

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

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

Wednesday, December 14, 2016, 2:00 p.m., KNDL-207/209

*Academic Senate meetings are recorded. Traditionally the written minutes consist of a summary of topics discussed. For more detail, listen to the audio file [here](#). Time stamps for each agenda item are provided in parenthesis for convenience. For accessibility questions, please contact the Academic Senate Office.*

**PRESENT:** Allen, Boyd, Calandrella, Cross, Crofts, Ferrari, Fleet, Ford, Heileson, Hutchinson, Hyatt (A. Grimm), Janos (Schierenbeck), Kemper, Kim, Kirchoff, Livingston, Meadows, McConkey, McLemore, Pittman, Ponarul, Pratt, Roll (Wilking), Rowberg, Schierenbeck, Scholz, Selvester, Sistrunk, Schulte, Stapleton, Sudick, Rehg, Thompson (J. Shepherd), Traver, Ward, Watkins, Wilking, Wyrick, Zartman

**ABSENT:** Boura

During an ebb in conversation, Chair Boyd called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m. (4:30).

**1. Approve Agenda.** (4:45)

Agenda was approved.

**2. Dean of Students – Discussion Item.** (5:00)

Boyd began by explaining why the Academic Senate was meeting and thanked everyone for attending.

She said that this meeting was called in response to petitions from 19.5% of the total senate membership. Under the provision of Article IX, Section 1 of the [Constitution of the Academic Senate](#), when the percentage of membership making such a request exceeds fifteen percent, “the chair shall call a meeting of the senate to take place within five instructional days”. She noted that in this case this percentage did not include any of the Senate officers.

She and President Hutchinson had received many expressions of concern about the December 2 announcement of a new Dean of Students position and the appointment made to fill it. ([http://www.csuchico.edu/fs/documents/academic\\_senate/2016-2017/12-14-16/dean-students\\_announcement-campus\\_announcements.pdf](http://www.csuchico.edu/fs/documents/academic_senate/2016-2017/12-14-16/dean-students_announcement-campus_announcements.pdf))

Boyd gave an overview of the plan for the rest of the day, saying she would allow some latitude about the topics addressed as clarification required, since Agenda Item Two and Item Three: Appointment Practices and Policies in the Context of Shared Governance were closely related. She also emphasized that discussion of Item Four: Determining Next Steps would be more focused in hopes of moving forward and creating future possibilities.

She recognized that everyone in attendance was united by a common purpose to further the mission of Chico State and the CSU to uphold the public trust and serve our students. With this goal of creating a better University in mind, she hoped that questions and statements would generally focus on this new office and the processes by which it was made and decided and not on the individuals involved. Finally, she reminded everyone of Robert's Rules with its speaker's list, and Chair's prerogative that is used to promote everyone's voice. She also reiterated the procedure followed in the Senate that allows audience members to be recognized by a sitting Senator so they can speak or ask questions if they wish from the gallery. She added other observations about the difficulties of discourse in the room. (12:07)

Hutchinson wished everyone good afternoon and recognized that this special session was an opportunity for all of us to come together and have a frank discussion about processes and policy. She hoped this would be interactive and productive, and she thought such conversation was very healthy. She thanked the members for the opportunity to ask and answer questions and especially to determine next steps together. (12:47)

Calandrella read a power point to guide his explanations and to provide more information. He began by describing the timeline of a sequence of events that started in October 2015 and that led to the appointment of the Dean of Students. He said the process began with the departure of the previous director of Student Judicial Affairs and his need to appoint an interim in a hurry. The Department had needs to meet deadlines and, in some cases, catch-up to them, and new staff that required training.

