the letter aloud:

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

September 15, 2015

Elizabeth Boyd, Chair
Rick Ford, Vice Chair
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary
Academic Senate Office
California State University, Chico
400 West First Street
Chico, CA 95929

“Dear Betsy, Rick and Tim,

I have reflected on your correspondence of September 3rd (attached for convenience). This reply is copied to President Zingg in addition to the colleagues you included in your correspondence so all can be informed of my thoughts.

I have discussed with Lori Lamb and Loren Blanchard their observation following their recent visit to Chico. Their perspective was informed by conversations with you, campus leaders and other campus individuals. They characterized the conversations as civil, professional and largely not personalized to specific individuals. They both indicated they heard meaningful ideas regarding shared governance. The intent of their visit was to listen to all voices available, not just a select subset. They also described their efforts to strongly encourage the campus *writ large* to create an environment that best prepares Chico for the impending transition in presidential leadership.

To be candid, Loren, Lori and I are disappointed by your letter of September 3, 2015. This letter and list of recommended actions are in conflict with the principles of civility, respect and shared governance; rather than send it to President Zingg and the Cabinet to further mutual conversations you sent it to me and distributed it broadly. I fear this approach, if continued, will perpetuate disharmony between the senate and the administration that will not serve Chico's

future well. Indeed, including a request for an "oversight presence" is inconsistent with the previous week's events as well as my letter of October 14, 2014 to then Senate Chair Selvester (attached for convenience). Your approach is one that does not have my support nor that of Lori and Loren. In addition, this approach displays traces of personal agendas, which further diminishes its credibility.

I respectfully request that you and your colleagues reconsider the approach you have initiated and think deeply about how to move forward in a productive manner. You can build on the strong progress at Chico on many fronts, some of which is reflected in the Campus Climate Survey results, and others which President Zingg summarized recently at fall convocation: ([http://www.csuchico.edu/prs/announcements/Fall %202015%20Convocation%20Speech.html](http://www.csuchico.edu/prs/announcements/Fall%202015%20Convocation%20Speech.html)).

The tools are in place to do so (i.e., the Resolution Response Team). What remains is the will to do so. I ask that you commit in good faith with the intent to truly move Chico in a positive direction. It is clearly time for the senate and the administration to work collaboratively together, along with staff representatives and student leaders, to resolve extant differences and prepare Chico State for the transition to a new president.

Sincerely,
Timothy P. White
Chancellor

Cc: Paul Zingg, President California State University, Chico
Lori Lamb, CSU Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
Steven Stepanek, CSU Faculty Trustee
Steven Filling, CSU Academic Senate
Lou Monville, Chair of the CSU Board of Trustees
Loren Blanchard, CSU Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs

Comments were offered. Desmond Tutu was quoted that reconciliation begins with acknowledgement that there is a problem, which this letter does not seem to do. The response feels like a slap on the hand and that is hard to understand. The letter follows a call for help that we made a year ago. It was observed that it often happens that if someone brings up an issue that goes against the flow, the response is often to stigmatize someone personally, but this seems to stigmatize a group of people.

The call to work again through the Resolution Response Full Committee was frustrating: If we are going to go ahead with this process, everyone should prioritize the work equally. There are actionable goals to accomplish that were identified at the Open Forum and the process to accomplish them should be taken seriously. The Open Forum was civil and topical and the moderators at each table tried very hard to make it that way. The Campus Climate Survey represents a large body of people.

Maybe the Chancellor is saying we broke the chain of command because we went to him first – maybe he wants us to acknowledge we broke protocol. It was pointed out that protocol was

already broken when our President appointed the Interim Provost to a permanent position without due process. The response was disappointing but not surprising. We would love to see the cabinet's commitment to the Resolution Response efforts. The Chancellor seems to be unclear about the sequence of events. He seems to be unaware that the letter of the 3rd was created after the Open Forum to put action steps to move the campus forward after massive input.

