

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Present: Baumgartner, Boyd, Cross, Crotts, Donoho (Ponarul), Ellingson, Ford (Boyd), Gray, Heileson (Gray), Herren, Janos (Ellingson), Kaiser, Kipnis, Kirchhoff, Lee (Thompson), Livingston, Mace, McCabe, McConkey, Meadows, Mills, Nichols, Ponarul, Pratt, Ratekin, Roll, Rowberg, Schierenbeck, Schulte, Seipel, Selvester, Sistrunk, Thompson, Tinkler, Traver (Tinkler),

Absent: Elrod, Hoffman, Schindler, Smits, Zingg

March 12, 2015

Laurie Ratterree, Academic Senate Office Manager, presented a new, updated, gavel to Paula Selvester, Academic Senate Chair. The text on the new gavel has been revised to reflect contemporary names and titles:

- “Chairman” has been revised to “Chairperson”
- “Faculty Senate” has been revised to “Academic Senate”
- “CSUC” has been revised to “CSU, Chico”

Ratterree noted that the Senate has not been the “Faculty Senate since 1994 and that four of the last five senate chairs have been women.”

1. Approve Minutes of February 26, 2015.

The minutes were approved.

2. Approve Agenda.

The agenda was approved with the addition of:

Item 4.B. RRFC Update.

3. Announcements.

Schulte announced that her cohort (Bernadette Walker-Gibbs) on the book she edited (Self-studies in Rural Teacher Education) arrived on campus on February 27 for a two week stay. Dr. Walker-Gibbs is from Deakin University (Australia), and serves on its Academic Council. Her activities at Chico include classroom visits, giving a talk, and she will accompany Schulte to the Statewide Academic Senate (SAS) meetings during March 18-19, 2015.

Kaiser complimented all those involved in the S.T.O.P. 4th Annual Human Trafficking Week, (“You Are the Movement, Fight for Freedom”). The event ran from March 02 to March 06, 2015.

Kaiser noted that the Red Tent (“Make It Happen, Raising Our Voices: Stop Violence Against Women”) was March 08, 2015. The event was in celebration of International Women’s Day. The theme of the event was “Make It Happen, Raising Our Voices: Stop Violence Against Women.” Janja Lalich, Professor of Sociology, “gave a really powerful presentation.”

Kaiser reported that AAUP (American Association of University Professors) marks its 100th year anniversary on March 13, 2015. A celebration will be held at CSU, East Bay.

Kaiser, for McCabe, noted the NCHIP (National College Health Improvement Program). Only two campuses on the West Coast, Chico and Stanford, are involved in NCHIP. Trish Seastrom, Program Director of CADEC (Campus Alcohol and Drug Education Center), gave a “really, really, presentation” about NCHIP to Kaiser’s class.

Kaiser noted that the memo regarding delays in receiving the “giant” 1.6% salary increase noted lecturers as being affected. Kaiser noted that FERPs also “are not seeing any kind of pay increase.” Kaiser urged that we

keep up the pressure here, and hopefully when we ask direct questions, “we will get direct answers.” Sharyn Abernatha, Assistant Vice President for Staff Human Resources, noted that the State Controller’s has not provided us with all that we need to process these increases. Payroll is trying to make the necessary corrections “without waiting for them.”

Ratterree noted she “had the pleasure of attending the Student Affairs First Friday on March 05, 2015. CADEC gave a presentation on NCHIP. There actually are some very encouraging stories coming from this committee” (task force). CADEC offered to give a presentation to the Academic Senate. The NCHIP Task Force will meet tomorrow morning, March 13, 2015, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m., in SSC 490. “Please attend if you can.”

McCabe announced that March 14 is “Pi Day.” Get a tee shirt; get some pie; “do something to celebrate your geek.” And Saturday is a special Pi day, a once-a-century occurrence that matches the year (15) with the third and fourth decimals of Pi – 3.1415 (March 14, 2015—3-14-15). Mills added that we will pass through all digits of Pi in one second shortly after 9:06:53 in the morning. “It will be amazing.”

Boyd announced that on Pi Day, March 14, is the FFA Field Day. Some 2500 high school students from the North State will compete in events on the Chico campus and the University Farm and Butte College. We have the second largest contest in the state. You’ll see a lot of students waking around in blue jackets. Please welcome them as we will be recruiting them as well.