[SLIDE TWO] **Dean of Students: Timeline:**

- October, 2015  
Departure of Director of Judicial Affairs
- October 26, 2015  
Appointment of Incumbent to "Interim Director"  
Current responsibilities in ARC, CARE, and Campus ADA Coordinator,  
Accessible Technology and Services  
Selected Incumbent based on department needs: new staff, work coordination,  
deadline completion  
Incumbent's understanding of Federal, State, Title V and Title IX laws and  
processes

[SLIDE THREE] **Timeline: Spring '16**

- Spring 2016  
Consideration of keeping position as currently formulated  
Discussed pros/cons with Senior Student Affairs Management Group  
members  
Accomplishments of Incumbent  
Staff morale and performance improvements  
Free up much needed budgetary resources/free up MPP position  
Discussed with President Zingg and gained support to pursue

- May/June 2016  
Met with President Zingg to begin HR process of position description development  
Advised that HR was not processing any HR changes until President Hutchinson arrived in July, 2016

[SLIDE FOUR] **Timeline: July/August**

- July 5, 2016  
Met with President Hutchinson and discussed position change of title among other items
- Week of July 12, 2016  
Reviewed position under EM 04-043  
Determined that this was not a Non-college academic dean as listed in EM  
Proceeded with work on position change as per past practice

[SLIDE FIVE] **Timeline: July/August Continued**

- August 16, 2016  
Met with President Hutchinson and discussed position in greater detail  
Shared outcome of CSU survey that revealed 17 campuses with Dean of Students title in combination with AVP or as stand-alone and recommended Dean of Students rather than Assistant Vice President

[SLIDE SIX] **Timeline: September**

- September 16, 2016  
Discussed impending completion of HR position description and classification with President Hutchinson and agreed to update (*sic*) Senate Executive Committee during next meeting –scheduled (*sic*) for October 13, 2016
- September 30, 2016  
Completed Staff Action Form Received in Staff HR

Hutchinson suggested Calandrella rephrase the wording of the slide from “update the Senate Executive” to say “inform the Senate Executive”. Calandrella explained that the Staff Action Form outlines in detail the position description, the incumbent’s name, the position classification, time of appointment, salary and other pertinent information.

[SLIDE SEVEN] **Timeline: October**

- October 6, 2016  
Staff Action Form Signed of in HR
- October 7, 2016  
Letter sent to Incumbent on October 7 indicating change in title and assignment
- October 12, 2016  
Acknowledgement/acceptance of reassignment by incumbent received in Office of VPSA
- October 17, 2016 (Approximate)  
Assigned staff in Office of VPSA to develop text for Campus Announcements for review/editing

[SLIDE EIGHT] **Timeline: October continued**

- October 13, 2016  
Informed Executive Committee of title change  
Received feedback from EC and questions about lack of consultation under EM 04-043 (*sic*)  
Provided clarification that this was a new title for a current incumbent who assumed additional responsibilities and also a reorganization
- October 21, 2016  
Special meeting held with President, Provost, VPSA and Executive Committee to discuss improving consultation and communication going forward  
Further feedback received regarding position and my need to explain in any announcement why no search was conducted

Calandrella commented that there were questions from the Senate Executive about why there was no consultation about this new position, but that he said it was not a new position, just a new title.

[SLIDE NINE] **Timelines: October/November**

- Week of October 24, 2016  
Asked staff to revise announcement to reflect title change to incumbent's current set of responsibilities in order to reflect a permanent change in responsibilities and therefore not a new position requiring a search
- Week of November 1, 2016  
Edited and reviewed announcement with VPSA office staff

[SLIDE TEN] **Timeline: November**

- Week of November 7, 2016  
Post-Election Activities: Absorbed with student forums, activating Campus Incident Response Team  
Decided to postpone announcement as concerned it would be lost in all the post-election activity  
The campus was involved with much reaction and activity through Thanksgiving  
Decided to push announcement out after Thanksgiving but before semester's end (14-15 work days)
- Week of November 28, 2016 (week after Thanksgiving)  
Reviewed Announcement with Joe Wills and message sent [Dec. 2]

[SLIDE ELEVEN] **Reflections**

- My Reflections
- Questions

Calandrella offered some final personal reflections. He noted that he had worked in public higher education for nearly 40 years and had served as the Vice President of Student Affairs on three campuses. He had worked in the CSU system for 26 of those years.

He said he had always believed in and was committed to transparency and shared governance. He observed that shared governance was different on each campus. He said his efforts to retitle a manager as the Dean of Students were taken with an eye to improving services to students and the greater campus. He admitted that he had learned that there is an expectation that we are moving away from past practices especially as regards to consultation and communication. He said he was looking forward to working with the Senate, the Executive Committee of the Senate and the Cabinet, other division leaders and staff, faculty and students as we fashion new ways to be transparent and consult, especially during these exciting times under the leadership of our new President.