Boyd concluded the conversation by remarking that if the senators have more comments or things they would like to share, they should do so. They should ask their constituents what they would like them to do as well. She underlined that everyone's input is valuable.

6. Standing Committee Reports.

A. Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Crotts.

EPPC Summary– September 03, 2015, Kendall Hall room 207, 2:30 p.m.

EPPC reviewed

The role of the vice chair and secretary positions

The schedule of meetings

Quorums and proxies

Academic Senate organization

The Academic Department Manual, and specifically the sections

Administrative Curriculum Processes

Program Proposals and Revisions

The Academic Senate flowchart

EPPC Procedures, Policies, & Guidelines

The two levels of consideration of proposals: introduction and action

Parliamentary Guidelines specifically for amending main motions

EPPC Summary– September 10, 2015, Kendall Hall room 207, 2:30 p.m.

Elected Michelle McConkey as vice chair

Appointed representatives from EPPC to

All University Responsibility for Teacher Education (AURTEC)

Graduate Council

University Writing Committee

Liberal Studies Program Advisory Committee

Curriculum Advisory Board

Reviewed the secretary *du jour* schedule

Preliminarily—"pre-introduction"—reviewed proposals for

Minor in statistics for non-math majors

Significant changes in the B.S. in biochemistry

B Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Meadows.

FASP Report 9/3/15

At the first FASP meeting of the semester FASP

- Reviewed and approved the FASP Guidelines
- Discussed and then formed a subcommittee to revise EM 12-025 Policy on Campus Behavior and Violence Prevention to better address bullying
- Discussed and then formed a subcommittee to create an EM on consultation when reorganization occurs within and across university divisions.
- Had updates on the subcommittees looking at Lecturer rights and class size
- Discussed concerns around facility use fees

FASP Report 9/10/15

At this FASP meeting

- We discussed the AS Resolution on Shared Governance. A subcommittee was formed to consider a Committee on Committees.
- The class size subcommittee report will be shared with the Deans.
- The other subcommittees reported out
- The Presidential Search was discussed

C Executive Committee – Sistrunk.

Executive Committee Synopsis Friday, September 4, 2015, 8:30 a.m., K 103

The Executive Committee met on September 4, 2015 and discussed the following issues:

- The inaugural meetings of EPPC and FASP
- The way that the Senate Retreat on Shared Governance and the Campus Climate Survey of August 27 became the Open Forum.
- The course of the Open Forum:
 - a) Steve Filling (Chair of CSU Statewide Academic Senate) remarks on shared governance.
 - b) Matt Thomas (of the Campus Climate Survey Working Group) overview of the way the survey was conducted, how to read the results and queries that might be made of the information.
 - c) The way the break-out groups worked and the role the Moderators played.
 - d) The panel of leaders from different groups who could help answer questions about ways to move forward: ASCSU Chair, Steve Filling, VP Student Affairs, Mat Thomas (CCSWP), President CFA, President CSUEU, Chair Staff Council, Chair Academic Senate, President Associated Students, Chair Enrollment Management Advisory Committee, Chair Executive Management Selection Committee and the representatives of the Chancellor's Office (CSU Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Loren Blanchard and CSU Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Lori Lamb).
- The Elected Leaders Action Council which met the following day from 8:00-10:00 and generated a list of actions that address the issues brought out in the Campus Climate

Survey and the Open Forum that was sent to the campus, the Chancellor's Office, representatives of the Board of Trustees and representatives of ASCSU on September 3.

- Preparation for the search for the new President and ways to promote an open search.
- Searches for the Deans of the Library and Agriculture
- Searches on hold for a new Director of Institutional Research and a Vice Provost for Budget and Finance in Academic Affairs.
- Interim replacements for the Director of International Education and the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs
- The challenges of Chairs planning without Department budgets or allocations determined.
- WASC preparation committee
- The many alternative activities planned for students to celebrate Labor Day.

Executive Committee Synopsis Friday, September 11, 2015, 8:30 a.m., K 103

The Executive Committee met on September 11, 2015 and discussed the following issues:

- The Presidential Search and the make-up of the Committee that will participate.
- Possibilities for the Resolution Response Full Committee.
- Best ways to effect changes in staff and student representation in the Faculty Constitution as called for by the Elected Leaders action plan
- The magnificent progress of EPPC and FASP
- Some possibilities of a University Template for Syllabi
- The Ombuds Office job description
- The state of the revised FPPP
- The Policy Hub software which will make document handling easier
- WASC planning team assessment strategies to reach out to the University
- Piloting the Tableau Desktop software
- The four HERI student surveys that have begun gathering survey data on all our students (from Freshman to Senior year).The Faculty Equity Plan
- The success of the Labor Day weekend
- The Financial Transparency Portal, OpenGov as recommended by Senate that allows for transparency in University accounts.
- The changing security life-scan policy of the Chancellor's Office
- The new Gus Manolis bridge
- Searches for the Director of FMS and a new AVP for Staff Human Resources
- The Donor Recognition Tower Society and the Student Philanthropic Society.
- Statewide issues about the Presidential search

7. Statewide Academic Senate – Schulte/Selvester. <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/>

A. Report ASCU – September 3-4, 2015

Schulte offered the following:

Relevant notes:

Chair Filling's Report

During Chair Fillings' report, he requested Chico provide a report on our situation. Ann provided a general timeline of our events including resolution, resolution response team, campus climate survey, retirement announcement, appointment and decline of the provost, and campus forum. Senator Selvester was introduced as new statewide senator.

Chancellor White gave a report. On the budget he noted next year might be a "harder lift even with a better economy." He discussed the 4 presidential searches happening this year, two to complete in December and two in March. He gave rationale and explanation around "closed" search processes noting that the "very best, strongest pool" comes with this type of confidentiality. He suggested we might talk with Pomona, Fresno, or Long Beach about their processes of hiring a president. There will be open forums and a website to collect suggestions for the presidential hire.

When asked about a response for a presidential review from Fullerton, the Chancellor noted that he had sent the review letter to the campus and it is a public letter. Senator Selvester told the Chancellor that our president's report was not received and he noted he had sent it to the campus. (Note: Chancellor White sent a follow up email on the same day clarifying that he had suspended the sending of notices to campuses about the reviews of their presidents 2012-2014 but resumed in 2015.)

In response to questions about budget and priorities for how resources are used, the Chancellor promoted transparency and noted that we "want everyone to know what the money is and where it is going."

There was a motion and discussion in the body to support sending a delegation of ASCSU senators, along with the Chair Filling and Faculty Trustee Stepanek, to campuses (specifically Chico, San Bernardino, and San Luis Obispo) to show support of the need for shared leadership. This suggestion for a resolution was sent to the Faculty Affairs committee for consideration. Meanwhile, campuses are always allowed to request support visits from members of the ASCSU EC. Chico can decide if and when to do this.

Juan Cervantes, California State Student Association liaison: reports that they're working on a new fee. As for having more students on the CSU Board: that's a controversial topic, still under debate.

Lou Monville, CSU BOT Chair, comments and responses to questions:

The CSU was relatively successful in the last budget go-round at the legislature, and the Senate deserves a good bit of credit for that. Let's be mindful that because of that, future successes will be harder to come by.

Presidential searches: Four at a time is a big load. He suggested the need to continue rethinking and reconsideration of our fiduciary / financial responsibilities. There was the recent draft report of the sustainability task force. Discussion / concerns raised. The CSU remains "woefully underfunded."

On appointing interim presidents: The Chancellor doesn't appoint one without BOT informal support. Monville talked about how BOT may not know each campus well and be familiar with senate roles and processes. He encourages new BOT members campus senate members send new BOT welcome letters and inviting them.