Baumgartner recognized Malcolm McLemore, Program Coordinator of Student Life and Leadership. McLemore spoke regarding concerns previously expressed at the Academic Senate regarding students missing classes due to “mandatory” Greek activities. McLemore noted that students who purportedly miss classes due to Greek obligations are not doing so under any sanctions recognized by the university. Missing classes due to Greek activities “is not a valid excuse.” McLemore noted that “our official university stance is that “Academic Trumps All.” If you know of any issues with Greek organizations please let us know. “I would like to deal with them before they become problems.” McLemore added that, unfortunately, we have no control over “non-recognized” Greek organizations. Selvester encouraged senators to share the information McLemore has provided regarding class absences with their departments and colleges.

Nichols announced that the Academic Assessment Council is hosting an assessment workshop for faculty on April 03, 2015, in Colusa 100A (“I believe”). Lunch is at 12:30 p.m., followed by the program at 1 p.m. It is open to everyone. Department program facilitators, GE pathway facilitators, among others, are especially encouraged to attend. More information will be coming.

Baumgartner reported that March is “Declare a Major Month.” All undeclared freshman are required to participate in a joint workshop partnering with Academic Advising in the Career Center. Several workshops are being held in March. Undeclared sophomores are required to meet one-on-one with an advisor.

Mace announced that March is National Social Workers Month. The local chapter of the NASW (National Association of Social Workers) is having some activities.

Cross distributed, on behalf of the Counseling Center, buttons that say “Mental Health Matters.”

Selvester announced that the Hispanic Association for Community and Education (HACE) will host their annual Latin Dance, Saturday, April 10, 2015, from 7:30 p.m. to 11:30 p.m., in Manzanita Place (Elks Lodge). Tickets are \$30 in advance and \$35 at the door. Music will be provided by a “big band” from Sacramento. Selvester noted, “For those of you who know my predilection for dancing, it’s my party so come and join us.”

Kirchoff reported that Chico passed two accreditation reviews in “stellar fashion”: National Accreditation for Teacher Education and state accreditation by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

4. Chair’s Prerogative.

A. Writing at Chico State – Nichols.

Selvester prefaced Nichol’s presentation by noting that this has implications for WASC, “in some ways in a broad sense” and implications for the literacy of our students, how well we are doing, what the problems are, our very high standards, “and what they bad things are.” As he proceeds through the presentation, he is thinking of “what kinds of solutions, advice, recommendations you might give him and his group.” Nichols is chair of CAB (Curriculum Advisory Board). Boyd noted that Nichols gave the presentation to EPPC. It was clear that this was a matter that should be heard by the full senate. Boyd noted that the GE document (EM 20-001) approved in 2010 set the writing intensive (WI) course cap at 20. A later revision increased the cap to 30, with several caveats regarding support and resources that would go toward WI instruction.

Nichols reviewed the following slides in a PowerPoint presentation.

Why do we care about writing?

- WASC requires demonstration of graduating students’ writing proficiency as one of its “core competencies”
- Lack of writing proficiency = diminished job prospects?

Writing is a KEY FOCUS of education at Chico State:

- Each program must include a Writing Proficiency Course
These courses are held to a cap of 30 for pedagogical reasons
- We have a University Writing Committee
- We have specially-designated Writing Intensive Courses within GE
- These courses are held to a cap of 30 for pedagogical reasons
- Proficiency in Written Communication is one of the 10 GE SLO’s (we don’t have campus-wide SLO’s – those of GE are as representative as it gets)

Concerns about writing: NSSE data (CSUC Seniors, 2014, self-reported)

During the past school year, how many papers or other writing tasks of the following length have you been assigned.

| Activity | Chico State average | CSU average | “Carnegie Class” average | Nationwid |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Papers 1-5 pp. | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Papers 6-10 pp. | 2.9 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.6 |
| Papers 11+ pp. | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Total pages | 66 | 83 | 79 | 79 |

Concerns about writing: availability of WI and C GE courses (Spring 2015)

| Course type | Unique Courses | Sections offered | Available space | Enrollment/ % |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Area A2 | 2 | 32 | 1158 | 1053 91% |
| Lower-Div WI | 16 | 28 | 923 | 873 95% |
| Upper-Div WI | 8 | 11 | 331 | 325 98% |
| Capstone | 17 | 24 | 688 | 667 97% |
| WI Substitution | 11 | 15 | 436 | 334 77% |
| Capstone Sub. | 20 | 40 | 1135 | 983 87% |
| Non-WI sections* | | 9 | 518 | 443 86% |
| Non-C sections* | | 17 | 805 | 697 87% |

WI and C GE courses (Spring 2015)

Enrollment as of February 16, 2015 (modified since presentation to EPPC)

*These are non-WI and non-C sections of GE WI/C Courses. No WI credit given

Caps on WI/C courses

- Of the 95 WI/C courses this semester, 63 have caps of 30 or less.