Boyd invited questions from the floor and reiterated that she would follow a speaker's list. Crofts stepped forward to facilitate keeping the list as Ford had not yet arrived at the meeting. (22:51)

Schierenbeck asked if there was a change in salary beside the change in title. Calandrella answered that the new position was paid approximately \$5000.00 more.

Livingston wondered about the gains made with the new position financially and in terms of efficiency. Calandrella thought that the gains financially are found in the reduction of a full-time MPP salary to approximately \$5000.00 for the new incumbent and that this person brought a skill set that included familiarity with the routines of the job, organizing the team and working within the many laws that we have to follow in all the areas of the position. He added that she provided consistency in the office as well.

Matt Thomas asked about Calandrella's interpretation of EM 04-043 pointing out that there are three particular categories of potential searches governed in the EM: 1) Provost, Vice-President and Vice-Provost; 2) Non-college academic Deans and 3) "Other senior managerial positions with significant impact on the academic program...". Why was this position not covered by the third category? He also noted that it was once usual to send "Notices of the Intent to Promote" on this campus and wondered if anyone could speak to this.

Calandrella answered that the rest of the language in the EM about the third category of positions reads: "as authorized by the President in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee." He said that he knew there had been changes recommended to this older policy that had not been signed off on by President Zingg, so that he read the policy as it is now and determined that it did not apply to the position. He also said that the use of the "Notification of the Intent to Promote" was inconsistently applied and at some point just stopped.

Hutchinson asked for clarification that Matt Thomas had used the term "Notice of the Intent to Promote". She continued by saying that this question about the third bullet in the EM serves to identify an area we need to address as we move forward to work together and find a common understanding.

Wilking asked why the position was not a "Non-college academic Dean"? Calandrella answered that the Dean of Students is not an academic position. Hutchinson added that she had a recollection that the context provided by all the prior EMs utilized the term academic

to refer to positions within Academic Affairs. She said this question should be put on the list of matters that we should treat in the future to achieve common understanding and interpretations of policy so that we can act together.

Ferrari noted that the fear that the announcement about the new position would be overlooked if sent too close to Election day was problematic, because the announcement that was made came on a Friday embedded in general campus announcements and during a time of the semester that the Senate was done with its formal meetings.

Calandrella explained that he was still “wordsmithing” the notice even after Thanksgiving, but that he wanted to make sure it came out before the end of the term. Ferrari replied that she was used to receiving a separate email for something as important as the position of a Dean. Calandrella said that this was usual practice in the division of Student Affairs and that they did not have that many announcements so this one went by.

Meadows pointed out that previously the Director of the Accessibility Resources Center and the Director of Student Judicial Affairs were both full-time positions that required the full-time effort of their incumbents to fulfill their assignments. She wondered what was being lost or given up when the full-time work of two people is combined under one person. Where is the workload being made up?

Calandrella replied that Student Affairs was a relatively flat organization and the managers are all working managers. Two new staff members were added with the administration of Title IX requirements and all the cases we were getting. He thought the efficiencies of a manager familiar with requirements undercut the losses.

Kirchhoff asked when the Dean of Students was done away with, as there had formerly been someone at Chico. Hutchinson believed that the last Dean of Students was Abe Daley in 1981-83 or so. This position was then converted to an Assistant Vice President of Students. Kirchhoff said it sounded like we were consolidating a lot more responsibilities into the position.

Shepherd asked about the problems of having the same person oversee both ARC and Student Judicial Affairs since they sometimes counterbalance each other (what if someone has problems with the “managerial board” of the other). Is there a potential conflict of interest in combining the positions? She also wondered about the specific responsibilities of other similar Deans elsewhere. Were these other job descriptions looked at elsewhere?

Calandrella answered that the incumbent has been in the position for over a year would not be doing the same case work, nor normally serve as the arbiter or hearing officer. He said that Sandy Parson-Ellis was professional enough to know that if there was a conflict of interest, she would hand the case over to Calandrella, or to the associate Vice President of Student Affairs, Pedro Douglas. Calandrella reported that there were about 17 variations of Deans of Students in the CSU and that there are four that have a very similar portfolio (though not the same).

