

California State University, Chico

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, December 3, 2015, 2:30 p.m., K-207/209

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

ABSENT: Boura

Chair Boyd welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 2:30.

1. Approve Minutes of December 29, 2015 and November 12, 2015.
October 29, 2015 minutes were approved.

2. Approve Agenda.

Livingston moved that a new Introduction Item be added to the agenda: Senate Statement of No Confidence in President, Interim Provost, and Vice President for Business and Finance (seconded). Briefly Livingston explained that he was asked by a group of faculty in his college of HFA as one of their college representatives to have this added to the agenda today.

Cross said that if our colleagues cared enough to bring something like this forward, it was our duty to consider it.

Sistrunk agreed.

Boyd explained that this item would become a new number 13 as an Introduction Item.

The revised Agenda was approved.

3. Announcements.

- Crotts announced that on December 17, JoAnn Bradley, a librarian who has served for over a quarter of a century will retire. She was an expert at finding the most obscure documents world-wide, no matter how esoteric or hidden. There will be an informal gathering and reception in the main circulation of the Mariam Library from 11:30-2:30 or 3:00.

- Heilesen reminded everyone that a reception for the “University’s Needy Children Program” will be held on December 9 at the University Farm when gifts destined to 72 families can be seen and yuletide singing, a band and some refreshments will be had.

4. Chair's Prerogative.

Boyd noted that she sent the presentation that she gave at the Open Forum on the Budget on Tuesday, December 1, to the Senators and encouraged everyone to distribute it widely to their faculty, staff and student constituencies. She also sent the list of comments, questions and suggestions that were made at the Forum and hoped these would be shared as well.

5. Standing Committee Reports.

A. Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Crotts.

EPPC Summary– November 19, 2015

For the purpose of keeping EPPC apprised of activities of groups and issues affecting student learning, overviews were presented as discussion items on:

- AURTEC (All University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee) by Deborah Summers, Director of the School of Education. AURTEC provides program and policy oversight of the teacher education programs.
- AlcoholEdu by Trisha Seastrom, Program Manager of CADEC (Campus Alcohol and Drug Education Center). Specific discussion focused on CADEC's recommendations to Student Affairs:
 - 1) Requiring new transfer students to complete the program in addition to incoming freshmen
 - 2) Raising the required passing score from 70% to 80%

B. Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Meadows.

FASP Report 11/19/15

FASP Subcommittees met and worked independently.

C. Executive Committee – Sistrunk.

Executive Committee Synopsis Friday, November 13, 2015, 8:30 a.m., K 103

The Executive Committee met on November 13, 2015 and discussed the following issues:

- University Budget Committee EM 05-017 rewriting committee charge
- Protocols for invited guests to ensure quality experience for those visiting campus
- FASP: Policy on Division and Cross Division Reorganization
- EPPC: CADEC Alcohol education scores
- Presidential Search Open Forum website
- The future of Faculty Affairs representation in Senate
- The dedication of the Gus Manolis Bridge with family in attendance November 16
- The success of the Tower Society University advancement efforts

Executive Committee Synopsis Friday, November 20, 2015, 8:30 a.m., K 103

The Executive Committee met on November 20, 2013 and discussed the following issues:

- Academic Affairs Budget and University Budget, impacts and concerns
 - Chancellor's Office changing back-ground checks policy and effects on students
6. Statewide Academic Senate – Schulte/Selvester. <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/>
Selvester called attention to a number of responses the Chancellor's Office had to some of the resolutions proffered by the ASCSU assembly.
- In their response to the call to reconsider the background check policy, Vice Chancellor Lamb and Assistant Vice Chancellor Merryfield were thankful to hear the concerns, but decided not to suspend the policy.
 - The request for a retired faculty member to be added to the CSU Board of Trustees elicited the response from the Board of Trustees that the composition of the Board was appropriate at this time and they decided not to change it.
 - The Board appreciated Senate support of the budget preliminary plan.
 - The response to the call of 22 of the 23 campuses for visits by Presidential candidates during the search process included thanks again, but the Board denied the request to change their practice.

Paula reported that the Senate wondered if they mattered, but knew that that was an existential question.

She also encouraged everyone to look at the report of the Faculty trustee in order to appreciate the conversations the board has: One example was that the Board revoked the honorary doctoral degree awarded to Bill Cosby by the California Polytechnic University.