The other 32:

- ENGL 130-50 and 130-51 (100 and 96) - U-courses with alternative pedagogy
- ENGL 130P-40 (73) - Breaks into very small groups of 12 or less = alternative pedagogy
- HUMN 281-02 (61) - splits into two groups of 30/31 = alternative pedagogy
- GEOG 101-01, 101-04, 101-09 (48 each) - breaks into activities of 24 = alternative pedagogy
- JOUR 130 (7 sections, 35 each) – hybrid of “discussion”, “activity”, and an on-line component: approved as alternative pedagogy
- 18 others from 10 different departments that expanded to between 31 and 34 students

Concerns about writing: distribution of WI and C GE courses (Spring 2015)

| Course type | Total sections | HFA | BSS | NS | CME | UED/ ECC |
|--------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------|
| Area A2 | 32 | 25 | | | 7 | |
| Lower-Div WI | 28 | 15 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Upper-Div WI | 11 | 8 | 2 | 1 | | |
| Capstone | 24 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 95 | 55 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 3 1 |

Concerns about writing: 2012-13 GE WI Assessment

- Approximately 500 samples of student writing independently assessed by 2 assessors each.
- Scored in four categories as:
 - 3 (Accomplished), 2 (Competent), 1 (Beginning)

Courses involved:

A-2 LD WI UD WI

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| ENGL 130I | ENVL 105I | MCGS 401I |
| JOUR 130I | GEOG 101I | POLS 324I |
| | HUMN 281I | POLS 365I |
| | NFSC 200I | POLS 401I |
| | RELS 204I | |
| | RELS 264I | |
| | RELS 275I | |
| | UNIV 105I | |
| | WMST 275I | |
| (311 papers) | (141 papers) | (53 papers) |

Concerns about writing: GE WI Course survey

- 46 WI courses within GE (19 of which are Capstone courses)
- Syllabi from 23 of these courses analyzed in February
- 14 of these showed clear evidence of using “Good Writing Instruction” practice
- 9 of these – evidence was unclear or missing
- Since then 16 of the additional 23 syllabi have been received: analysis is still pending

“Good Writing Instruction” Practice

- Multiple drafts and revisions
- Sequencing writing into manageable parts
- Peer critique/editing and revision workshops
- Writing instruction
- Significant amounts of writing
- A variety of genres or kinds of writing
- Low-stakes, reflective or "Writing to Learn" activities
- Writing integrated with course content

Concerns about Writing

\$
\$
\$
\$

Final Slide – Issues for discussion

- Amount of writing (NSSE data)
- Availability of WI/C GE courses
- Confusion between WI/non-WI sections of same course (e.g. ENVL 105I vs. ENVL 105)
- Effectiveness of Writing Instruction (GE WI Assessment, GE WI course syllabus analysis)
- Cost of low-cap courses of low-cap courses