Allen asked if there was a recruitment process when the interim position for a Director of Student Affairs was filled. Calandrella said that there was not, and that it was more of an exception than a rule in the division of Student Affairs. Allen followed up that it seemed concerning that there is no recruitment before someone is put into a position, and then later that position is given a new title based on the recommendation of the Executive management team. It is unclear why recruitment for this new titled position was not deemed necessary. Calandrella said the collapsing of duties was not unusual in the division. For example, when the Cross Cultural Leadership Center was created, other departures required reorganization and a Directorship was necessarily named. Other changes of title that were also reorganizations have been made (i.e. changing an Assistant Vice President to an Associate Vice President). If there is an incumbent in the seat, we don't really have a position to recruit for.

Sistrunk wanted to emphasize that at no time was the Senate Executive consulted about the Dean of Students position no matter how one constructs the timeline describing how it was built. He said he thought this was a lost opportunity to reconsider the profound academic impacts that Student Affairs has on the academic mission. He asked Calandrella to comment further on this sense among the Senate officers that they were not consulted. Calandrella said he understood that we need to change some older practices, and he reiterated that he was reading policy in a different way and not in the new spirit of transparency that the President wanted to promote.

Kemper expressed some concern about the services some students are receiving at ARC, and she reported that as an instructor of special education courses, she often received calls for help from students needing accommodation. She thought that strong leadership from ARC was essential to help these students. Calandrella said he understood the concern and he said he believed students were being well served. He emphasized that the position was managerial, not working cases.

Hutchinson suggested Calandrella address how the operations of the office are managed. Calandrella described how students come to the Accessibility Resources Center and register and provide their documentation. They are then assigned the best person to support their educational efforts. The Director considers entry and placement and helps the Advisors or case workers as they need assistance. She does not manage individual cases, but she provides input and advice at staff meetings to oversee any issues.

Kemper recognized that there are many case workers, student employees and individuals under the Director. She said again, that the students they seek to serve can easily be under represented or feel lost. The position seems to have many other kinds of responsibilities.

Pittman remarked that according to the ground rules laid out at the beginning of the conversation, we were supposed to discuss the position and not really the person given the position. He said he had heard concerns today, that he shared, regarding conflicts between the two previous jobs that are being combined into one, and other concerns regarding the utilization of resources, and the responses he was hearing seem to be: "this incumbent has this experience, this incumbent will surely recuse herself when needed" etc.. His concern

in going forward was that we now have a job that the next person might have difficulty filling. If this job had been brought forward in consultation and utilizing shared governance, we could then tailor the job description for the job, and not for the person who is already sitting in the seat.

Calandrella said that Student Affairs was such a flat organization probably all of the positions were based on the skill-set that people possessed at the time the positions were made. When someone leaves, we have to consider whether we have someone to fill the position or do we change it, and in almost every case, we have changed or modified the positions.

Shepherd wondered about the use of the term interim in this context, since the usual use of the word implies that to become an incumbent, there will be a search or you might need to be replaced. She noted that in the Library their past Dean was an interim and there was no sense that she would necessarily become the incumbent. When did this position move from an interim to an incumbent?

Calandrella said that this idea emerged last spring as the position had been collapsed from two and seemed to be working. The timeline he already described showed how he had considered other solutions and candidates from across the country (but kept his inquiries within the system, by and large). He saw support from both Presidents Zingg and Hutchinson. The staff HR developed the appropriate job description, and they too, did their due diligence with respect to other similar positions in the CSU. It was not a typical thing, but it can happen.

Zartman wondered about Calandrella's description of the practice as "not typical" since there have been two other examples in the last two years when interims became incumbents, not after a search, but by designation (not at a Dean level, but at a director/coordinator level). He and Calandrella whispered to each other and continued to disagree. Calandrella said that interims are not turned into incumbents every time and sometimes there is no search because there is no position to search for.

Allen asked what the plans are for the other interims currently on campus. Are there plans for any of them to become incumbents by designation of a new title? Calandrella said there were none in the works.