7. Associated Students - Jarquin.

Associated Students Business and Other Updates

Associated Students Report – December 3, 2015

DREAM Center

- The AS President and the AS Commissioner of Diversity Affairs will be accompanying students, staff and faculty on a trip to the UC Davis DREAM Center and the Sacramento State DREAM Center.
- California State Student Association November 14th and 15th CSU, Dominguez Hills

Big Topics:

- Constitution Changes based on influx of dollars related to the SIRF Fee
- Goal – More representation
- Postponement of the Task Force on a Sustainable Financial Model Discussion item
- Presentations by Edgar Romo, DREAM Resource Center Coordinator at CSU, Long Beach
- Anthony Rendon, Speaker Elect for the California State Assembly Associated Students Dinning
- New fridge in Butte Station
- New coffee machine in Common Grounds

- Created the Sutter Crew to boost moral. They play music, have dress up days and plan themed menus.
- EBT use exploration – EBT usage is being explored by the Associated Students. As you could imagine it is a long and detailed process so we will provide more information next semester Retirement
- Sally Parenti, Associate Student Union Director of Operations for the Bell Memorial Union is retiring after 31 years of exceptional service! Please join Associated Students in honoring Sally and her contributions to the campus community at a reception on Tuesday, December 15 from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. in BMU 203. Comment Feature
- The Associated Students is unveiling a new AS Program's Comment Feature that will allow students, faculty, staff, alumni and community members the opportunity to give feedback about our programs. The Associated Students Programs values accountability. This link will stay open continuously and will provide the opportunity to leave both comments about positives attributes and opportunities for improvement. Please provide feedback at "<http://studentvoice.com/csuc/howareourprogramsdoing15>"

Upcoming Events

- AS Productions Holiday Party - AS Productions is throwing a Holiday Bash on December 4th! Join us as we celebrate the season and the end of the fall semester featuring Live Music by The Yule Logs. The fun starts at 6pm in the BMU Auditorium
- Chico State Unplugged - Chico State SOTA Productions presents our semi-annual Chico Unplugged record release party in partnership with AS Productions. The winners of our fall 2015 Chico Unplugged are ready to WOW you with their winning original songs. Thursday December, 3rd | 7pm to 9pm | Upstairs at Madison Bear Garden | FREE | All Ages
- AS GSEC LGBTQ+ Conference - Join the AS Gender & Sexuality Equity Center (GSEC) for their 8th Annual LGBTQ+ Conference from 12:30–5 p.m. on Sat., Dec. 5. The theme for this year's LGBTQ+ Conference is “Equity without Exception.” This theme aims to highlight the voices of LGBTQ+ identified people of color as well as other marginalized identities within the community. A detailed conference agenda with workshop descriptions, times, and locations can be found on the Eventbrite registration page here. Please register early if a speedier check-in process is desired. Appetizers will be available before and during the keynote address at 1 p.m. For more information or questions, feel free to visit the GSEC office in BMU 004, call (530) 898-5724, or email asgsec.lgbtq@csuchico.edu.
- AO Fall Trips – AS Adventure Outing trips will go on sale December 7th at <http://aschico.com/adventureoutings>.

8. Staff Council – Heileson.

Heileson will submit the next Staff Council minutes when they are approved.

She reported that staff had their forum to hear about the Campus Climate Survey results on December 1, in Colusa 100a-b. It was informative and she remains hopeful that someone is looking at those results and cares.

9. University Report – Zingg/Elrod.

Zingg:

Zingg passed the presentation over to Elrod promising to make comments as appropriate.

Elrod:

Elrod introduced Bran Oppy and Bill Loker to give the WASC report.

A. WASC Update – Loker.

Bill Loker reported that the WASC Planning team met and began the work of looking at the worksheets each division provided (The EER worksheet and the Chico Responses Worksheet). The team will go through this data and try to make sense of it in order to report to the campus in the early spring semester. The team has also been in contact with the liaison person at WASC and they are planning his visit and process sometime early in spring. Loker was sure that they would include Senate leadership in these discussions.

B. Tableau update – Allen.

Bill Allen was introduced to give an update on a new data dashboard tool –Tableau. Bill confessed that he had spoken to Senate more in the last few years than in all the rest of his time working, but he had to admit: “I am still Bill Allen, and I am still the Director of Institutional Research.” As part of his farewell tour he would talk about the new dashboard tool that was installed in late October.

Ultimately, there will be a website through Institutional Research on Chico data, including census data, admits, applications, enrolls and trends over the last five or six years. For example, looking at applications we can see that they have reached an all-time high of 30,000. Then we can see in 2013-14 that we admitted 20,000 of those students who include all types of applications: transfers, freshman and graduate students.

The dashboard will allow us to break the information down. For instance, in applications it can be broken down by ethnicity and we can see the trends over the years, in say, Hispanic applicants. We can see how many enrolled from those admits and overall percentages. We can add many other values to our considerations as we have data going back over 20 years. We can distinguish fall from spring and go up to this semester F15. The same graphs can be asked about all students or only the first time freshmen. So that we can filter different things such as California residence (which is what our FTES budgets are based on) or by looking at Colleges. All the filters can be combined in different combinations.

We also have a dashboard by degrees. Again everything is handled through multiple filters (like masters, over 10 years in which college or department).

This is pretty powerful software. We have just started to scratch the surface of what is possible and the plan is to ask for reports to move toward an academic program review. At this point the software is only available on campus. In order to make the data directly available, we need an analyst programmer to allow someone to go to a website to work. This will be a major project for the Spring Institutional Research Group (which will not include Bill as he is retiring).

