

California State University, Chico

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, November 12, 2015, 2:30 p.m., K-207/209

PRESENT: Boyd, Calandrella, Cross, Crotts, Donoho (Sager), Elrod, Ferrari, Ford (Rowberg), Gray, Heilesen, Hoffman, Janos, Jarquin, Kipnis, Kirchhoff, Livingston, McConkey (Crotts), Meadows, Nichols, Ponarul, Pratt, Roll, Rowberg, Schierenbeck, Scholz (Sistrunk), Schulte, Seipel, Selvester, Sistrunk, Stapleton, Thompson (Roll), Traver (Livingston), Wilking, Zartman, Zingg

ABSENT: Boura, Kemper, Ratekin

Chair Boyd welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 2:31.

1. Approve Minutes of October 29, 2015.

Deferred minutes until next time.

2. Approve Agenda.

The Agenda was approved.

3. Announcements.

- Crotts announced that the first candidate for the Dean of the Library position will be visiting campus on November 16 and 17 and will give a public address on Monday, the 16th at 10:15 in Colusa 100b. Everyone is welcomed to attend and give feedback.
- Schierenbeck informed the Senate that every Friday at 4:00 p.m. the Biology student club hosts a seminar and this week it is co-hosted by the Friends of the Herbarium. There will be a High school photo contest afterwards as well.
- Heilesen reminded everyone she is still accepting donations on behalf of Staff Council for the "University's Needy Children Program". The raffle has been concluded and earned \$4,000. But, it is not too late for groups to adopt a child to support.
- Seipel announced that the Chancellor's Office is in the process of considering contracts for Learning Management systems (like BBL). Ideas, thoughts and feedback may be sent to Ben Seipel about keeping BBL on this campus, for example, or other notions about these systems.
- Boyd had two announcements:

- 1) The two positions for at-large senator have been filled by the newly elected Chiara Ferrari and Charles (Chuck) Zartman. Applause was enthusiastic.
- 2) The committee to advise the Board of Trustees about the selection of our next President advised Boyd to pass out a copy of the presidential search firm's "Call for nominations from you and your networks" looking for the names of people who might be worthy of the office of our new President, or for the names of people who might know people worthy of the task. The sheet provides examples of the type of questions one might ask to uncover candidates with an especial eye to finding a diverse pool. These sheets can be returned to the address listed on the backside of the sheet for the campus search committee with a guarantee of confidentiality.

Zartman pointed out that the intention is to cast as broad a net as possible for worthy candidates. Boyd reiterated that people should reach out beyond senate to think about possibilities.

4. Chair's Prerogative.

Civic Engagement Strategic Priority draft – Discussion Item.

<http://www.csuchico.edu/fs/documents/fall-2015/as-11-12-15/strategic-priority.pdf>

Boyd introduced some of the members of this Strategic Priority draft committee: Ellie Ertle, Zach Justus and Thia Wolfe.

Ellie Ertle described the long vetting process undertaken from last Spring 2015 to hear ideas about this priority. The document is the result of a long collaborative discussion with stake holders across the University and community (outlined on pg. 2 at the bottom of the document). This presentation in Senate is part of the ongoing effort to get feedback.

Zach Justus described that the priorities function in many complex ways in the University not just for Advancement, but as a touchstone for work in and out of the classroom as well. The priorities are not proscriptive in requiring faculty to follow them, rather they provide a place to locate and reference the work faculty already does, especially in compiling out RTP files. The format of this priority document matches the flow and structure of the other priorities.

He asked for comments now and pointed out his contact information and welcomed any meetings people may wish to make later (zjustice@csuchico.edu).

Roll commented that she was aware from earlier conversations that there were some specific concrete resource implications discussed while bringing forward this priority. Were these part of the implications of this?

Zingg said that there are resource implications to every element of the strategic plan, but this proposal does not add, for example, a center or institute, nor specific space assumptions. Those possibilities would only occur through the normal

channels, particularly within Academic Affairs. As it might involve space, that would require consultation through committees and especially germane to this proposal, private support that might evolve into an endowment for a center or institute. At the moment there are no resources attached to this proposal.

Livingston asked for elaboration about the RTP implications. Zach Justus pointed out that currently the civic engagement work that faculty do is almost exclusively reported as “Service”. This projected priority would allow faculty to situate their work in their RTP reports, and particularly where they are asked to reflect on University strategic priorities.

Zingg reminded everyone that the strategic priorities allow faculty to explain their work and no one is expected to fulfill them all.

5. Standing Committee Reports.

A. Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Crotts.

EPPC Summary– November 05, 2015

The following items passed as action items and forwarded to the Academic Senate office for inclusion as introduction items on the Academic Senate agenda for November, 2015:

- New Minor in Geospatial Literacy
- Revisions EM 10-018: Grading Policy, Section X. Repetition of Courses.
- EPPC continued discussion continued on course syllabi.

B. Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Meadows.

FASP Report 11/4/15

At this FASP meeting we considered

- Proposed EM on Appointment, Evaluation and Support of Department Chairs, Directors and Unit Program Coordinators – Action Item Passed
- Revision of EM 12-014 Campus Equity Council – Discussion Item – Subcommittee Formed
- Other subcommittees reported out

C. Executive Committee – Sistrunk.

Executive Committee Synopsis Friday, November 6, 2015, 8:30 a.m., K 103

Executive Committee met on November 6, 2015 and discussed the following issues:

- Student Mental Health: training and protocols for student problems in courses
- Policy Hub –new software to organize policies
- UBC Policy – planning to rewrite committee description to allow more members and promote input in budget issue before decisions are made
- EM 04-042 –Discussion of Executive Management Hiring Committee practice and position

announcements in Academic Affairs

- FASP: Policy on Division and Cross Division Reorganization
- FASP: Lecturer Teaching Tenure
- EPPC: New Minor in Geospatial Literacy
- EPPC: Revisions to EM 10-018: Grading Policy
- Demolition of the Henning House in the BCCR
- Audits:
 - 1) 200 faculty have not completed Security Awareness Training
 - 2) Students and Faculty with access to Level 1 or 2 data must complete data security forms
- Warrens Center remodeling schedule
- Wildcat statue

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

Schulte reported that a number of resolutions were introduced and several had been passed at the ASCSU meeting in Long Beach. (For instance, there were commendations for people and a call for more money in the budget). She addressed two particularly as of interest.

- 1) There was a call to suspend the policy about background checks. We discussed locally some ways to implement this policy, but others brought up questions about how the background information will be used as there seems to be no systematic policy about that. It was pointed out that since the justice system is full of inequities, the policy could potentially limit the diversity of applicants and even people that are particularly sought for positions. Student representatives wondered about the impact on Service Learning programs. This resolution passed.
- 2) Another resolution supported the 21 campuses who have already passed measures calling for open Presidential searches by calling for the public announcement of candidates and their official visits as finalists. This passed unanimously.

Selvester discussed “First Readings” of resolutions in an effort to promote our Senate participation through our representatives in a timely way in statewide policy considerations.

AB386 is legislation that asserts that all online courses offered in the C.S.U. can be taken by any student system-wide and they must all be accepted wherever the student resides. There is no separate process to evaluate how courses are truly articulated with others as faculty assert that they make individual determinations about what is in the curriculum. At the moment, the courses identified as suitable for this assimilation are lower division “bottle-neck” courses, but eventually upper division major courses will be absorbed. The ASCSU resolution calls on campuses to create procedure to evaluate how their courses might be articulated in this system, so that Chairs can control the influx of possibilities that might be claimed as equivalents in their majors. This will be sent to the Curriculum Advisory Board and EPPC for planning ahead.

ASCSU reaffirms, yet again, its commitment to the principals of shared governance and will

ask for the Chancellor to comment on the notion of “shared leadership” in the HEERA and APP documents because there have been many reported violations of these principals across the system with little response from the Chancellor.

There is another resolution calling for the inclusion of Lecturers in semi-annual and annual Orientation days, which CSU Chico is already doing and may have some guidance to offer.

The representatives do not return until January and invite comments on the resolutions found in the statewide Senate website (listed above).

Zartman asked about the way the calls for open Presidential searches compared, and Schulte explained that most of them were unanimous and the ASCSU was unanimous as well. Selvester clarified that the term “open search” really signifies “campus visits” which is a highlight of the ASCSU document.

7. Associated Students - Jarquin.

Associated Students Business and Other Updates

- Updates AS Strategic Plan - The AS Strategic Plan is now in each individual standing committee after being approved in October. The Board of Directors is looking forward to hearing specific tactics from each program and standing committee.
- Safety Summit – A Safety Summit was held this past week on Wednesday with topics ranging from property crimes to assault, which was followed, by the quarterly Town and Gown meeting. At the Safety Summit, fifty-five students, staff and community members spoke about tangible solutions to increase safety in our community.
- At Town and Gown we discussed safety cameras on the Nord Corridor bike path and LED light replacements pending funding approval.
- 17th Annual Women’s Conference – This past Sunday the 17th Annual Women’s Conference was held focusing on Intersectional Feminism. We want to thank two faculty members Mim Roeder and Kate McCarthy for donating their time to talk about this important topic.
- Upcoming Events Multicultural Affairs Night – Thursday, November 12th from 6pm to 9pm in the BMU Auditorium.

Beyond the report, Jarquin wanted to add that the AS had been working with Thompson and Tray Robinson to lead some groups to Dream centers at CSU Sacramento and UC Davis to learn about their practices. The front page of the Orion today features a good story about Dream students on our campus.