Wiling raised the concern that we are being inconsistent with other interims who are having to apply for their positions. It seems like we have found a policy that works for certain purposes in this case, but everybody else must follow another process. That is not fair or consistent. Calandrella answered that we have had inconsistent practices for a number of years.

Wyrick began by noting that we have a challenging recent history with regard to the promotion of interims to permanent positions. EMEDC has been having ongoing discussions about this topic. He had suggested that if an interim position had undergone a national search, it would be possible for an administrator to designate it as an incumbent if



they were satisfied after a sufficient period of probation with the candidate's performance. Still, he thought it was important that there was a recruitment process either at the beginning of the interim level, or when the candidate was made incumbent. Bypassing both pieces seems to run afoul of what is the public trust.

EM 04-043 regulates EMEDC and speaks to this circumstance by requiring searches for Non-college academic Deans as well as other "senior managerial positions with significant impact on the academic mission as authorized by the President in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate." This represents a second area that the campus is concerned about. We need to decide how to determine if a position has significant impact on the academic mission, and since the EM still applies, notification of the Executive Committee does not stand in for consultation.

Meadows responded to the paper copy of the Dean of Students MPP position description that was handed out to Senators. She noted that this was the first time she had seen this. She observed that in section E.1 on page four under Demonstrated Knowledge, Skills and Abilities the job description does not speak to the knowledge, skills and abilities needed to lead Student Judicial Affairs. The description only really speaks to the disabilities services aspect of the work. She wondered why there is not anything about Title IX, or the federal laws about the Office of Civil Rights.

Calandrella said that this was an older position description and that the newer one had been rewritten with such considerations in mind. He would make sure we all received the latest description. Meadows then asked why the signature lines copied and dated by hand at the very end of the document read 11/14/16. This fairly recently dated position description needs to include the skills associated with Student Judicial Affairs since this is very important in moving forward.

Susan Avanzino appreciated the conversation and thoughtful timeline as well as the comments about improving the process so that we can act to improve things we all agree need improvement. She hoped to offer a faculty point of view about the notion that there is some separation between the mission of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The Dean of Students position is overseeing units that are vital to student success and that are growing in importance. ARC will need to expand as we have more and different students coming to us, as will the efforts that must be undertaken by Student Judicial Affairs to implement the guidance offered by rules governing behavior and relationships. These are the shared responsibilities of us all and this new position will be pivotal in addressing them. The concern expressed today is whether the office created will be robust enough to support these vital functions. She hoped Calandrella would take this impression away with him.

Boyd noted that we have gone through the speaker's list and moved to item 3

### **3. Appointment Practices and Policies in the context of Shared Governance - Discussion Item.** (59:57)

Boyd said questions to Calandrella could still be asked, but wanted to change gears. She summarized, generally, what had been discussed above:

- There are inconsistencies with the processes on our campus about how interim appointments are made and progress
- There are different interpretations of EM 04-043
- There are potential revisions that need to be made to policies

Boyd invited conversation about what shared governance should mean on this campus, what the expectations should be for involvement and engagement, and what type of issues these questions raise? She underlined that our new administration is willing and eager to engage about these questions and hoped that everyone, even in the gallery, would speak out.

Schulte asserted that we need more language about the criteria about how interims become permanent that will help us to determine when a search is useful or not. We need more information about how and at what level these decisions are made across campus.

Sistrunk said that the difficulties that emerged about the position of a Dean of Students made him reflect on how essential the services of Student Affairs are, not just to students, but to faculty as well. Beyond this, there are many faculty who work in and for this division and all of the counselors and coaches are Unit 3 faculty. Faculty must work with students and they, themselves, can also have accessibility issues. He hoped people were thinking about how essential this division is to the educational mission of the University. And since this is true, the expectation should be that it should share the practices of the rest of the University like shared governance, transparency, open searches, and open communication.

Zartman hoped that as the problem of making interims and moving them to full positions was contemplated, that there would be emphasis placed on the need at some point (either when the position was initially filled, or when it was made permanent) for a search that was widespread and disseminated the position as a way to show its legitimacy.