Nichols discussed selected components of the slides as they were presented. This led to a general discussion of the data among senators and guests. Writing is a key focus at Chico, and four WI courses are required. HFA has the lion's share of WI courses, and this has serious budgetary implications. HFA expends some \$600,000 in supporting WI instruction. Enrolling over-target leads to increased demand upon WI courses. Over-enrollment of some 300 freshman can lead to the need for 30 sections at 30 students per section. WI and capstone course substitutes alleviate some of this demand. But these courses are also capped at 30. WI courses take more time to teach. A three page paper is not the same as a one page paper. WI courses are "easily twice as intensive to teach." Systemwide, there are two types of WI courses required: English within the "Golden Four" (requires a minimum "C" grade) area; and a course to "qualify" for the GVAR ("graduation writing assessment requirement"). However, non-native students (those who do not start here as freshmen) can come to us with a C (or better) in their Golden Four course but only have to receive a C- in whatever course we determine as a GVAR equivalent. With diminishing budgets and decreasing faculty, can we continue to support WI and WI substitute courses at the present level? A growing problem in any course heavily dependent on writing is plagiarism. We need to ensure our effectiveness in providing "good quality feedback" to students in WI courses. We need to look at capstone courses and the overall number of WI courses required. We need to look at the cost of supporting WI courses. We need to revisit the disparity between the number of courses required to native and non-native (transfer) students. Non-native students are required to take only one WI course if they have satisfied the GE requirement prior to coming to Chico; whereas native students must take four courses. The degree progress report is very clear on other GE requirements; however, "there is nothing in there that gives you a red, yellow, green light" on whether or not a student has fulfilled the WI requirement. There actually is an indication of meeting the WI requirement, "but it is pretty far down." The requirement of four WI courses as opposed to requiring fewer or more courses was based upon the rationale that "It shouldn't be ridiculous to expect students to take one writing intensive course per year." In addition to WASC and other expectations, "The reason we use writing in our courses is because it is one of the best ways we know to assess whether and how they are learning." Supporting WI courses is an unfunded mandate. However, we have said that "If the program is worthy and vital, we will put resources there." We must recognize the excessive burden it places upon HFA, where most WI courses are housed. We are thinking in opposites here in terms that we want to educate students with the skills they need, with writing a major priority; yet we are contending with a Graduation Initiative that endeavors to move them through to graduation in less time. Senators, their colleagues, and administrators need to be thinking of ways to address these issues. "It's not sustainable."

B. RRFC Update – Selvester.

Selvester reviewed the summaries of the February 11 and March 03, 2015, meetings of the Resolution Response Full Committee.

February 11, 2015.

1. The Chair began - the meeting process was reviewed.
2. The meeting summary of January 30 was accepted with a few changes for added clarity.
3. An amendment was added to the meeting ground rules: Civility
4. The RRFC returned to the first item of the overall meetings organization:
Renewing shared governance principles: trust, transparency, shared decision making, good-faith information sharing, clear communication and cooperation. (combined R1, R2 and R4)

a. Present Issue(s), perceptions, significance, and implications

Continued from last meeting: Concerns about succession planning and changes in leadership

Three handouts were shared related to Climate Surveys

b. Renewing Shared Governance
Perceptions about EO 1000

This example underlines how a process could alleviate negative perceptions

- 1) Provide clear rationale to campus
- 2) Be sure there is pre-consultation before brought forward
- 3) Vetting before implementation stage

Applies to other examples of need for consultation (many perceptions have been Collected, some include)

- 1) lack of decision for replacing director of RESP since Director retired
- 2) moving Enrollment Management
- 3) change in academic calendar
 - a. influences on intercession not fully vetted
 - b. effects on pedagogy of courses
- 4) post allocation plan – Audits called for
- 5) renovation prioritization
- 6) PSAG discontinued
- 7) confusion about Diversity Action Plan (lack Chief Diversity officer)
- 8) Research Foundation Board –faculty membership, publication of meetings, etc.
- 9) Reservations during finals week cancelled without consultation (ie. 10 year program in Social work)
- 10) Restructure library a surprise announcement

Sign posts on path we want to redesign:

- 1) Identify (Clarity)
- 2) Discussion (Consult)
- 3) Communication (including past and post decision making)

5. Confidentiality is a pressing concern at this point moving forward.

The RRFC will continue addressing issue 1. Renewing shared governance principles: trust, transparency, shared decision making, good-faith information sharing, clear communication and

cooperation. (combined R1, R2 and R4) derived from the Resolution: *Request for Review of and Assistance in Strengthening Campus Shared Governance, Communication, and Morale*, at the next meeting, March 4, 2015.

Ideas going forward so far:

- 1) Provide for training for succession between older and newer position holders when administrators are replaced
- 2) Create permanent expectations and procedural practice about clear notification, consultation and transparent communication about policies and designs

March 03, 2015.

Members of the committee discussed the Report on Resolutions and perceptions therein. The perception that Cabinet appears to be making decisions without adequate consultation of influence from shared governance was discussed.

Changes to the Campus Calendar, MOUs between RF and the university regarding facilities use charges (with respect to RESP F&A) were discussed at length.

Selvester added that the plan is to report the culmination of work-to-date to the Academic Senate prior to the final meeting of the Senate. However, the process should not be considered as concluding at the end of spring semester. This is an ongoing process; it will continue, and “will run into next year, I’m sure.”

5. Standing Committee Reports.

A. Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Boyd.

EPPC did not meet since the previous Academic Senate meeting (February 26, 2015).

B. Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Sistrunk.