She hoped people would be inspired before March 31 to plan some course awareness of Cesar Chavez Day and his importance in California, especially.

Pratt depicted how on November 11, after the Presidential search forum, the student trustee, Maggie White, held a reception for students to allow them to express their concerns. She will return again in February and wants to meet with more students from more of the

colleges. If any senators know students who might be interested in talking with their trustee, please have them contact Pratt.

8. Staff Council – Heileson.

Heileson submitted the following approved report:

Staff Council Minutes of October 12, 2015 Kendall 207-209, 8:30 am – 10:30 am

Approved: November 10, 2015

Attendance: Jim Aird, Sarah Balana Molter, Rebecca Belser, JoAnn Bradley, Mary Kay Bringham, Rebecca Cagle, Mario Chandrakumar, Melissa Cheatham, Don Converse, Joe Crotts, Katrina Cunningham, Nicole Davis, Holly Ferguson, Dana Francis, Chris Gardner, Kathleen Hassig, Annette Heileson, Michelle Holmes, Deanna Jarquin, Cindy Kelly, Eva Kennedy, Kara Maas, Rena Marino, Lynn Maurer, Jackie McMillan, Russ Mills, Melanie O'Connor, Jene Rabo, Lori Rice, Jen Ross, Erin Tarabini, Scott Taylor, Katherine Tilman
Absent: Gale Carillo, Margie Mitchell, Andrew Nichols, Cari Phipps, Michael Pratt, Rachelle Sousa, Sheryl Woodward
Meeting Commence: 8:37 a.m. Call To Order: Annette Heileson

Approval of meeting minutes from June 2015 & September 2015:

June approved; September approved.

- Open Forum for staff members regarding the recent campus climate survey: We have been asked to host a staff review of the Campus Climate Survey. Please send any questions you would like addressed to Annette.

Chair's Prerogative: Staff Council members to go around the room and say what Department you are from and one thing about yourself.

Announcements:

- JoAnn Bradley will be retiring at the end of December after 25 years of service to the University.
Kayla Whitehead from the Library is interested in Staff Council and will be sitting in on today's meeting.

Human Resources –Sheryl Woodward: absent; no report

Payroll & HRIS – Rebecca Cagle:

- Working on wrapping up the student reports.
- Next big project is the paperless student employment project.
- Working on filling the Payroll Tech 1 position.

Associated Students – Deanna Jarquin and Michael Pratt:

- Deanna and Michael have staff meeting at this same time so they will be switching off each meeting.

- The AS is a non-profit corporation whose board is comprised of students elected at general elections in April. They pass policies and work on bettering the AS and the University. They have three standing committees.
- AS provides opportunities for students such as funding councils that give money for events on campus, internships and they employ over 500 students on campus and 100 career staff.
- Represent students on campus and provide student support.
- AS passed several resolutions last year; one to advocate to adopt a dream center on campus, one to support shared governance practices on campus and another to look at space for the CLIC on campus.
- AS Represents Chico State at the system wide level. This past weekend they attended the California State Student Association in San Francisco. Just had a bill for open learning resources signed by Governor Brown.
- Student Involvement and Representation Fee (SIRF) is an opt out fee for students where they pay \$2 each semester and have the opportunity to pay for CSSA.
- Looked at the rough draft for sustainable funding models this past weekend.
- Within the AS Business they have a new Associate Director Jamie Cameron Clyde.
- Performing a study of feasibility study of our lower level of the BMU to see how we can make it more accessible to students and how we can allocate space in a more equitable way to programs.
- Just did their audit committee and no significant findings were found.
- Strategic Plan for AS that includes language about technological literacy and diversity strategic plan goals.
- Passed two career staff policies regarding sick leave and bereavement policy.
- All committees are currently up and running and have staff representation.
- Over 1000 people attended the free Labor Day events. Over 30 events during the three weeks of welcome week and 9 events during Labor Day weekend.
- Collected 2301 non-perishable food items for the Hungry Wildcat Pantry. Goal this year is 4000 non-perishable food items.
- Michael Pratt chairs the student academic senate which is comprised of one senator from each of the 7 colleges. Focus this year is internalized structure and supporting shared governance on campus.
- Thank you to all staff for helping to make our students successful.

Academic Senate - Joe Crotts:

- Senate met on August 25, September 17 and October 1.
- August 25 meeting was planned as a retreat but after the President's announcement of a permanent appointment of a Provost the meeting was changed to an Open Forum on Shared Governance and the Campus Climate Survey Report.
- September 17 meeting began with an announcement that nominations for two faculty to serve on the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the 3 President. The Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents was reviewed and commented upon. There is concern over the prohibition of campus visitation by candidates (closed vs. open search). Senate passed a resolution on the search calling for "an open and transparent search process for the next president". A synopsis of the Resolution Response Full Committee Retreat was also reviewed at this meeting followed by a reading of the response from the chancellor from September 15 to a letter from the Academic Senate

Executive Committee officers to the chancellor on September 3, Recommended Actions in Response to the Open Forum on Shared Governance and the Campus Climate Survey. The chancellor sent the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources to our campus who then reported back to the Chancellor's office. The Resolution Response Full Committee has a meeting scheduled on October 27.