He also pointed out that the ongoing searches currently underway for the two new divisional heads have generated excellent conversations and are an example of the working definition of shared governance, collaboration and consultation. He acknowledged that this meeting showed that we have hit a patch of ice in our efforts, but that we can take the things we have learned to move forward.

McConkey said that the use of “Dean” in the job title “Dean of Students” implies something higher than just a manager. The justifications of this position today have emphasized that it is just managerial and only pertains to managing narrower concerns, which doesn’t sound like what a Dean does. She noticed that in the timeline presented that one piece of the process was completing the Staff HR paperwork, and she had not realized until then that a Dean is staff. She thought that some clarification of the use of these titles would be helpful.

Hutchinson agreed that clarifying the varied titles used would be useful in the near future. This should be part of an effort to depict the varied classifications of MPP administrators to define the categories within this designation. She said that there are Admin II’s and III’s who perform

essential MPP functions, but do not perform the kind of senior leadership functions that Admin. IVs do. The conversation that we need to have should look at the essential functions associated with, or correlated to different levels within the MPP category. This will be helpful.

For example, when we look at tenure density are we looking at the number of tenure track we have, or should we add the number of part-time to the figure. Comparing the number of tenure track alone to the MPP number makes it appear that the latter is extremely high. It appears that we have all these Vice Presidents running around and that we are top heavy, but if we dived into the data, we would realize that there are different categories of MPP. Many of those folks are staff with confidential responsibilities or additional responsibilities that place them with essential functions, but do not place them with a leadership role. This can inform our conversations about the ratios we have comparing the number of faculty with the number of administrators. Especially because as we have said today, many of the MPPs in Student Affairs serve functions that are essential to the success of our students.

Boyd added that this conversation would inform us as we create policy so that we have a context within which the language and words of our policies apply and to what areas.

Allen wanted to make some suggestions about how such position announcements are made. She thought the Friday campus announcement listed at the bottom of many other announcements added to a sense that the notice was being slipped under the radar. She thought that something that sounded as important as the Dean of Students should be sent via email directly to the University.

Hutchinson thought this was a good point, but she reasserted that she believed that the explanation for the delay of the announcement made by Calandrella was convincing because of all the post-election activities we experienced. She also believed that he was trying to allow 14 to 15 working days before the semester concluded and that there really was no conspiracy about the timing of Senate meetings. She thought we should seek consistency for our practice, but that sometimes the work of crafting statements and the varied contingencies make it difficult to always repeat best practice. She observed that despite her own efforts at transparency and integrity, that it sometimes did not matter when the announcements she made went out, there might be unhappiness.

Sistrunk thanked Hutchinson for the opportunity to respond to the conversation about tenure-density and the need to reconsider the categories of MPP. He thought this was important because there is a sense across the system that certain functions should be “professionalized” by outsourcing them to consultants who are brought in to solve our management difficulties without due consideration of the place of the faculty and faculty tenure in preserving the creativity within the system and academic freedom. That over reliance on a private business style model that we just hire outside people can undercut the integrity of the University –a danger represented by the fact that tenure is disappearing.

Cross apologized for bringing up the culture of fear that we lived under at Chico over the last years, but he said that when this announcement came out, it seemed to him like a breach of trust. Maybe, as Zartman said, this was just an icy patch, but it still hit him hard.

Hutchinson answered that the fact that we are here today having a very open and transparent conversation is important because it will be what we do heading forward. She admitted that there might be other icy patches ahead, but they should be considered opportunities for us to study the case at hand to understand where our deficiencies are and to take corrective measures to get ourselves back on track. She said this special meeting and fora like it were appropriate for us to come together and roll up our sleeves and have the difficult conversations to move us forward. This will let us develop consistency in action while we will learn more trust of each other. As Betsy said, we should know everyone is here with the right intentions. Hutchinson believes in communicating as openly and often and as transparently as possible so that if we need to do so, we can come together to discover how we messed up. This will move things forward for the better.

She concluded by observing:

“All you have right now is my word and the word of Cabinet”.

Boyd hoped the many relationships we have on campus (especially between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs) will flourish in this way. As the Senate Chair, she promised that she will work to facilitate such cooperation across the divisions and hoped every Senator would participate and lead by example since we are all united by our common desire to support our students.