In its meeting on March 5, 2015, FASP made the following decisions:

- EM: Exceptional Service Assigned Time passed as Action Item.
- Proposed Change to FPPP: Definition of Office Hours passed as Action Item.
- Proposed Change to FPPP: Faculty Code of Ethics passed as Action Item.
- Proposed Change to FPPP: Delete Lecturer Range L passed as Action Item.
- EM: Instructionally Related Activities Advisory Committee: Postpone Definitely until the next meeting.
- IRA Student Code of Conduct for Off Campus Activities: Postpone Definitely until the next meeting.

In addition, FASP discussed a proposed change to the FPPP about requiring a Degree at Time of Hire.

Other business:

- The Class Size Policies Subcommittee is still waiting to hear from all the Deans about the policies of their colleges about class size.

C. Executive Committee – Crotts.

Executive Committee Synopsis

Friday, February 27, 2015, 8:30 a.m., K 103

- The Executive Committee met on February 27, 2015. Topics of discussion included:
- Academic Freedom and the Statewide Academic Senate resolution
- Upgrading the minimum grade of “C-“ to “C” in Golden Four courses
- Racially charged incidents

- Student club bank accounts
- Leadership Initiative
- Personnel (RTP) process for counsellors
- EMAC (Enrollment Management Advisory Committee) resolution and recommendation on FTES enrollment targets for 2015-16
- WASC planning team
- Climate survey working group
- SAFE Place
- Elevator operation and maintenance

6. Statewide Academic Senate – Kaiser/Schulte.

Kaiser reported that the SAS will meet on March 19-20, 2015, “while you all are on the beach drinking beer and having a good time.” The systemwide GEAC (General Education Advisory Committee) will meet on March 17, 2015. Being, essentially, a statewide committee, GEAC has open invitations to the UC and the Community Colleges (CCs). UC rarely attends, but the CCs consistently are present. Kaiser noted that national groups may also bring proposals to GEAC regarding major issues, like Statway (a program designed to teach mathematics skills that are essential for a growing number of occupations and are needed for decision-making under conditions of uncertainty).

Kaiser reviewed the status of Community College baccalaureate proposals.

Chancellor White notified Chancellor Harris (Community Colleges) on March 02, 2015, that CSU had reviewed the program proposals and reached the following conclusions:

CSU **objects** to the following
two programs - Interaction
Design, Santa Monica College
Automotive Technology, Rio
Hondo College

CSU **is concerned about but willing to work with CCC districts to resolve concerns** for the following four programs
Emergency Services and Allied Health Systems, Crafton Hills College
Occupational Studies, Santa Ana College
Biomanufacturing, Mira Costa College
Respiratory Care, Modesto Junior College

CSU **has no objection** to the following nine programs –
Dental Hygiene, Foothill College
Dental Hygiene, West Los Angeles Mortuary Science, Cypress College
Airframe Manufacturing Technology, Antelope Valley College
Equine Industry, Feather River College
Health Information Management, Shasta College
Health Information Management, San Diego Mesa College
Industrial Automation, Bakersfield College
Respiratory Therapy, Skyline College

CCC Chancellor Harris informed Chancellor White that the CCC system would be recommending the nine programs CSU did not object to and the four programs CSU expressed concerns about to the CCC Board of Governors for approval. The two programs

CSU objected to will be subjects for further discussion.

Please know that the Executive Committee is in the process of following up with Chancellor White on the variance between campus [both administration and faculty] conclusions and those expressed in his letter. We will also be discussing the nature of further conversations with the CCC districts and system to resolve concerns about programs. We will report to senators when we have information to share.

Kaiser reported that the four candidates for Faculty Trustee will make presentations (10 minutes each) to the SAS. The SAS is required to forward a minimum of two candidates (could forward all four candidates) to the Governor for appointment. Kaiser noted, that despite the lack of “readings” (only a single second reading) on the agenda, she anticipates “a lot activity coming” to the meeting because items not introduced at the March meeting “can’t be passed in May and therefore won’t see the light of day.”

7. Associated Students – Herren.

The Student Academic Senate (SAS) continues to meet bi-monthly and is crafting language for several resolutions regarding subjects such as shared governance and STEM courses on campus. The SAS meets Wednesday, March 12th, from 8-9am in the Bell Memorial Union room 220D and at the same time and location on March 26th.

Major projects underway by the Student Academic Senate include the passage of internal policies and the gradual development of an administrative procedures manual as well as the creation of a uniform shared governance system for students using our latest technology resources. Both projects will require assistance by experienced faculty in these areas, and any help would be greatly appreciated. As the inaugural year of the Student Academic Senate gets closer to concluding I would like to encourage you to reach out to your college’s senator and learn about what they’re currently working on. Here is a list of each senator and their contact information for your convenience.

Ben Liwanag
Vice Chair, Student Academic Senate
Senator for the College of Agriculture
sas2@csuchico.edu

Madeline Michael
Chair, Internal Review Committee
Senator for the College of Communication and Education
sas3@csuchico.edu

Marty Salgado
Chair, Academic Affairs Committee
Senator for the College of Humanities and Fine Arts
sas6@csuchico.edu

Geoffrey Leeds
Senator for the College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Construction Management
sas7@csuchico.edu

Kaitlyn Enticknap
Senator for the College of Behavioral and Social Science

sas5@csuchico.edu

Crystal Vasquez
Senator for the College of Natural Sciences
sas4@csuchico.edu

Kevin Cai
Senator for the College of Business
sas1@csuchico.edu

The Associated Students sent a group of students to the California Higher Education Student Summit (CHESS) on February 28th to lobby for higher education at the capitol in Sacramento the following day. The students met with Chico State's district representatives to discuss the importance of specifically supporting additional funding for the CSU system.

The Associated Students is accepting "Intent to File" applications for elected officer positions through March 23rd at 5pm. Applications can be picked up in the Bell Memorial Union room 220 and more information can be found [here](#) or by emailing aselections@csuchico.edu. Please share this information with students in your respective areas.

The Associated Students Board of Directors approved language for an Advisory Measure that will be included in this year's campus elections. The ballot initiative will survey the student body on their interest in sustainable food and the Associated Students committing to the Real Food Challenge. The Real Food Challenge requires signatory campuses to purchase 20% of their food from a local, organic or fair-trade vendor by 2020. More detailed information about the Real Food Challenge can be found by clicking [here](#).

The Associated Students, Alumni Association, Student Life and Leadership and Athletics have been working with the Campus Public Art Committee (CPAC) and the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) on the Wildcat Statue Project. The group met in mid-February to review approximately 50 artist applications. The CPC approved the artist recommendation brought forward by the members of the CPAC. Matthew Gray Palmer is the artist selected to work with the campus to design a Wildcat Statue that is unique to Chico State. The next step is for the CPAC to recommend a location to the CPC.

The Associated Students Community Affairs Council will be hosting the fifth annual Cats in the Community event on March 31st. The community service event honors the legacy of Cesar Chavez and hundreds of student will spend the day volunteering in the local community. If you are interested in volunteering or helping with the event more information can be found by clicking [here](#)

The Associated Students Diversity Affairs Council will be hosting the 41st annual International Festival from 11:00am-4:00pm on April, 2015 on Glenn Lawn and Trinity Commons areas. The event is free and provides multicultural organizations the opportunity to showcase their culture to the campus and community through the expression of music, dance, food and more. There will be booths displaying and selling cultural arts, crafts and food as well as live performances and music entertainment.

Any questions, comments, or concerns can be directed to the Chair of the Student Academic Senate, Michael Pratt, at asunivaffairs@csuchico.edu or to Taylor Herren at aspresident@csuchico.edu.

Herren added that an event ("Stop the Violence Now") was held for the student that was recently slain near the campus (Travis Powell, March 07, 2015). Over 200 attended. Herren noted she "was moved by the genuineness of the students there wanting to make a difference." Herren requested faculty to encourage

students to run for A.S. offices. Pratt noted that some recent changes have been made to A.S. committees. Three committees remain in need of faculty representatives.

8. Staff Council – Heileson.

Ratterree reported that Staff Council met on March 10, 2015 “and the minutes have not been prepared yet.” The raffle was held for the “Evening for Two” fundraiser for the Staff Awards Luncheon in April. Planning is underway for the Staff and Faculty Art Show (Exhibition). “We will have door prizes, with a wonderful grand prize for the luncheon: golf for two, dinner at Kinder’s Steakhouse, and \$50 play money. All in all, a \$250 value, all donated by Rolling Hills Casino.

9. University Report – Zingg/Elrod.

Zingg and Elrod were not present.

Calandrella noted that a memorial service will be held next week in Gridley for the student (Travis Powell) that was recently slain near the campus. Calandrella expressed appreciation to all who attended the event for the slain student (noted by Herren in Item 9. Associated Students) and to those who attended the interviews for the campus police chief. Calandrella noted that, unfortunately, violence is continuing, including some of our own students “being bad.” A memorial for Rick Rees, retired Associate Director of Student Activities, will be held March 28, 2015, in the Lakeside Pavilion. Kaiser added that Rees and his first wife were active on the CUSD board for many years. After her passing, he joined the board. Rees’ second wife was a retired principle in the school district and said, “He just could not let go of the hope that he could help students do a little bit better.”

10. Proposed Change to FPPP: CBA Changes to Online Education Language – FASP – Action Item.

Sistrunk moved Proposed Change to FPPP: CBA Changes to Online Education Language as an action item. The revisions to reflect language that is necessary to remain in compliance with the CBA. Kaiser noted concerns that faculty being evaluated and evaluators of fully online course are “at a distinct disadvantage.” There is not a class to see; you cannot observe student reactions. You cannot answer many of the questions that a review is supposed to address. “I feel that we are in danger of not being fair to both positions: the faculty [being evaluated] and the observer.” “I would like to see the committee address how we can more effectively do online-only class reviews.”

Mace/Kaiser moved an amendment:

Under FPPP (AY 14/15) 8.1

The evaluation of online portions of a course should take place with the candidate present to give a narrative of online material. The faculty unit employee will not be required to provide more online content for evaluation than would be available in a classroom visit.

McCabe/Crotts moved an amendment to the amendment:

The faculty unit employee will not be required to provide more online content for evaluation than would be available in a classroom visit. The scope of such evaluations shall be reasonably equivalent to the scope of one classroom visit.

Kaiser indicated support for the amendment, noting that some reviewers review the entire online class and not just one session of the class.

Vote: The amendment to the amendment passed.

Vote: The amendment passed.

Meadows/Crotts moved an amendment:

Under FPPP Renewal 8.1.1.e

There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. The scope of online evaluations shall be reasonably equivalent to the scope of one classroom visit.

Vote: The amendment passed.

Vote: The Proposed Change to FPPP: CBA Changes to Online Education Language passed as an action item.

11. Proposed EM: Exceptional Service Assigned Time – FASP – Introduction Item.

Sistrunk moved the Proposed EM: Exceptional Service Assigned Time as an introduction item.

Sistrunk noted that the proposed document is a template based on documents used at some other campuses in the system; “so it’s a proven functional piece of working bureaucracy.” Selvester noted that the new (2014-17) CBA allocates each campus a certain amount of money to be awarded to support release “and we [campus senates] are tasked by that CBA requirement to create some means by which we can distribute that money.” Crotts added that the CBA charges campus senates with: “Academic Senates on each campus shall develop criteria and procedures for the use of the funds” (CBA 20.27). Meadows noted, “It is a lot of work for very little money and we can thank our union for that.” The proposed document has only very minor changes from the template already in systemwide use. Selvester noted an extreme sense of urgency here as the first round of awards are supposed to be granted this academic year, and we are already approaching spring break.

Boyd/Crotts moved to call the question (and cease debate).

Vote: The move to call the question passed.

Vote: The Proposed EM: Exceptional Service Assigned Time passed as an introduction item.

Sistrunk/Boyd moved to suspend the rules and consider the Proposed EM: Exceptional Service Assigned Time as an action item.

Vote: The move to suspend the rules passed.

Sistrunk moved the Proposed EM: Exceptional Service Assigned Time as an action item.

Crotts noted that normally with a document that has a great deal of substantive text we do not suspend the rules. However, the overriding sense of urgency to implement a process for considering Exceptional Service Assigned Time warrants proceeding here in a most alacritous manner.

Vote: The Proposed EM: Exceptional Service Assigned Time passed as an action item.

12. Proposed Change to FPPP: Definition of Office Hours – FASP Introduction Item.

Sistrunk moved Proposed Change to FPPP: Definition of Office Hours as an introduction item. Sistrunk noted that the FASP subcommittee consulted with deans and chairs in developing this proposal. The proposal decreases the *minimum* number of hours for instructional assignments of 12 WTU or more for all faculty (tenured/tenure track and temporary) from five to four hours each week. This brings the requirement for tenured/tenure track faculty into consistency with full time temporary faculty (who were required to have one office hour for every three WTU for a total of four hours per week) and recognizes that faculty may engage in office hour communication (e.g., electronic communication) beyond formally scheduled

office hours. Kaiser noted the lack of recognition in the document for “professional flexibility” to accommodate “scheduled work travel” and office hours during finals week. Regarding concerns noted over office hours during finals week, Mills noted that office hours during finals week are covered in another EM (EM 08-040: Student Rights and Responsibilities—“Students have the right to have instructional faculty schedule a reasonable number of office hours for student conferences, including availability during the week of final examinations.”)

Vote: The Proposed Change to FPPP: Definition of Office Hours passed as an introduction item.

13. Proposed Change to FPPP: Faculty Code of Ethics – FASP – Introduction Item.

Sistrunk moved the Proposed Change to FPPP: Faculty Code of Ethics as an introduction item. This document is “the work of a very distinguished group of people, including innovators and scholars among us who were involved in the Title IX committee.” “It replaces older language with more contemporary language with more contemporary understandings of professional responsibilities that faculty have” regarding professional relationships. Kaiser noted that when actual (Title IX) violations occur, we should use the law for what it is intended for. “The danger” in this document is that “we will get trapped into simplistic perceptions and not go after perps.” Discussion among senators noted that unique situations are expected and will always occur, and this document is [part of] a code, not a policy. The document is a comprehensive revision of the “Personal Relationships” section of the Faculty Code of Ethics, which is Appendix III of the FPPP. Mills recommended that faculty review the entire code to put the proposed document in context.

Vote: The Proposed Change to FPPP: Faculty Code of Ethics passed as an introduction item.

14. Proposed Change to FPPP: Delete Lecturer Range L – FASP – Introduction Item.

Sistrunk moved the Proposed Change to FPPP: Delete Lecturer Range L as a FASP introduction item. Sistrunk noted that the motion is in response to the deletion of Lecturer Range L from the CBA.

Vote: The Proposed Change to FPPP: Delete Lecturer Range L passed as an introduction item.

Kaiser/McCabe moved to suspend the rules and consider the Proposed Change to FPPP: Delete Lecturer Range L as an action item.

Vote: The move to suspend the rules passed.

Sistrunk moved the Proposed Change to FPPP: Delete Lecturer Range L as a FASP action item.

Vote: The Proposed Change to FPPP: Delete Lecturer Range L passed as an action item.

15. Nominations CLOSE March 13, 2015 for one Statewide Senator position, a three year term (2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-2018 AY). A faculty-wide evote will be conducted the week of March 23 through March 30, 2015 if there is more than one person nominated. ([Nomination Form](#)).

16. Nominations CLOSE March 13, 2015 for one at-large Senator position, a three year term (2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-2018 AY). A faculty-wide evote will be conducted the week of March 23 through March 30, 2015 if there is more than one person nominated. ([Nomination Form](#)).

17. Ask the Administrator.

Sistrunk requested an update on the Live Scan issue that was brought up at the Academic Senate February 26, 2015 (under item 13. Ask the Administrator). The primary concern among faculty is over the need to have all (final) candidates “Live Scanned.” It is expensive, time consuming, and embarrassing to the candidates.

Abernatha noted that the policy originated from the Chancellor's Office. They have developed a new "background check" (criminal records check) and are currently meeting and conferring with the unions on the draft of the new policy. Discussion among senators and Abernatha noted a discrepancy between whether or not the Live Scan requirement applies to all finalists or just to candidates to whom an offer is made. Abernatha noted that the current policy requires Live Scanning only a candidate for whom an offer will be made. Several senators noted that they had been under the impression (it is a mandate) that all finalists have to be Live Scanned. Concern was noted over the obligation upon departments to cover the cost of Live Scanning all final candidates. At the Academic Senate on February 26, 2015, Hoffman noted that she is still working with Sharyn Abernatha on the Live Scanning issues and will get back. Hoffman was not present at today's meeting. Abernatha noted that concerns will be addressed and they will get back to the Academic Senate.

Schulte noted that, at the Academic Senate on February 26, 2015, Elrod was asked about the article in the Chico News and Review regarding counselors. Elrod indicated that a response would be provided. Elrod is not present at today's meeting, and Schulte wants it on the record that we are still awaiting a response.

18. Other.

A senator recommended that announcements at the beginning of meetings (Item 3) be kept "very very brief" because, by the time we get to the real issues, "it's a flurry and a flurry does not make" for good discussion.

19. Adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Crotts, Secretary