Senator Denise Fleming made a statement about how it is time to shift the rhetoric away from "we don't have enough money" to "ways of advocating for public money" (higher taxes on oil severance, the 1%, etc.). Monville responded that we need to be realistic about what we can do.

Dia Poole, Alumni Council liaison made various comments, including the procedure for how the outgoing Trustee Monville (who represents alumni) will be replaced.

Steve Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor, CFO. Mr. Relyea gave a talk about the system's financial situation and projects, task forces, physical and network infrastructure, etc. Health care and insurance costs are rising rapidly. Demand for admission to the CSUs is higher than ever. In general, the system faces many challenges, on both the expenses and the revenues sides. Question time included comments that the CO seems to be pursuing all revenue sources *except* a restoration of state funds, which seems like the wrong message to send.

Loren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Students Affairs (new). Introduced himself and his vision regarding student success and how the campuses can nurture it. In accepting the job, he was particularly impressed with the CSU's graduation initiative. He took questions and provided responses, including on the issue of the increase of non-resident / international students, the diversity of (differences among) the various far-flung CSU campuses, and certain CSU practices and policies.

Resolutions Passed

AS-3222-15/FGA Support for SB 707 (Wolk): This resolution supports SB 707 (Wolk), which would prohibit persons with a concealed weapon permit from bringing a firearm onto K-12 school grounds or higher education campuses. The bill has an exception for certain law enforcement personnel.

AS -3224-15/FGA Support for SB 172 (Liu) Pupil Testing: High School Exit Examination: Suspension: This resolution supports SB 172 (Liu), which would temporarily remove the high school exit examination as a condition of high school graduation for the academic years 2015-16 through 2017-2018. According to the rationale, the bill is in response to recent developments that raise questions as to whether the continued use of CAHSEE is desirable at this time. The exam is no longer aligned with current high

school curricula, and the usefulness of the exam in assessing performance is questionable given disparate exam pass rates among various subgroups. In addition, the State's contract with the Educational Testing Service that administers the exam will expire at the end of 2015. The exam was not offered by the State in 2015.

AS-3230-15 Establishing a Task Force on the Requirements of CSU General Education (GE) Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (B4) Credit: This resolution is in response to the implications of a pilot program called Statway for the GE B4 quantitative reasoning requirement. Statway is currently used at seven community college campuses and two CSUs (SJSU, CSUS). It is designed to speed up progress through students' developmental math sequence and college-level course for credit. Statway bypasses the existing intermediate algebra proficiency standard in quantitative reasoning required as a prerequisite to CSU GE B4 courses by Executive Order (EO) 1100. The resolution asks for the creation of a task force to address the current GE B4 quantitative reasoning standard, particularly what courses will transfer to the CSU. The resolution directs the task force to answer two questions: Can the pre-requisite content for the CSU GE B4 course requirement be met concurrently with achieving the SU GE B4 standards (this is how Statway is designed)? And what should be the pre- (and potentially co-) requisite content for quantitative reasoning and mathematical competency (CSU GE B4)? For more information on Statway, see: <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/in-action/pathways-improvement-communities/>

AS-3232-15/APEP On the California High School Exit Examination: This resolution applauds the efforts of Senator Loni Hancock and Assembly Member Patrick O'Donnell in sponsoring and co-sponsoring respectively, SB 725, *Pupil testing: high school exit examination: exemption*. The legislation lifts the requirement for an exit exam in English and Mathematics for California 2015 high school graduates. The legislation was necessary because the exit exam was not offered by the State in 2015

First Reading Resolutions

AS-3223-15/FA Suspension of CSU Background Check Policy, HR-2015-08: This resolution calls for a suspension of the new CSU background check policy and requests that the ASCSU and Chancellor's Office create a task force to study the policy and make recommendations regarding the appropriateness of background checks for specific areas of faculty responsibility. The Rationale argues that subjecting all new faculty employees to a general background check represents an unwarranted infringement of privacy, potentially resulting in unintended consequences and unwarranted discrimination. The concern is also raised that the policy could prove a deterrent to attracting the strongest and most diverse candidates. The ASCSU was not consulted about the policy. The policy is available at: <http://www.calstate.edu/HRAdm/pdf2015/HR2015-08.pdf>

AS-3228-15/FA Additional of an Emeritus/Emerita Faculty Member to the CSU Board of Trustees: This resolution calls upon the ASCSU to advocate for the addition of an emeritus or emerita faculty member to the CSU Board of Trustees. It also requests that the Chancellor's Office support legislation amending the Education Code to that effect. The Rationale states that emeriti faculty have institutional knowledge of the CSU and its students that would be beneficial to the Board.

AS-3229-15/FGA California State University 2016-17 Support Budget Preliminary

Plan: This resolution commends the CSU preliminary plan for the 2016-17-support budget. It also urges the Board of Trustees to seek additional funding to provide a compensation pool increase for all employees beyond the administration’s proposed 2%. The Rationale acknowledges that the preliminary plan recognizes that CSU fiscal needs are greater than those in the governor’s multi-year funding plan. However, it also states that the 2% compensation pools in 2015-16 and 2016-17 are insufficient in light of multiple years when long serving employees had no cost of living increases, and a 1-year mandatory furlough resulting in a 9-10% pay reduction.

Selvester gave some “color commentary” to the statewide report.

The Chancellor reported that the budget was not that great. There is some difficulty in conducting four presidential searches in the same year, and he reiterated his feeling that there is an important need to maintain confidentiality on behalf of the candidates.

When asked about the reviews of President Zingg, he assured Selvester that Chico had already received these. He later had to retract that, as he had suspended the practice of sending the campuses reviews from 2012-14.

San Bernardino asked for a copy of our Campus Climate Survey and morale seems to be a widespread issue across the system.

Schulte read a statement sent by Steven Filling, Chair, Academic Senate, California State University:

“The core mission of the ASCSU includes nourishing and enhancing shared governance, both at system and campus levels as authorized by statute and statements of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellors Office administration and ASCSU. ASCSU is deeply supportive of campus shared governance, and will be supportive however it can be. We are more than willing to send members of the ASCSU Executive Committee to the campuses to visit Senates, to observe, to share our thoughts on how shared governance can and should work in the CSU. ASCSU visitors are not empowered to act as mediators or factfinders, rather as observers and sources of counsel.”

B. Resolution: Sonoma State University 2015-16 Presidential Search
(See above: 5.A: Resolution).

8. Associated Students - Jarquin.

Jarquin introduced herself and gave an overview of the Associated Students and their activities and plans for this year.

Associated Student Overview

- 18 million dollar non-for-profit corporation with the goal of supporting co-curricular mission and high impact practices

- She described the nine member board composition
- She gave a brief overview of the standing committees and noted that the Faculty Affairs committee needs a faculty member to volunteer.
- opportunities for your students – funding, representation, Associated Student Program internships and employment
- Strategic Plan Conversation – updating strategic plan for the Associated Students – the biggest change will be moving more towards technological literacy and staying on the cutting edge
- tightening up our diversity strategic plan to be more objective oriented
- Sick Leave – sick leave will not be afforded to students in hourly and non-hourly positions – 24 hours a year (around 3 days) that will not carry over to the next year
- CSSA Policy Agenda passed at September CSSA Meeting
- Labor Day Update – had over 1000 people at our three labor day events, collected 2200 nonperishable items.

Pratt added an update about the Student Academic Senate which will be starting its second year. They will work on internal structure and shared curricular activities. They will administer \$500 grants to promote student networking and high-impact practices, and they have already started a task force and committed resources to dealing with food insecurity on campus.

9. Staff Council – Heileson.

This full report will be forthcoming at the next meeting.

10. University Report – Zingg/Elrod.

Zingg:

President Zingg was gratified by the relative calm of Labor Day celebrations. He noted that all the activity of the last years including the alcohol summits with the community and all the other efforts seem to have changed the culture.

He also extolled Chico State's performance in the US Department of Education's College Scorecard in which our low cost, low student debt, good graduation rates and the high salaries our graduates received for the second time "a perfect score".

Elrod:

Interim Provost Elrod encouraged everyone to be excited about the upcoming WASC review and the new data posted on the WASC website.

She noted that the WASC planning committee needs another student to serve.

She described and shared copies of the unit/department self-reflection rubric that has been developed by the committee. The goal is to find what is important to the University, what the gaps are in our practice, and what we have done well. The hope is to have the Departments respond to the Rubric Survey by October 6. This will enable Division level and then University level assessment to depict our

strengths and goals by the academic year 2016/17. The hope is that by Fall 2017 we will be able to tell WASC our story.

Besides the rubric self-examination process, a WASC steering committee will be created as will working groups to focus on specific lines of inquiry and particular areas of work. This will unfold fairly soon.

11. Nominations OPEN for two at-Large Senators. (If there are 2 nominations only, these will be appointed by acclamation.) If there are more than two, the senators will vote on October 1, 2015. Information regarding at-Large Senators can be found at Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution of the Academic Senate. <http://www.csuchico.edu/fs/guidelines/constitution.shtml>

12. Ask the Administrator.

Nichols asked Elrod about how the WASC planning team is planning to discover institutional level learning outcomes as required by WASC. The last time we were reviewed, they asked us specifically to define the “Chico Experience”. She recognized that we are still early in this process, and noted that we can identify five core competencies that are required of our graduates. These can be measured by benchmarks over the course of an undergraduate experience and include the types of things we already promote (like civic engagement, active and engaged learning).

Sistrunk: Our Campus Questionnaire last year and the Campus Climate Survey recognized that we have issues with bullying and work place intimidation. We have created an Ombuds Office and FASP is working on updating the EM Policy on Campus Behavior and Violence Prevention, the missing piece is manager and administrator training and practice.

Zingg: Bullying and intimidation are system-wide problems identified by the Board of Trustees. There is a system-wide effort to help Human Resources personnel on campuses address these issues, but a comprehensive approach should not just be top-down, but also bottom up. We can take advantage of the Chancellor’s Office HR efforts to help by asking them to work with our campus so that we can regain our leadership in this area.

Nichols asked when the latest FPPP will be available and was told “tomorrow”.

Ford asked what plans there are to initiate a search for a new Vice Provost for Budget and Allocation in Academic Affairs since the last office holder left in early June. Is it possible to hire a consultant as the budget is still unresolved for Chairs and Deans?

13. Other.

The University Budget Committee will meet tomorrow at 8:30 and all are welcomed to attend. The new system recommended by the Senate last spring, Opengov will be explained.

Stapleton pointed out that FASP had requested information about Facilities Use fees (including

- 1) Where does the money collected for Use Fees go specifically?
- 2) Exactly how much is collected from whom and when?
- 3) What are the specific Use fees applied for cleaning, charges for equipment, and room occupancy or rental? Are they always the same?

4) What is the real cost to clean a room, for example? Is there some efficiency that might be discovered?

5) Is there a way to compare what the fees were historically? What about the changes in the last five years?

She wondered if the ball had started rolling to address these.

Zingg admitted that if he could work to implement EO 1000 again, he would have done it differently. He said the cabinet has decided to create a centralized fund to help the departments, and all the units defray the expenses. He said discussion had been ongoing for the last 18 months to implement this idea of taking the expense “off the top”. When asked who was part of these discussions, he answered that the Cabinet, the Deans, students and community groups.

Boyd asked about the timeline to give the deans who did not have them, immediate retreat rights to a department. The reply was that this will be completed this week.

Boyd returned to the question about adding representatives from the students and staff to the academic senate. She said that the Executive Committee is currently discussing the best way to accomplish this and the issue will be brought forward soon.

14. Adjourn.

Adjournment at 4:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Sistrunk, Secretary