Ferrari wanted to express that she shared the deep disappointment that has been expressed about how this announcement was made and the position filled. She wanted to say for the record that we are here today because we believe this process was a direct violation of shared governance and the way that it has been corrected, is also a violation of shared governance. She asserted that however we want to go forward to correct policies, address concerns or define shared governance, it must be on the premise that this is not the way to behave.

Pittman wanted to echo Senator Ferrari in some respects. From his perspective, transparency and shared governance must involve all the different stake holders in the decisions. The responses of the many disciplines represented today and all the turmoil created show that this action was not insignificant. For example, it might be possible to work out the concerns people have expressed about the conflict of interest in combining the two offices under one position, but we don't have any way to know how these concerns were addressed. Earlier and more open consultation would have avoided all this trouble and the necessity of meeting again during finals week.

Boyd said that she agreed with Ferrari and Pittman that these actions were a violation, but hoped our conversations could be an opportunity. She appreciated that we have an administration that came to sit in special session and worked to facilitate the meeting. She said we are in new territory and charting our way into better waters and, not to mitigate the severity of the offences that brought us to this meeting, she wanted to give a nod to the direction we are headed.

McLemore recalled that at the beginning of the semester at the Senate retreat, we met to redefine what we would be as a Senate to this campus and that has seemed to fall to the wayside. He said he believes in leading by example and there have been many concerns and solutions suggested today, but we have not defined what our role is in self-governance. Is it specific consultation, or is it to be informed, are we to manage or simply be reactive. We need to bring this back to the table. We know what our policies are, but we don't understand this in regards to procedure, whether it is

from the Student Affairs side or the Academic Senate side. What is our role as Senators to solidify the future progress of shared governance?

Boyd said she valued McLemore's perspective and wanted to point out that the older ideas that we will add more student and staff representation to the Senate has not been swept away, if that is what he was referring to. She said she thought we should be in a healthy place to open up our constitution. To speak to transparency and communication, she thought that the Senate was at a spot where it was trying to promote the timely sharing of information so that it did not just seem reactionary.

Ponarul wanted to comment on what might be called administrative density. The decision to combine two positions could lead, down the road, to a decision that it is better that they are separated since the skill set the position represents is complicated.. It seems likely that the two directors would then be supervised by another person holding the Dean of Student's position. This type of proliferation of administration is a national trend that has led to the growth of University bureaucracy and has been well documented by academic literature.

Ponarul also wondered if the Dean of Students would be part of the Council of Deans. Calandrella answered "no" but that a new Provost might change a lot of this organization around. He added that there are four other similar Dean of Student positions elsewhere in the system and that there should be qualified people to apply for this if the position opens up. Ward added that all the Deans in the current council were in Academic Affairs. There are no other divisions represented.

Boyd remarked that she had received emails asking how to interpret the meaning of the position of Dean in relationship to the other Deans, and there had been a question about how someone outside the University would interpret the moniker.

Kirchhoff wondered what the students thought about the Dean of Students, or if they had had any input about the position. Pratt had nothing to add.

#### **4. Determining Next Steps –Discussion Item. (1:35:38)**

Schulte wanted to express her gratitude that her experience in Senate has been very different this year than in the past. She thought that we were communicating in a way that was effective and helpful. She was unsure if this is what McLemore was referring to, but she wondered what had become of the Statement on Shared Governance that was discussed at the beginning of the year in our original retreat. Could you give an update on the status of this?

Boyd said not to quote her, but that the committee had met approximately ten times for half an hour to an hour each time. The committee has gone through very many iterations of the statement. Although it was still in draft form, she thought it was really reflecting the collective character of Chico State, especially in terms of its inclusivity of students, faculty, staff and administration. The intent is to share the draft early in the next semester and hopefully have a signing event soon thereafter.

She said the document asserts that if there is a sense that something has happened without adequate consultation, that there will be an explanation of the reasons why.

Boyd complimented Pratt for his contributions and scholarship about shared governance to the committee. Hutchinson added that the retreat generated important information about Chico's ideas about shared governance and that information has been taken very seriously and has fed the composition of the statement. The writing has been painstaking and a complex undertaking. Symbolism is important and when the representatives finally sign the statement, it is supposed to be a solemn pledge to uphold its principles into the future. She hoped no one would think the retreat has been forgotten.