Elrod asked Bill Allen to comment on how the Tableau will change access to data. Researchers will be able to set up reports that allow them filter through a lot of different types of data far more dynamically than the older Insight program made possible. Eventually, we will be able to allow interested individuals to build their own modified reports or whole new reports and manipulate the data themselves, add formulas, do calculations, take the information, for instance, to look at incoming admits to create predictive information.

This can be downloaded to an excel file or a pdf. if you wanted to ship the file.

Elrod pointed out that the data can be disaggregated by a variety of terms (like Ethnicity, student type, Departments, majors, High school of origin, last school of origin, or any information we can get through our census records, as well as demographic and other information out of the data warehouse that is being worked on currently from the nightly dump out of PeopleSoft. This information is quite complex and will take exploration to access.

Boyd wanted to know who has access to the information. Bill Allen answered that right now the way Tableau is set up, he can send the links to an individual and just like Insight, one would have to provide their normal University credentials to access the material, but they are not displaying any sensitive or level1 material now.

Elrod pointed out that eventually we can create a public facing portal with public graphic displays about graduation rates, or other public information as well as a password protected information that could allow one to drill down to the student level, for example Elrod explained that we would be rolling this out over time and that eleven CSU's are already using it, so there might be ideas that they have explored already. This is a state of the art tool that will allow us to share data and define its source and let people access what they need so that we are all taking about the same information we need for consultation.

C. Audit of College Financials –Kitchell and Grimm.

Elrod announced that the next presentation would help to understand the way audits are conducted and some basic challenges. She introduced Jeni Kitchell (University Budget Director) and Annabel Grimm (who will take over Audits eventually) who prepared a power point of some basic facts.

Audit Friend & Foe

Jeni Kitchell explained that the title of the talk was supposed to elude to the good and challenging aspects of Audits. On one hand Audits are something that can help us find inefficiencies and make corrections in some of our processes, on the other hand someone going through all the detailed work of being audited can find it very painful and a lot of work and extra work for staff.

The example that will be the focus of today is the audit conducted randomly of the College of ECC which put all their departments under a great obligation to complete a great deal of

work. Jeni Kitchell started with an overview of the Audit process in general. Most of the Audits we have on campus are conducted by the Chancellor's Office and they are essentially internal.

Internal Audit Process (Chancellor's Office)

Office of Audit and Advisory Services (OAAS) complete an annual risk assessment and determines what areas pose the highest risk to the CSU across the 23 campuses.

Some audits are standing audits such as occur with Auxiliaries every three years and others are specially commenced as the Audit of ECC was.

Campuses are then selected

Kitchell thought the Chancellor's Office tried to share the joy across the system so that the obligations are evenly spread. She is not exactly sure how they are chosen, but that each campus has multiple audits ongoing at different points in the cycle that they are all trying to manage.

Campuses complete the large internal control questionnaire and submit documents requested

This requires explaining a lot about internal procedures and finding documents, and then the auditors come to campus.

Team of auditors conduct fieldwork on campus for 4-6 weeks to evaluate compliance, their assessment includes:

Inspections and observations of process

Interviews and inquiries of personnel

Transaction testing of reports, invoices, and other types of records

Internal Audit Process –Cont.

During fieldwork, opportunities for improvement or deficiencies (findings) are presented to the campus.

Currently, the campus auxiliaries are being audited and these visitors will be here until the middle of December. Kitchell meets with them weekly to discuss problems and questions they have found that they are suggesting we are doing incorrectly. Eventually, there is a draft report with final corrective actions ordered.

The campus then reviews this report, submits a corrective action plan, and finally accepts the report

A formal report is issued 6-10 weeks after the audit

It is normally this long before our campus sees the final reports which are posted online for public view.

Corrective actions must be completed within six months of the report date

Kitchell shared the Audit matrix that is used by the Board of Trustees for each of their meetings. It basically depicts every campus and the Audits they are undergoing and where campuses are in regard to the corrective actions they are undertaking. As Presidents travel to the Chancellor's Office they must report on the state of their corrective actions and they can

be called out if they are falling short in some way. The Chancellor's Office requires proof and documentation of any claims to be rectifying problems identified. It is a rigorous process to be cleared from the obligations spelled out by the Audits. She highlighted Chico's appearance in the matrix.

Recent Audit Findings

Auxiliary Audit (RS, RF, UF)–currently in progress

This audit occurs every three years and is a large audit with a lot of information that is being looked at. The Foundation of many Universities has a lot of activity in it, and you may know about some of it. Grimm noted that Chico had to submit well beyond a thousand documents at this audit.

ECC College Review June 2015 –5 Findings (2 of 5 cleared in four months)

Kitchell thought these findings were probably true all over the campus and all over the system. She thought it might be useful to be aware of them since one might encounter them regularly.

Unauthorized use of Chico State name

Two non-profit organizations were using the Chico State name. This problem appears with non-profits, but also with off campus bank accounts and club accounts among other cases.

Cash handling and employee reimbursement procedures were non-compliant with Integrated CSU Administrative Manual (ICSUAM)

Our 2009 cash handling procedures proved to be outdated and did not comply with our administrative manual. This manual is applied not just within the university, but in the procedure of auxiliaries.

Deficiencies in auxiliary and campus contract processing and delegation of authority

Chico had an agreement with Verizon which was never signed by an appropriate individual. If someone has an agreement with an auxiliary they are required to get the signature of a duly designated person who has the authority within the auxiliary to sign for it. If any Senator is presented with the opportunity to sign such an agreement and s/he is unsure, just give contracting or the auxiliary a call. In this case, someone signed on behalf of the University Foundation, but no one signed a duly executed document on behalf of Verizon.

Another example was a verbal agreement. A Department agreed with someone to do some work and to pay for it, but there was never any documentation created to show this. The payment could not be processed the way in which it was promised. It is best to make sure everything is documented in some sort of agreement and everyone is clear about how that payment will be made before any work is undertaken. If one is uncertain about what the legal language should be, one can unintentionally subject the University or the Auxiliary to embarrassment.

Auxiliary expenditures relating to honorariums, hospitality and travel payments did not have appropriate approvals or substantiation

This finding was interpreted to apply to Chancellor's Office procedural manual so that every expense of lodging had to have the appropriate receipts. All amounts and all the services provided must be substantiated with proper documentation. The Foundation is currently working on all these processes.

All of the audit reports are available online for our campuses well as other campuses.

Faculty outside-employment was not being reported as required

Information Security February 2015–21 Findings (16 of 21 cleared in nine months)

Too many findings to list here

Risk acceptance for non-compliance

(CSU Audit Reports: http://www.calstate.edu/audit/audit_reports/index.shtml)

As you conduct University business, you should ask yourself:

Are YOU Audit Ready?

Signature Authority

Conflict of Interest

Appropriate Use of "Chico State" Name

Adherence to ALL applicable Policies and Procedures

There are a ton of agencies and rules and regulations involved in conducting University business, which is why it is a good idea to rely on the expertise of those who can help manage the difficulties.

Auditing Agencies (more than ten agencies)

Regulations (more than eight bodies of law and regulations)

D. Academic Affairs Budget -Elrod.

<http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/documents/aa-budget-2015-16-dec4.pdf>

Elrod remarked that the onion on the budget cover was supposed to symbolize the process of making the budget as layers were peeled back bringing tears but also nourishment to the institution. She knew there were lots of questions and concerns and she would try to address as many of these as possible.

We had more money and we allocated more money this year. Why then does it feel like we are being cut? We had more than \$5 million more allocated this year, but personnel costs have increased more than \$5 million between last year and this year. These increases were collective bargaining mandated salary increases, Lecturer reclassification, Staff IRPs and reclassifications, promotion salary increases, new hires and our own campus equity program. The mandated compensation increases were not fully funded by the CSU. We had to come up with our own campus money for those as well as for the campus equity programs that we implemented.

Why are new hires included in this list? One of the main ways we replace faculty is by replacing FERPing faculty. Faculty members who are part of the FERP program make half

their salary and we don't pay benefits on them. If we hire a new faculty member we have to pay the contemporary salary level to that person, plus their benefits, so the cost more than doubles compared to a FERP faculty. If we replace 20 FERP faculty in a year, that's \$2 million that we must find in base money.

Our top priority in the budget is to support student success and protect our workforce. In addition, we have a fiduciary responsibility to use the resources of the state responsibly.

When Elrod arrived on campus, she came into a situation of transition in Academic Affairs. For the past year and a half or so, Academic Affairs has not had the management expertise and the process for budgeting to enable us to have a clear understanding of the situation and strategies to address it. The operating culture in budgeting has been one of allocation and spend. At the divisional level we have not really had a budget plan. In Academic Affairs the different colleges have different processes and even understandings about the budget. Many of the Deans are new, or in interim positions. When she arrived many CBAs and hiring decisions were already in motion, or set. Elrod acknowledged Jennifer Mays for all her help

Elrod chose to ask questions and take action. Action she realized would take many months of work. One of the reasons this information is being released now, is that it is really fresh as we have just come to understand much of what Elrod is about to present. Actions started to roll out in July with the Academic Affairs leadership retreat. They appointed an ad hoc leadership group that consisted of Mike Schilling, Judy Hennessey, Dave Daly and Bob Knight. They also decided to build a budget from the ground up verifying real costs and understand what they all were, specifically personnel costs and operating expenses. They would then compare these allocations to the formally used ABC model.

From August to October meetings were held with the Consultation group, the Deans, and other AA leaders and college analysts and other staff to help us understand the budget. The budget was then released in October and we were finally sure what our allocation was at that time. Then in November we released AA's allocation. Now we are working with the Deans and other leaders to figure out where the gaps are and to be sure that colleges have enough money to offer courses in the spring. We are doing one time allocations and backfilling to make sure students can get their classes.

The timing of this budget is not different than what has happened before, what all of you are concerned about are the results of the budget allocations that were released to the colleges. Elrod acknowledged that this budget process is transitional clunky and imperfect. Because of the uncertainty we did not have a clearer or earlier picture to act on.

She shared a slide about general fund allocations by unit in AA (colleges and support units). This year we decided to use a method where we categorized allocations in fixed base personnel allocations and OE allocations. We had \$5 million more and we also honored our commitment to faculty development by allocating that money separately from reserves. We retain central control of paying for program review and accreditation fees.

It was also figured out that last year beyond traditional base allocations, units in AA spent \$7.2 Million additional funds in one time allocation. \$6.7 million of this came from traditional AA reserves. Beyond that an additional \$3 million was rolled back to various units in AA from their own rollover account. So, all together in addition to allocations that were made last year, units in AA spent an additional \$10.2 million in essentially one time money taken from reserves.

Elrod then discussed straight state allocation money that does not include lottery money, or CERF funds (which represent more than \$6 million that is available to colleges). The bar graphs show that we got more money, but our personnel benefits and even our OE costs increased. What's missing from this graph is the additional one time \$10 million one-time money that was spent because that is considered just an extra allocation. We are spending down an additional \$3 million from reserves, which is another concern Elrod has because we will lose our reserves.

The next slide treats he terms that the small group of AA leaders developed to help us think about this year's budget. They include Fixed Base Personnel and O & E which is basically everything else. (O&E includes part-time lecturers and student workers because they are part time). The people in fixed base, are people we absolutely have to pay. A Base Budget combines the other two. CSU guidelines recommend that a campus keep enough money in Reserves to cover three months of payroll (that would be \$16.5 million).

The next slide shows the five forms AA uses to get budget information from all the units in AA. These were sent to the 19 or 20 offices in AA asking what all their expenses were. (Units in AA have been Rollingover @ \$5 million). This process took several months and included such information as employee lists and everything was then verified. This led to re-evaluation of unit claims against their actual historical expenses.

The next slide of budget estimates looking at all the units' personnel costs and their O&E and their historical expense actuals ended up with a total of \$83,555,617 to compare to the State General fund of \$75,229, 273 (a difference of 8,326,344) that Elrod chose to cover with \$3 million from reserves. This led to the number that Elrod distributed in October which she did not mitigate by other considerations at all. She allowed units to spend their O& E as they chose.

The next slide summarizes the reserve picture. Elrod said that we could choose to continue to allocate supplementary one time funds from reserves, but that we are already projecting to have only \$12,402,279 from reserves by the end of this year. Two years ago AA had \$27 million. Last year we spent \$10.2 million in a single year. The chart shows the categories of expenses we will have from reserves this year as well. Things not included in that reserve number are any equipment purchases, remodels or refreshes of academic spaces, and information infrastructure upgrades.

The next steps (and the next slide) will include continuing to work with the deans to fund courses in GE and core major courses (\$500,00-\$750K). We will have to keep our eye on the reserves and continue to maximize existing resources including the use of other funds

(the over \$6 million in fees, CERF, etc.). In February Elrod has committed to providing a preliminary allocation estimate for 2016-17 and we can start proactive planning for the future. Elrod will establish an ad hoc budget taskforce that will be an inclusive representative taskforce that will work in the spring with UBC, the deans and other campus leaders to create a new AA budget model. Elrod is more than happy to come to any meetings to continue to explain and consult.

The last slide represents some ideas that people might consider as they are talking about their budgets. How can you maximize the use of the resources you have? Consider how we offer our curriculum, increase fund raising efforts, review AWTU and special consultant contracts (25% of faculty are fully released), student learning fees, course consolidation, CS definitions, part-time hiring practice, etc.

Jeni Kitchell is running a budget workshop on December 11 at 3:30 in Colusa 100B.

Meadows wondered if it was possible for the table about general fund allocations of 2015 to get the table for 2014?

Elrod answered that she is working on a more detailed spreadsheet of information that she can release and she is waiting partly to hear back from the deans. It is her intention to continue to release more information.

Schierenbeck hoped that the recommendation to combine part-time instructors to save on benefits costs would not be followed.

Elrod said the suggestions were listed just to prompt consideration, not because they must be done. Elrod believes the units should create its own ideas.

Sarah Cooper asked if there was one place we could go to see the list of all the additional existing resources and get direction about how we might apply for them.

Elrod said that list was available to all the deans.

Stapleton had a question about OE funds, and noted that in the past her department had been very fortunate to have foundation money from our successful graduates, but that their OE funds are never adequate and they spend foundation account money to run the base budget of their department. She thought the description of the inaccuracy of department depictions of their OE would be accurate in their case because they have had to send money they did not have to carry out the department mission.

Elrod said that they had only communicated at the college level and presumed that College level analysts had department level understandings. We are still going back and forth with some of the colleges and Elrod is more than happy to do that to make sure we have the right numbers.

Meadows was concerned about the OE budgets because most of the people she is hiring in her department because they are part time are not in the fixed base. Her student assistants have a minimum wage increase and her labs will not be open on weekends anymore.

In the past we have heard that money from International students would be directed at AA. Did this happen, or was this money split off in another way?

Elrod admitted that there was a proposal to split the fees between AA and Student Affairs and the question is at Cabinet level right now. The fees presently are sent to the general fund and are distributed with the general state allocation.

Zartman noted that in regards to International students, each 50 people above the target means a million dollars. Are we working to recruit more of these students?

Elrod said that this year here was a decrease in the number.

Boyd said that she noticed the pleading eyes to ask more questions. Elrod said that she was happy to set up a special session just on the AA budget. Boyd wondered if Elrod would come back to Senate as well.

10. [Proposed New Minor in Geospatial Literacy](#) – EPPC – Action Item.

Crotts recounted his introduction to the proposal that the skills in the basic geospatial techniques are increasingly germane to many fields of inquiry. Geospatial literacy, basic knowledge of maps, GPS and GIS, and geoposition systems are becoming critical skills for many students' perspective disciplines. He introduced Geography professor Scott Brady to answer questions.

Action Item passed.

Livingston moved to revise the agenda and move item number 13 to the next item to be considered (#11) given the number of people who were interested in the Resolution about no confidence (seconded).

Crotts explained that this change of the agenda requires a 2/3 majority vote to pass because this is a post approval revision of the agenda.

Cross supported this since he did not believe the EPPC action item was very controversial, and he would like to be sure that all the people sitting in the chamber not have their voice cut off because we have gone so long.

Motion to change the agenda passed.

11. [Senate Statement of No Confidence in the President, Interim Provost, and Vice President for Business and Finance](#) –Introduction Item.

Anna Moore passed out a copy of the resolution and spoke to it after bidding the audience good afternoon.

“We ask for this resolution because it is the right thing to do.

We ask because it is unethical for my fellow lecturers to be notified of probable spring lay-offs in November. Because it is unethical for executive leadership to demand that chairs, deans, directors, coordinators, professors, and assistants spend inordinate amounts of their time accounting and re-accounting for every dollar, and asserting and re-asserting their need for reasonable monetary support. Because it is unethical for executive appointments to be made without following rules of process and procedure. Because it is unethical for faculty and staff to face humiliating difficulty when requesting university space for our students, programs, and events. Because it is unethical for values like diversity to be stated rather than funded. Because it is unethical for this or any public university to become a corporate structure; institutes of learning are not businesses, nor should they be governed as such. Because it is unethical for executive leadership to cut budgets, keep faculty and especially staff salaries stagnant, and accept large raises in the same year. Because it is unethical for executive leadership to frog-march our administrators, colleagues, and co-workers out of their offices.

Because the faculty, staff, and students who work at this institution and seek its potential as inspiration, hope, and a better future deserve tangible support and respect—even and especially when we disagree with executive leadership decisions. Because too many mistakes have been made, too many reasonable requests for accountability, explanation, and shared governance ignored and scorned. Because it is unethical for executive leadership to demonstrate such ignorance, disrespect, and incompetence in different ways year after year.

Because it is time that faculty exercise its power and vote decisively for no confidence.”

RESOLUTION

Senate Statement of No Confidence in President, Interim Provost, and Vice President for Business and Finance

WHEREAS, The faculty, staff, students, and administrators of California State University, Chico, are united by a common commitment to maintain an educational institution that promotes and preserves the intellectual development of the people of California and of the North State; and

WHEREAS, The executive leadership has failed to effectively manage the development and implementation of policies and personnel processes that concern the faculty and staff of CSU, Chico; and

WHEREAS, Shared governance practices mandated by California State law, Chancellors’ Executive Orders, and CSU, Chico policies have been corrupted; and

WHEREAS, This lack of shared governance has led to the erosion of the primacy of Academic Affairs, an office with the university’s academic mission of the

campus at its heart and from which all other functions of the University derive their purpose; and

WHEREAS, Faculty, staff, and student trust in executive leadership has fallen markedly as a result of a lack of transparency and good-faith information sharing in budgetary decisions that impact the CSU, Chico community; and

WHEREAS, The budget in the 2015-16 AY was withheld from colleges and departments until November 2015, and;

WHEREAS, Failure of senior executives to make timely decisions and maintain working relationships has resulted in uncertainty and unpredictability; faculty, staff, and student stress; increased workload; deterioration of morale; loss of jobs; very high turnover rates in administrative positions campus-wide; and

WHEREAS, The lack of focused leadership by the senior executives has placed our academic mission in jeopardy, and;

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSU, Chico has no confidence in the ability of President Zingg, Interim Provost Elrod, and Vice President for Business and Finance Hoffman to lead our institution in a manner that enables our faculty and staff to effectively serve our students; and

RESOLVED, That this resolution be forwarded to the Board of Trustees, Chancellor Tim White, President Zingg, Interim Provost Elrod, Vice President for Business and Finance Hoffman, the Chair of the Academic Senate of the California State University, and Academic Senate CSU, system-wide Campus Senate Chairs.

Stapleton said that it was refreshing to hear some information on the budget earlier. Her concern was that when decisions should be made in a timely fashion, they are postponed and postponed. She offered a case from the Computer Science program that grew its enrollments from 20 master's international students to 80 in one year. She was promised by many administrators who are mostly gone now, that if she only had the students, her department would get faculty to teach them. That never came to fruition. The academic plan calls for support of these students, but it has not happened and so she has had to limit the numbers of students who are allowed to enroll.

Jarquín stated that she looked forward to bringing this resolution to her constituents and the governance bodies of the AS to get their feedback.

Rowberg thought that this body had spent the last year trying to address concerns raised in the Climate Survey and that to have this brought forward at the end of the year did not seem like the right way to go about addressing the concerns.

Roll thanked Anna for her bravery and she supported the resolution in large part because over a year ago, we had a similar discussion in which faculty came and expressed their concerns about

what is going on on campus. We narrowly decided not to vote no confidence then, and the Resolution Response Team spent countless hours trying to make significant progress which she did not see. The Campus Climate Survey was very clear that people are still unhappy and she did not think appropriate moves have been made to really alleviate the frustrations.

Nichols moved that this vote be taken by secret ballot (which does not require a second).

Cross spoke in support of the Resolution since faculty have been trying to have their voices heard for many years and their concerns, instead, have been killed by committee, which he thought was a tactic. He recognized that he works for the people who are outside the Senate as an at-large Senator.

Sistrunk felt that he should remind the Senate that we have shown due diligence over a long period by asking questions. For example, we were told that a team of Deans was working on the Academic Affairs budget, but it is clear that they don't understand the budget, or the model on which it has been built either. Like them, we don't understand how the Academic Affairs budget is related to the whole budget and the central fund of the cabinet. There has been a failure in the long term effort to create adequate consultation, which suggests that there has not been a good faith effort to make communication work. It is hard not to assume that decisions are being made about how our University will be run without us. That is why he would vote to consider the Resolution.

Zartman queried Elrod about her statement that she consulted with people before she took action. He wondered what response she had had from the individual who was steward of the Academic Affairs budget when it reached its surplus of 27 million, Dr. Arno Rethans. Elrod admitted that she never spoke to him. Zartman pointed out that we did not get to 27 million by accident during some of the darkest budget years we have known, partly because Rethans had acumen. Elrod explained that she speaks with Jennifer Mays, who has past and current knowledge of the budget.

Ferrari observed that she felt rushed during the question period after the budget talk which she feels is a symptom of what happens over and over. She did not appreciate receiving the budget so late, and getting to discuss it so late in Senate because she could not develop her understanding as she is always being rushed. There are pages of questions created during the open forum that should be addressed. This is consistent with wider problems that keep being brought up and never really answered.

Ford felt it was his job to work to build trust and mutual respect and transparency to furthering shared governance. He had been frustrated by his inability to be communicated with effectively by those in leadership positions who needed to address his questions. He wants this to happen in the future and he is in favor of discussing the issues brought out by the no confidence resolution to try to get at them. He will consult with his constituents in Natural Sciences to see what their sentiments are. This issue has come upon him very suddenly, though he was aware of the crisis feeling on campus that came about with the release of the budget with so little forewarning. It was why he supported so strongly the open Forum on Tuesday to allow people to raise their concerns, and why he would support this Introduction item so that administrators could come back and have rigorous conversation next week.

Heilesen wondered what we are trying to accomplish with this resolution. She asked Livingston, who said that the purpose is to express a deep and wide discontent with the way things have been operated around here for so many years.

Zartman said he heard an important part of our campus community represented by the resolution who said they were blind-sided by massive lay-offs that would leave them unemployed in January. The budget presentation today just represents the damage control after that shock. The precipitating event was the emotions of this constituency and the answer that the budget transition must be severe is inadequate.

Selvester said that 2 ½ years ago she had been approached by faculty who felt very unsettled by longstanding feelings of low morale. She believed that she could do something about it. She told her President, who she always supported at that time she was Senate Chair: “don’t make me sit at the table when they bring a resolution of no confidence.” Selvester admitted that she fell short in thinking she could improve morale quickly enough to turn the Queen Mary. Selvester said now our job is to go out and ask ourselves what do we do now? She still believes we can create a place in which we can all work together as Peter Block wrote in his book about Community, and despite however different our ideas and values might be, we must say them because we inhabit the universe of ideas, the University. Such conversation must continue about this resolution as well.

Heilesen said she would vote for the resolution to continue to have the discussion as well, but she still sought answers about what this document will accomplish. She would take it to Staff council to ask about.

Cross hoped we can somehow resolve the disconnect between our faculty and administration. Sometimes it feels like our administrators don’t know their faculty, who educate, which means they lead. We need to be part of every step of everything that governs us and that the goal of everyone should be to work on behalf of the students.

Crotts explained that a secret ballot was acceptable without a formal vote, if no one was opposed to it.

The vote was tallied and the yeas were 29 for the Resolution, and 3 nays opposed. The Resolution passed as an Introduction item.

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

Crotts explained that the EPPC measure was supposed to revise only section 10 parts A and B of EM 10-018 (of 2010). Section 10 deals with Repetition of Courses and under section B our policy says students may repeat no more than 16 units or 3 courses with grade forgiveness. The Chancellor’s Office EO 10-37 (of 2008) allows students to repeat up to 16 units with grade forgiveness and our policy thus restricts the EO more than it allows.

This policy 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.

Sager 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. 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. This would make the policy “student friendly”.

Rowberg recognized Jean Irving, the University Registrar, who wondered about the how the language about the highest grade worked as we currently just take the last grade awarded. She also corrected the title used “Student Records and Registration Office” with “Office of the Registrar” in the policy.

Nichols explained that the intention was to take the highest grade awarded and not the last grade awarded of a number of attempts.

Selvester wanted to support the document and the intention of it. She wants students to learn, even if some are trying to manipulate the system.

Correcting the name is only editorial and requires no vote.

Action item passed.

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

Meadows moved the item (seconded) and then moved that the item be postponed definitely until next week (seconded).

Nichols supported this delay.

Roll asked about an apparent issue with the document, wondering if the item attached on the Senate agenda had accidentally blended the first document we discussed on the Chairs. Boyd promised this would be checked out.

Item postpone definitely until next.

14. Ask the Administrator.

Seipel asked about the EM defining Online Education and noted that it requires that the mode of instruction for every course be listed in the course schedule. Elrod asked that she be emailed this question.

Ford had three questions sent to him:

- 1) What steps are being taken on campus to respond to the Climate Survey to improve job satisfaction for faculty and especially on behalf of staff?

Elrod explained that the Climate Survey Working Group met earlier in the semester and suggested that the University Diversity Council and Staff Council be presented with open forums about the information found in the survey. The Senior management group just met this morning to review the survey results. She thought that the Climate Survey Working Group would reconvene to consider a set of next steps. The Senior Management team has already begun this and Human Resources has already been engaged in conversations about various staff issues. She wanted to take the time to let people give enough feedback about what the next steps should be.

Sistrunk appreciated the complexity of trying to respond to everything in the Survey, but he was not sure that the Climate Survey Working Group is really the entity to talk about next steps systematically. They created the survey, which is different from implementing changes required of it.

Elrod thought that management teams working with appropriate stakeholder groups need to address the varied issues, but that the Climate Survey Working Group would play a role in informing the discussion.

Heilesen said that she thought what people would like to hear is that administration looked at the survey and that they acknowledge the problems openly.

Elrod said that 40 senior managers had met just this morning to discuss just that.

Hoffman said that Staff HR had been putting out announcements about what it is doing. They will also establish a set of goals in order to set a timeline to accomplish what they plan.

Ford read the next question he was asked to ask that he had already sent: With the budget AVP vacant and Faculty Affairs AVP on leave, we have only the Provost and staff and no mid-level managers in place, and in addition, you have been absent from campus a significant portion of November and you will be gone next week and campus will be closed for the Holidays, after that, what are the plans for filling these vacancies and are there immediate plans for temporary help? And what is the expectation of Cabinet regarding the physical presence of the interim Provost from January and beyond and how often should the interim Provost be meeting with the Deans?

Elrod answered that she is in Chico as much as she possibly can. She has academic council meetings to represent the campus to the CSU. She is part of a Provost professional development community, which represents her own professional development and the scholarship she is trying to keep alive while serving in this position. Some of the work that takes her off campus is work at the national level. For example, she has just been selected as to serve on a National Academy of Science Study Committee that will determine at the national level indicators for change in STEM education. It is hard for her to say “no” to the national academies when invited to serve

on trips that will take her to Washington, D.C. for example. She does her best to balance being on campus and trying to maintain her own scholarship.

In terms of filling the vacancies, at the moment the budget conditions still remain on hold and there is no plan (although she and the President had just been talking). As far as the other position, she could not comment because it is a personnel matter.

Zartman reported that he had a colleague fall in Tehama and that he, himself, had slipped in the north side of Kendall. He hoped we could have more mats on the floor during rainy days. Hoffman agreed.

Kipnis wanted to bring up the matter of violence on campus and wondered if we could move forward with measures that keep faculty safe. She said that sometimes students expelled for unprofessional behavior and safety concerns are especially alarming especially since they can stay on campus in another program. Since national news has many cases of such violence, she pointed out that we have doors that offer no protection (as they can't be locked) and they have no window or other means to ascertain who might be on the other side. She requests that something be added to the doors to keep instructors safe.

Elrod apologized for what she deemed an unacceptable feeling of insecurity. She felt there might be a number of things that we are already doing to make things better and knew that there were things outside of Academic Affairs that could help, such a workshops for dealing with such circumstances, but this doesn't mean we can't do more.

Stapleton noted that she is serving on the Campus Facilities Use Committee (CFU) and there is only one other faculty member currently on it (who is the Director of the Institute for Sustainable Development). She feels there should be more faculty perspective as there is a general feeling among faculty that facilities use policy is not meeting our needs. She thought we are missing opportunities to help people from across the community interact with the University, especially since the fee structure is so off-putting. Maybe someone from business or accounting would be a good addition. Elrod suggested that Stapleton look at rewriting the EM that governs the committee, and Hoffman pointed out that many people on Senate could help her with this.

15. Other.
No other.

16. Adjourn.
Meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Sistrunk, Secretary