- October 1 meeting Senate reviewed and approved several proposals. Minor changes in the Bachelors of Science degree in biochemistry were approved as an introduction item. These changes will revise the curriculum to improve written and oral communication in biochemistry and chemistry. In addition, the results of the election of two faculty members to serve on the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President were announced, with Chuck Zartman and Academic Senator Paula Selvester being elected.

- Next Senate meeting will be this Thursday, October 15. Everyone is invited/encouraged to attend the Senate meetings.

- Deanna Jarquin comments we are the only campus that has both a faculty and student trustee as part of the presidential search.

- Annette adds that three staff names were submitted to Lori Hoffman for her to pass on to the Chancellor's office to choose one staff member to serve on the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President. We should be hearing in the next couple of days who was chosen.

Office of the President – Russ Mills:

- The presidential search open forum will be held on November 10. Please attend to have an opportunity to express concerns and things that you would like to see in the next president to the search committee.

- Ombuds search announcement went out. We hope to have two people selected and in place by beginning of spring semester. The ombuds will serve as an informal place where faculty, staff and students can go and address concerns they have about campus, employment, etc. This does not replace normal personnel processes on campus.

- WASC – there is a small group working on preparations.

- Russ comments that the Chancellor is supportive of the Climate Survey process. The Chancellor's response was to a letter from the officers of the Senate. At the Senate meeting where the Chancellor's letter was provided the original letter was not provided to senate. After that meeting the senate released the letter.

- Joe adds that the Chancellor is complimentary on our processes and hopes that we continue and make it work.

- Annette comments that the letter Russ referred to actually had already gone out to campus. Russ responds that an email was sent out that talked about the climate survey but that is not what the Chancellor was addressing. There was a separate letter that was not revealed to the campus until later.

- Joe notes that in the past 42 years there have only been 4 presidents and since 1952 only 5 presidents.

Staff Council guest speaker – Mimi Greminger & Tila Guizar-Powell, Butte County Children's Services; 2015 University Needy Children's Program:

- Cindy Kelly comments that the University Needy Children's Program has been going on

for 30 years with Chico State and 25 of those have been with Staff Council.

- Mimi & Tila are social workers with Butte County Children's Services. They would like to express their sincere gratitude for Chico State's generosity through the UNCP. The reactions of the families when they receive their gifts are priceless and they appreciate everything that is given to them.

- Throughout the year donations can be made to Butte County Children's Services (books, clothes, etc.) and to local foster family agencies such as Youth & Family and Environmental Alternatives. There is an Independent Living Program (ILP) store on Morrow Lane that also accepts donations. More information can be found on the Youth & Family website

<http://youthandfamily.info/butte-ilp/>

Staff Council Guest Speaker – Ann Schwab, CAVE; United Way Campaign:

- The "Our Promise" California State Employees Giving at Work is an annual campaign that has been going on since 1957. They are in collaboration with Human Resources Service Center to rollout the campaign this year.
- The United Way Giving Program has 50 agencies in the Northern CA area. You can donate to general United Way fund or to a specific agency such as CAVE.

- State employees can contribute using payroll deduction.

- Letters and pledge forms will be mailed out this week to campus zip.

- CAVE is Community Action Volunteers in Education and is the largest student run organization on campus. 70 student working for the program, 11 programs that students can volunteer through. Student volunteers get 30 hours of service equal to one credit toward graduation. Last year they had almost 2000 Chico State students volunteering their time in the community. Programs serve a broad base of community needs such as working in the classroom for Chico Unified, working in assisted living/retirement homes and cleaning up the park.

- This year they are doing a pilot program with the Esplanade House. Student volunteers go to the Esplanade House to play/do activities with the children. This semester they have 20 volunteers going there with 4 site supervisors and there are 28 kids signed up through the program. Next semester they have an estimated 50 children with the program. They are working on a carnival for the children for Thanksgiving and would like funding for this.

- It was asked if there are things that staff/community members can volunteer for. Right now they are only serving Chico State students but there might be opportunities for collaboration with staff in the future.

- CAVE will be celebrating its 50th anniversary next October.

Standing Committee Reports: Governance Committee – Jim Aird:

- Official seating of Staff Council member Jene Rabo

- Shared governance update – all staff positions have been filled.

- Area list reminder – please continue to update and send to Melanie.

- Introduction item: revision of by-laws to include addition of the Staff Recognition Committee.

- Lynn asks about sending out minutes – we should send out the minutes to our areas after they have been approved. Can send a summary to their area and then follow up with the approved minutes.

Service Projects – Cindy Kelly

- UNCP update – raffle proceeds will go toward food certificates for all the families and last minutes gifts for the children. Gifts are due on Wednesday, December 9. There will be a reception at the pavilion with a Christmas tree, children’s choir/music, raffle and refreshments. This year is our 25th anniversary. We will email out the flyer so that each member can distribute to their areas. Everyone gets 100 tickets but if you need more please ask Melanie. All of the information is on your packet. Don’t tear apart your tickets. The email for adopting families will go out next week.
- October Blood Drive sponsored by Chico State Greek Community is today. Next Blood Drive is Tuesday, November 17. Email Melanie to set up and appointment to get through faster.

Ways and Means – Rachelle Sousa

- Rachelle absent; no report.

Staff Recognition Committee – Melissa Cheatham

- Committee will meet today.

Executive Committee Business/New Staff Council Business

- Don Converse, Bike & Board Safety Project: Power point presentation next month. Just got lollypops in and will talk about it in detail at next meeting.
- Melanie O’Connor o Refreshment Coffe collection - \$10.00/person. Please place donation in the envelope that will be passed around.
- Staff e-newsletter - every month or every other month. Melanie is working to get the first one out by the end of October. Please send ideas to Melanie to include. 6 We could include a welcome to new staff and farewell to staff retiring or leaving campus.
- Distribution of UNCP raffle tickets & envelopes – please pick up before you leave o Distribution of See’s candies & envelopes – please pick up before you leave. 24 bars per box. Raised price this year \$2 per bar and \$1 per lollypop. Flyer to attach to box. Proceeds of see’s candy sales go to the Ways & Means Committee, Halloween costume contest and awards, decorations and incidentals for the staff luncheon. Erin comments that if you have extra money left over after shopping for your UNCP family you can donate it to go towards last minute gifts.
- Halloween costume contest again this year on Friday, October 30th. Prizes to the top three winners.
- Friday Oct 30th Koffee & Kudos at Warner Center sponsored by the Office of the President, 10-2 p.m. Wear your costume!
- There will also be a November and December Koffee & Kudos. Look for those announcements.

Intent to Raise Questions:

- AS to author a letter for presidential search about the 4-5 traits they find most important for the next president. The more unified campus groups can be would be great. Staff Council Execs will put forward suggestions on behalf of Staff Council. Email suggestions to Annette, Jim and Melanie.

Adjournment: 10:18 a.m.

Heilesen also alerted everyone that staff will be having a forum to hear about the Campus Climate Survey results on December 1, from 12:00-1:30 p.m. in Colusa 100a-b, which will particularly focus on information germane to staff.

9. University Report – Zingg/Elrod.

Elrod:

Elrod reported that budget allocations have been going out and will continue to go out in the next couple of days, so that all Units in Academic Affairs should have their budget allocations. You should be hearing from your Deans. She would love to make a presentation at the next Senate meeting about the state of the budget. There are still little tweaks here and there to be made even though we allocate.

Elrod introduced Katy Thoma, the Executive Director of the Research Foundation (RF) to give an update on the Henning House, which is at the Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve (BCCR). Katy Thoma explained that the RF was planning to tear-down the Henning House over Thanksgiving Break. Two engineering reports have designated that the house is structurally unsound and a biological survey and evaluation of the historical significance of the property have been conducted. The materials will be dedicated to the Habitat for Humanity and the seasoned wood will be used to construct a bat condo on the site. She noted that RF had reached out to the Henning family to let them know the plans and promised they could still visit the reserve. She explained that the house was purchased, it was not a gift.

She wanted to correct the Enterprise Record newspaper account that the RF receives a grant from Academic Affairs to use the BCCR. The RF has an MOU that spells out the payment Academic Affairs will make for faculty to use the reserve. So far there have been 1500 users this year since June (these users were not identified).

Boyd explained that Katy Thoma had been providing updates on the BCCR and the RF to EPPC since last year and members attended RF meetings.

Roll noted that a letter had just been sent to Katy Thoma and President Zingg and some of the Deans from the Technical Advisory Committee that asserts that there has been a lack of transparency and shared governance about this decision, and they are surprised this process is moving forward and are asking to halt it for more consultation. They do not feel they have been given all the information they have asked for, and several of our faculty colleagues are also concerned.

Katy Thoma said that the deck of the house collapsed October 19, 2013, which resulted in eleven serious injuries had resulted in a number of lawsuits. Since then, risk management people have looked at the property and discussions with the Technical Advisory Committee which includes faculty, community members and neighbors of the property. RF has not disclosed the reports including the engineering reports because litigation was ongoing. There is on suit ongoing and until that is settled, RF will not release any of the reports.

Roll asked if there was a pressing need to have this happen at Thanksgiving, could there be a pause to wait for the Technical Advisory Committee to be fully informed.

Katy Thoma said that they have been apprised, that there is no use for the house, that it is not structurally sound, it does not meet ADA requirements, and it does not impact the programs that go on at the reserve. She does not believe a caretaker is needed on the site.

Elrod added that the Research Foundation oversees the BCCR and the Research Foundation Board governs the RF and the Board has been apprised of the demolition and they have been involved.

Sistrunk asked why it would not be advantageous to have a caretaker on the property as the Henning House could serve to house such a person and it might be part of the multifaceted ways of promoting the reserves.

Katy Thoma said a caretaker is not needed because there are cameras that can serve the purpose. The house has been deemed structurally unsafe and should not be used for any purpose at all.

Livingston asked about the \$250,000 amount that the newspaper reported Academic Affairs transferred to the RF to use the BCCR. Katy Thoma said the amount is not a “grant” it is rent because the RF owns the property and faculty is using it. Livingston said he had always thought that money went from the Foundation to Academic Affairs and not the other way around.

WASC Update

Bill Loker reported that the WASC accreditation management team, with representatives from every division has been charged with gathering preliminary data, looking at the timeline to complete evaluations, and planning the approach CSU Chico will take to get accreditation from WASC. A worksheet that mirrors the criteria asked in the review was sent to all the deans and filtered down to the Departments and everyone was asked to comment. The management team is currently evaluating these responses.

Meanwhile, a second document has been sent out (called the “blue form”) that seeks the input of these same people to evaluate where we are in the areas of focus particularly asked about in our earlier accreditation in 2009. There are six areas WASC wanted us to continue to focus on:

- 1) Diversity – recruiting of students, providing a meaningful “Chico Experience” for a diverse student body, and a diversified faculty and staff.
- 2) Assessment – assurance of learning, meaning and quality of degrees
- 3) General Education program redesign
- 4) First Year Experience
- 5) Institutional Effectiveness for decision making
- 6) Approaches to academic technology

The 2019 accreditation will need to cover these areas. There is some overlap between the

forms passed out by the accreditation management team, but the emphases are different and the intention is not to be exhaustive but to take the temperature of the campus. The “blue form” is due tomorrow.

Zartman wondered about comparing how we did in January 2006 with January 2016: how are we doing in terms of time frame to complete our tasks? Bill Loker answered that it is hard to be comparative as we are looking at different areas than was done then, and he pointed out that the WASC process itself has changed. There is much less emphasis on the Institution reporting how wonderful it is, and more about the criteria we use and how we measure up according to them. He admitted that we are stronger in some areas than others, as for instance, comparing our Technology of education with the types of responses we heard at the Presidential search forum that doubted our accomplishments with Diversity. The point of the exercise is to get a preliminary reading on our strengths and weaknesses.

Elrod explained that the next steps in the process will require forming working groups and task forces around the issues that arise to which we feel we still need to pay attention.

Sistrunk asked for more clarification of the use of assessment to make sure our degrees have meaning. Bill Loker explained that there is much conversation across the country about exactly what a baccalaureate degree means. We are given some latitude in defining what a Chico State degree means, for example, but WASC has expectations about the core competencies undergraduates should receive.

10. [Proposed New Minor in Applied Statistics](#) - EPPC – Action Item.

Crotts moved the motion and explained that the degree was a means to give non-mathematics majors a minor to apply statistics skills to their majors. Gray underlined that the intention was to provide students with hands-on experience with statistics as opposed to a more theoretical grounding.

Rolls noted that EPPC had discussed the motion thoroughly and was glad to support bringing it forward.

Gray moved to add

Anth. 485: Formal Methods for Anthropology as one of the listed electives for the minor on page 5 and page 7. (seconded)

She explained that she had just overlooked the course and thought it was a very good fit.

Bill Loker admitted to having taught the course and asserted that it had a quite robust statistical dimension that would serve the minor.

Amendment to the motion passed.

Russell Mills pointed out that the minor proposal did not restrict Math majors from taking it. Gray explained that there is a Statistics minor in the Math major already and students would be advised in that direction.

Revised Action Item passed.

11. [Significant Change Proposal - B.A. in Philosophy](#) – EPPC – Action Item.

Crotts explained that this proposal simplifies the Philosophy program substantially by making it broader and eliminating the two Options currently part of the degree that are felt to be unnecessarily restrictive.

Ed Pluth described how he had discussed the concerns voiced by the student representative to the College (Diego) about how some courses are being changed from requirements to electives to provide more flexibility for students.

Jarquin reiterated that student concerns had been addressed, and it was hoped that the changes would get more students involved with Philosophical thinking.

Action Item passed.

12. [Proposed Policy for Official Communication with Employees via Electronic Mail](#) – FASP – Action Item.

Meadows moved the policy noting that Mark Hendricks could not attend, but that Mike Schilling (Vice President for Information Resources and CIO) would answer questions. She clarified that the question about access to email for emeritus faculty that was brought forward last time is in a different policy (EM 07-001) [Use of Computing and Communications Technology for Faculty](#) which states: “Retired faculty and staff will be granted continued access to computing and communications facilities, but such access under certain circumstances may require modifications due to limited resources.” She noted that this policy would not change this provision.

Mike Schilling noted that this policy will close audit item #21 which the Chancellor’s Office has encouraged.

Meadows moved a change under

[Section five: Purging of Deleted Messages \(page 3\)](#) the first sentence should read:

“Unless a legal hold has been placed on an account, messages in University Email Accounts will ~~should~~ be purged from folders as follows:” (seconded).

Amendment passed.

Amended Action Item passed.

13. [Proposed EM: Responsibilities of Department Chairs, Directors and Program Coordinators of Standalone Units](#) – FASP – Action Item.

Meadows moved the proposed EM as an action item and reintroduced Katie Silliman (from the Chairs Council committee) who will answer questions.

Cross moved to consider a substitute document (seconded). He explained that he wanted to make the language of the EM more accommodating of different types of leadership. The substitute does not change the duties articulated in the previous document, but invites and encourages delegation and collaboration with faculty and Deans.

He read through the substitute and explained the changes he advocated and their rationale. Boyd allowed Senators and the Provost to comment throughout Cross's descriptions. Fascinating procedural processes were discussed along the way.

The substitute document was accepted.

Meadows proposed amending

I. Responsibilities, Section 1: Administration: line 2 "~~Facilitate~~ university, college" with "Administer university, college" (seconded).

Motion passed

Rowberg moved to change

I. Responsibilities, section 2: Planning: "With Dean and faculty input coordinate" to strike "~~With Dean and faculty input~~ coordinate" (seconded).

Motion failed.

Sagar wondered what the purpose and spirit of the document were. Is the document merely suggestive of the types of things a Chair should be involved in, or is it proscriptive? He wanted to hear someone speak to the motivation of the document. What will the document be used for down the road?

Meadows pointed to the first line of the document that depicts its purpose as a description of what a Chair does. It puts on paper what Chairs actually do, because it was probably unfamiliar to many people.

Sagar worried about the tendency to heap more and more things on the Chairs. He hoped the description would not be used pedantically nor proscriptively.

Livingston proposed changing the language of

I. Responsibilities line 1 2. Planning: "~~With Dean and faculty~~ input coordinate" with "With appropriate input coordinate" (seconded).

Motion passed.

Rowberg deferred to Katie Silliman to bring the document up to date and depict new responsibilities the Chairs hold. For example she pointed out that accreditation was not mentioned before.

Crotts noted that the notice that this document supersedes AA 84-18, refers to an older Academic Affairs documents from 1984.

Meadows moved to strike the wording of

I. Responsibilities line 2 section 6 Personnel “with the dean and faculty, including” and make it “with the dean ~~and faculty~~, including” (seconded).

Motion passed.

Rowberg moved to strike the words from

I. Responsibilities, line 1, section 9 Courses “With consultation of faculty, direct the” and replace with “~~With consultation of the faculty~~, direct the” (seconded).

Motion failed.

Livingston moved to change the language

I. Responsibilities, line 1, section 9, Courses from “With consultation of faculty, direct the” to “Through appropriate consultation with the faculty, direct the” (seconded)

Motion passed.

Rowberg’s motion was allowed to be withdrawn.

Elrod wanted to replace

I. Responsibilities, section 11: Students: line 1 “~~Facilitate~~ student advising, mentoring, outreach, student clubs” with “Manage student advising, mentoring, and outreach. Oversee student clubs” (seconded).

Motion passed

The amended Action Item passed.

14. [Proposed New Minor in Geospatial Literacy](#) – EPPC – Introduction Item.

Crotts introduced the proposal asserting that many students have taken the Geography department’s three introductory geospatial courses because the skills are increasingly germane to many fields of inquiry. He introduced Geography professor Scott Brady to answer questions.

Sistrunk wondered if there was a sense of the resources changes or staffing that would be needed to support this effort.

Brady answered that the courses were already offered and the electives are already offered as requirements for the other departments that have chosen to participate. The main resource would be advising.

Motion passed.

15. [Proposed Revisions to EM 10-018: Grading Policy](#) – EPPC – Introduction Item.

Crotts explained that the EPPC measure was supposed to revise only section 10 parts A and B of EM 10-018. Section ten deals with Repetition of Courses and under section B our policy says students may repeat no more than 3 courses with grade forgiveness. The Chancellor's Office EO 10-37 lets students repeat up to 16 units with grade forgiveness and our policy thus restricts the EO more than it allows.

Crotts discovered that the Chancellor's EO came out in 2008 while our EM 08-013 that allowed no more than "two courses" came out in 2008. In 2009 our people added language to our EM to revise it to EM-09-010 that said no more than three courses or up to 16 units could be taken again with grade forgiveness. The present EM 10-018 did not change this and offered no comment.

This policy being introduced today eliminates the course number qualification and also adds that the "highest" grade earned will be calculated as part of the student's grade point average as opposed to the previous language that the "last" grade awarded will be.

Sagar spoke to the rationale for the changes. He observed that someone with suitable courses that allowed them to reenroll in the maximum 16 units gained more than others with courses that did not end up being 16 units but reached the maximum of three. He also surveyed all the campus policies in the system and discovered three that specified units more restrictively than the Chancellor's EO and that ours was the most restrictive and we are the only campus that mentions "courses". This can lead to more students being disqualified or taking longer to graduate, which impacts students financially and probably impacts underserved students as well.

Stapleton wondered if there was a policy that students can not repeat courses and fail them more than a certain number of times. Boyd asked Stapleton to forward this question to the EPPC Chair and herself to help to find the answer. Dean Judy Hennessey informed everyone that when the Chancellor's Office EO came out many campuses moved to address the question of repeating courses, but that she did not believe it had been addressed on this campus.

Meadows explained that the original impulse to be more restrictive arose from a notion that allowing students to take so many courses and fail them did not seem rigorous. With this continuing loosening of restrictions it means that students could fail up to five classes (a semester of work) while they take up resources and space that serious students may want to graduate. She has heard anecdotally of students who just give up in the midst of a semester because they will not be penalized and they are just salvaging their grade-point averages. This seems inefficient and sends a bad message about quitting.

Kipnis reminded everyone about that many students who may be coming back to school and we should be mindful of maintaining flexibility for them.

Stapleton reported that the catalog from 2009 allowed students to retake a course up to three times again before they had to meet with an advisor.

Boyd promised that EPPC or someone could look into the question to find the EMs and other policies that guide our treatment of the question and encouraged anyone who did the research to share it.

Sagar pointed out that some people might stay in a course to qualify for financial aid when they should have abandoned the course earlier. Compassion and the desire that students master the material should dominate our policy concerns.

Boyd reminded people to leave a proxy if they had to leave so that we can maintain a quorum.

Nichols did not think our campus should be special compared to other campuses. We could set our enrollment processes to advantage students taking the course for the first time, as Chemistry was considering.

Introduction Item passed.

16. [Proposed EM on Appointment, Evaluation and Support of Department Chairs, Directors and Unit Program Coordinators](#) – FASP – Introduction Item.

Meadows moved this new EM as a companion piece to the EM just passed about Chairs. It supersedes EM 83-009 which is about appointment but did not treat evaluation or support. She introduced Katie Silliman who explained how the Chairs' Council had wanted to expand the definition of Department Chair and include Directors and Program Coordinators. They also wanted to give departments the flexibility to utilize the procedures for selection that they had in their constitutions, if they so choose.

Rowberg thought it be advantageous if departments choosing a nominating committee would add someone from outside the department to add impartiality.

Elrod discovered a series of mistakes about the timing described and the numbering of the nominee(s) which were corrections inadvertently forgotten from earlier drafts.

Meadows blamed the new EM Template,

Cross asked if this EM passed, did it give the Lecturers the right to vote for their Chair in every department?

Meadows pointed out that it will be up to the departments to determine the way that Lecturer voting is calculated.

Cross said he would like a stronger statement that all Lecturers should have one vote. He emphasized that the Chair is an especially important person to Lecturers.

Ponarul said he had supported this as an introduction item, but that this language about Lecturers needed fine tuning.

Rowberg said that her department had passed by-laws governing Lecturer voting already.

Meadows explained that FASP had found that there are some departments that don't allow Lecturers to vote at all, some only allow fulltime Lecturers to vote, and some only allow partial voting, but this policy did allow Lecturers the right to vote across the board.

Sagar thought that if it is left to departments, practice would be all over the map.

Nichols asked if an EM overrules a department constitution and heard that it does.

Russell Mills said that the Faculty Constitution describes voting rights [and allows regular faculty if they are inclined, to keep Lecturers as auxiliary members from voting] and that it should be changed first.

Introduction Item passed.

17. Ask the Administrator.

Seipel asked about the EM defining Online Education and noted that it requires that the mode of education for every course be listed in the catalog. Bill Loker said the registrar would need to be contacted with this question. Elrod said she would send a follow up email about this question.

Boyd said she had heard a rumor that the deans and associate deans had been given immediate retreat rights to departments. Elrod confirmed this amid loud clapping.

Rowberg asked about the bridge but no one present had definite information.

18. Other.

Jarquin wanted to clarify that the AS has not suspended composting because of rising prices, but because of lack of availability of the services needed.

19. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Sistrunk, Secretary