Sistrunk noted that we have come up with a lot of interesting ideas to move forward talking about reframing Student Affairs as important partners in the academic mission of the University and revisiting the EMEDC EMs about searches, etc. Since the confusion about the Dean of Students position precipitated this meeting, he thought it would be healthy to consider if there is a chance to promote the unfolding responsibilities of the position. Would it be possible to form some sort of advisory committee or create some means to have input about the responsibilities of ARC and Student Judicial Affairs under this Dean?

Calandrella responded that each year the division goes through MPP evaluations and job descriptions can be revised or updated then. He thought we should let the position gel a year before reconsidering it. That does not mean someone could not provide wise counsel to himself or the incumbent before this.

Hutchinson said that looking at the services provided to our students and the chances to impact student success, she thought it was very appropriate for faculty and Academic Affairs' staff working with students to sit down with the incumbent or the Vice President of Student Affairs and talk about what works well and what does not with regard to the functions of these areas. This should not be a performance review of the position, but kept within the realm of enhancing services and communication for students.

Selvester explained that she had been thinking about how organizations evolve and our changing understanding of shared governance. She wondered if we can answer the question: Does shared governance take place in every division? Who embraces this and what are the characteristics? Does it depend on the character of divisional units and what are the expectations among the staff of Student Affairs, or among the students in AS? For faculty the AAUP provides the Red Book which governs the expectations of faculty in Academic Affairs. We need to have a larger conversation about this as we are considering enlarging the Senate membership. What do the other divisions think about how shared governance works? The Senate carries out shared governance and it is a watchdog for shared governance. How should non faculty be accommodated here?

Boyd interrupted this query briefly to wonder if it would be useful to provide feedback from people who use ARC and Student Judicial Affairs through the use of surveys or some assessment tool. Senate might be able to provide an avenue to give some feedback about these important services.

Meadows said she does believe shared governance goes beyond Academic Affairs and she says this as Chair of the Faculty and Student policies committee. Often, we are considering policies that impact the entire University like the Time, Place and Manner Policy, the Student Code of Conduct and the Academic Integrity Council. Many of these cross the boundaries of the divisions.

Ford suggested that there is a lot of evidence that governance occurs across divisions. The EMs on EMEDC specifically address all the Vice Presidents, the EM that governs EMAC and is a committee containing members from both Student Affairs and Faculty Affairs, UBC has membership across divisions, the Senate itself has membership from across all the divisions representing faculty, staff and students. He thought the answer to Paula's question is that in the Chico model shared governance is ubiquitous across all divisions. The Provost candidates seem to have a similar mindset, and he thought the tradition would be strengthened and continued.

Selvester answered that it seems like Ford is describing how the organization allows faculty to participate in information sharing across the divisions. Shared governance enacts and operationalizes the faculty voice, but it does not describe the way that the divisions enact shared governance amongst themselves.

Boyd thought this touched on some of the discussion generated in writing the Statement on Shared Governance. Faculty may be the face of shared governance, but the practices should trickle down. Chairs are part of it, faculty in each department are part of it, and it can reach out potentially into the other divisions of the University along the same networks.

Selvester wondered if she asked staff what they thought was needed for shared governance to take place and what would they think are violations of it?

Hutchinson thought Selvester's question was really good and needed more exploration. Historically, divisions have been run differently and that historically the focus of Academic Senates have been on Academic Affairs. But as we think of everyone contributing to the success of the institution, as for instance we did today when thinking about the wrap around services of Student Affairs, she said this explained a change of thinking at the Chancellor's Office where there is now one Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs together. We need to figure out where our integrations are to better our collaboration so that we really are one University united by common purpose so how do we determine services accordingly? She thought that the basic practices of shared governance were establishing transparency and communication and making sure we align all of our actions with our strategic values. So that we can report out and consult about our efforts.

People clapped!

Boyd observed that we have a lot of work to do. She thanked everyone for attending and said we are a pretty awesome bunch. Happy holidays and we will take up these issues when we come back.

5. Adjourn.(1:54:24)

Meeting adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary