PRESENT: Adamian, Akinwande, Allen, Altfeld, Boura, Boyd, Connolly, Day, Donze, Ferrari, Ford, Gruber, Hart, Herman, Hidalgo, Horst, Hostetter-Lewis, Hutchinson, Kaiser, Kim (McConkey), Kitchell, Lang, Larson, Livingston, McConkey, Mitchell-Brown, Paiva, Peterson, Pittman, Sharma (Akinwande), Shepherd (Ferrari), Sistrunk, Sudick, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood (Hart), Watkins, Wyrick (Chair), Zartman

ABSENT:

Wyrick gavled the meeting to order meeting at 2:31 p.m. (2:20-2:33)

   Item 12, third paragraph, Connolly was misspelled.
   Revised Minutes were approved.

2. Approve Agenda. (4:22-4:33)
   Agenda was approved.

3. Announcements. (4:34-9:08)
   - Kaiser congratulated Political Science for their part in sponsoring the Constitution Day speaker on September 27, Erwin Chemerinsky, Dean of the University of California, Berkeley, School of Law.
   - Sistrunk announced that CFA will host Dr. Jabari Mahiri on October 8 at noon (KNDL 207-209) to discuss his work on deconstructing race Pigmentocracy: The Color of Social Justice as part of the Anti-Racism Social Justice Transformation conversations series.
   - Wyrick said that the Student Academic Senate is looking for a senator to serve as liaison between itself and the Academic Senate. The Student Academic Senate meets every other Friday from 2:00-3:30. Sam Akinwande, Director of University Affairs, added that students from each of the colleges meet and a voice from the Academic Senate is needed there to help guide student policy discussions.

4. Chair’s Prerogative. (9:09-
   Wyrick noted that Chair’s prerogative discussion will no longer include WASC updates, but will move instead to conversation about the Master Plan and the Strategic Plan.
• **Strategic Plan and Master Plan Updates** (Hutchinson/ Tony Dunn/ Mike Guzzi) (9:13-28:09)
Hutchinson introduced Tony Dunn, Project Manager, Information Technology Client Services and Mike Guzzi, Director, Facilities Management and Services (FMS), to give the overview of plans to engage the community in writing these plans.

Tony Dunn thanked everyone for participating last week in the Physical Master Planning sessions and, ongoing until this evening, the Strategic Plan. He said that we are at the beginning of a planning cycle that will be ongoing to encourage voices from the campus community.

Mike Guzzi noted that FMS had been gathering data since last April and began sessions about the Physical Master Plan last week as well. He said merged meetings about both plans reaching out to campus constituency groups will start November 5 and 6.

[Slide 3] Tony Dunn explained that the Fall is primarily about reaching out and sharing with the University. Winter and Spring will be spent drafting and prototyping the plans and getting input and feedback about them later in the Spring. All this work will be finalized over the summer. Implementation will begin next Fall.

[Slide 4] Tony Dunn reiterated the purposes of strategic and master planning - they are to establish a vision for the future of CSU Chico and a realistic plan to make it happen. He said we have gotten an incredible amount of input and feedback in our search to provide actionable answers to our planning questions: Who and what are we? Who and what do we want to become and why? and How do we get from here to there?

[Slide 5] Mike Guzzi explained what the Physical Master Plan is supposed to work in conjunction with the Strategic plan. The Board of Trustees requires every University to have a Master Plan to show existing and anticipated facilities needs that will support its educational policies and objectives.

All of our major capital projects need to align with this plan. Thus, the Physical Science building was part of planning that was made in 2005. Revising this plan requires a fairly extensive process and will determine our projects for the next ten years.

Highlights that will be added to this new Master Plan include:
- Update the Climate Action Plan that was written in 2011. There is still some work to do to accomplish these goals.
- Infrastructure improvement ideas about what to prioritize
- Housing market study to determine what needs there may or may not be for housing for students on our campus
- Other smaller ideas include a cohesive Campus wayfinding and signage plan

[Slide 6] summarizes the dates and attendance at the FutureFest planning sessions. Over 700 people participated in both types of planning sessions. Mike Guzzi added that 2000 students responded to a housing survey that was sent out. He noted that we only needed 375
responses to have a 95% certainty of the results. Tony Dunn added that besides evaluating these results in November that the 148 sheets of feedback from the Futurefest will also be uploaded so that everyone can see the results.

[Slide 7] He continued to depict the plans to engage specifically with campus shared governance and consultative bodies on campus as well as community partners. He hoped people would add groups to consult if they saw the need. These will really start up November 5-6. Please email him, or Brooke Banks, Chief of Staff, or planning@csuchico.edu. Someone suggested adding the Student Academic Senate.

Ferrari noted that the data about current students and potential future increases that was shared at the Futurefest meetings was extremely important. Tony Dunn said that these dashboards were only about 50% completed. He hoped everyone would feel free to suggest other types of data that they thought important for these processes.

Donze asked about the Campus Climate Survey, and Hutchinson said that the survey analysis was complete, and would be out in the next day or so.

Livingston wondered about off-campus bodies that might be consulted. Mike Guzzi said last week evening sessions were held with the Chico Avenues organization and another one with city of Chico officials including the city manager, the police chief, Chico fire, one of the public works engineers as well as state parks engineers. This was to show them what we are planning and get their ideas and feedback. These meetings will continue (plans include the Chico Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown Business Association, etc.).

Wyrick noted that the planning team could consult with the Academic Senate, but might also go to the standing committees (FASP and EPPC) as well.

Mike Guzzi asked for more comments. He noted that we want to get our planning right and create something that is actionable and can be implemented. He hoped the plan would not sit on his shelf, but perform real service in guiding the work. He noted that our Climate goals for 2030 (zero greenhouse gas emissions) are right around the corner. The Master Plan will enable us to get there.

Kaiser thought there should be consultation with Chico Unified and the charters. She was told that their representatives had been at the earlier meetings and they are invited to future meetings as well.

Brooke Banks noted that lists of other stakeholders have been made including the community colleges, various boards of education in the North state.

Zartman asked if previous studies had captured data about what percent of stakeholders need to participate so that future compliance seems likely.

Tony Dunn answered that he was not aware of that kind of study, but that experience taught that the more consultation done so that people felt that they are being heard adds to the
success in executing the planning. He said there is a difference between making a plan to sit on the shelf and creating something that people feel engaged with and can understand and appreciate how it is being implemented. It builds momentum. This is part of a culture change that is ongoing and is not static. The modern world is moving rapidly with economic, demographic, technological change that planning must be ongoing.

Boura pointed out that this was done while tracking participation.

Mitchell-Brown said that the School of the Arts and Chico Performances should be included because their spaces were so specialized and required specialized voices to maintain and promote. Mike Guzzi noted that representatives of these concerns had been consulted, and that plans were to keep doing this into the future.

Akinwande hoped our spaces would reflect the student body. As an example, he pointed out that a student had told him that there was only one accessible restroom in Butte hall on the first floor which was a hardship when you are on the seventh floor. For this reason, he thought Accessibility Resources (ARC) should be consulted as well.

Altfeld suggested including the Chico Community Arts Council.

Wyrick hoped ideas and comments would continue.

- **Sum Total Training Management System** – David Rowe/ Sheryl Woodward (28:10-44:44)

David Rowe, Manager, Distributed Learning Technologies, introduced Beverly Gentry, Manager, Professional Development, so that they could introduce a new training system.

[Slide 2] He noted that our older online training is unreliable and we are alone in the system for relying on it. He said he and his team of three have about 40 calls for assistance with our system a month.

[Slide 3] The Chancellor’s Office has implemented a system-wide training management system called SumTotal. It is a better system providing more mobile device support and user centric design.

[Slide 4] is a view of what the screen will look like. It will be rebranded to call it CSU Learn. It is set up to allow a user to get into four areas a service easily:

- **Assigned Training**
- **Recently Viewed** which includes courses you might be interested in taking. There is additional content that users can explore.
- **Transcript** This will allow courses to be grouped and cataloged so that important content is foregrounded. These can be printed to put in an RTP or annual professional review file easily.
- **Training Schedule** will give an overview of required trainings so that users can plan how to take them.

[Slide 5] provides a sneak peek at how a manager will be able view the Learning Activities
undertaken. This is a site that is undergoing updating now.

[Slide 6] is a more detailed view of the type of report that will be generated for managers to get an overall report of the trainings undertaken or pending. This will allow a manager to drill down about how individual employees are doing.

[Slide 7] is the Project Timeline. This came on fairly quickly in July because the Chancellor’s Office contract with the old vender was ending. They are looking to roll out the system before the end of this year.

[Slide 7] depicts concerns to promote a successful transition. 15 to 20 offices on campus are charged with providing training and they are part of the Enterprise Training Collaborative. These offices are having discussions about how to implement the new system.

Our campus is also having to migrate data about all the previous training that people have done over the last ten years (over 200,000 pieces of data about this). This includes prior courses and users’ training history.

Communication with various groups to facilitate training and preparation to accommodate the new system is underway. There will be email communication with everyone as well. There is a training website.

Chico specific content will be added in Phase 2. This includes over 900 custom courses. Phase 3 will integrate Lynda references that people may have taken as well.

[Side 8] This is a large and fairly rapid unfolding project. Questions were invited:

- Will the due date to finish older required training by October 15 be pushed back? This might be moved back.
- When should the old trainings be complete? Everyone is encouraged to complete these now. Completed trainings will be easily transferred and the new courses will be all new content.
- Should all records of completed courses be printed off now? The existing contract with the current vender is still valid through June. The front-end access to those trainings will disappear, but queries can be made and course completions verified.

Wyrick introduced the time certain Item 10.

10. Proposed Program Name Change from Minor in Chicano Studies to Minor in Intersectional Chicanx/Latinx Studies - EPPC - Introduction Item (44:45-53:35)
Ferrari invited Sara Cooper, Director, Multi-Cultural and Gender Studies Department to guide conversation through the rationale of the proposal and answer questions. Ferrari said that EPPC was also considering whether the minor in what was once Chicano Studies will become a major, but this is not finished yet.
Sara Cooper reminded senators that he conceptual abstract turning the Multi-Cultural and Gender Studies program into a department included contemplating utilizing the intersectional language of Chicanx/Latinx for the minor.

Boyd asked for more background on the word choice. Sara Cooper explained that older programs with this type of content would have been called Chicano studies and if they were a little more inclusive might have included some appellation like Latino studies, or Latino/Chicano studies. We are going two steps further by introducing the gender inclusive “x” rather than the gender specific masculine “o”, or even the gender binary “o/a”.

The other step forward is that our new designation underlines the intersectionality of the groups to be studied. These groups are varied and not homogeneous in heritage of origin. This new language imparts different categories like socio-economic class, sexuality, gender, race, ethnicity, ability and the many other aspects that inform who we are. She noted that there were great conversations across campus and with student organizations to come up with this more inclusive language.

Introduction item passed.

It was moved and seconded to suspend the rules and allow the item to move to action. Passed.

Ferrari noted that it was asked in EPPC what current language is used and that response was very positive about embracing more diverse language.

Akinwande added that this verbiage connoted to students that we value who you are and that the subject matter of the courses is not limited.

Wyrick asked if the new title implies different content. Sara Cooper thought this would promote the intersectionality of the whole curriculum more effectively. She said the program had spent two years introducing new course work and having conversations to promote this. The first round of the new courses was currently underway and the intersectional emphasis is being expressed even more effectively.

Action item passed.

5. Standing Committees Reports (53:37-1:03:51)

- **Educational Policies and Programs Committee** – Ferrari

Ferrari noted that her report was attached.

She also observed that EPPC had suffered delay in conducting its business because an essential member had been forced to miss a meeting and their proxy could not fulfill their function adequately. She said that typically people had been asking someone from their standing committee or from the senate to take their proxy because they would be at the meeting anyway. But, especially if content specific expertise is required, this is inadequate. She thought that guidelines about choosing proxies should be clarified, because it is important to have representatives from specific offices who can perform their functions.
Sistrunk pointed out that current constitutional language requires someone to pick a proxy representative from their own college. Wyrick noted that EPPC can clarify its own procedure.

Boyd noted that EPPC can add its own operational guidelines, but it does default to Senate by-laws and constitutional practice and specifically invokes Robert’s Rules of Order to fill in any gaps. Robert’s Rules specifically says that a proxy should come from the missing member’s constituency.

Ferrari emphasized that her concerns were not to blame people for absences, but that there is a great deal of business before the committee and that the lack of appropriate personnel will make matters even more difficult.

Pittman quoted Article 5 of the Senate bylaws: “a member of the senate may appoint any member of his or her constituency” as a proxy. Wyrick said that EPPC could get more specific than that and require that a proxy come from the particular office.

Ferrari summarized that proxies vote on behalf of the missing member (and they can be instructed about how to vote specifically), carry forward questions or motions and they should also be able to perform the functions or answer questions of the office they are representing.

- **Faculty and Student Policies Committee** – Pittman
  Pittman noted that FASP passed the Time, Place and Manner policy as an introduction item.

Larson asked about the note that other subcommittees are waiting to undertake their charges for other subcommittee to act. Pittman said that the Chair of FASP had been over exuberant about the future business of the committee. He enumerated the committees that are already working, but pointed out that the online education policy committee was still waiting for the ad hoc committee that originally took up the topic to report.

- **Executive Committee** – Sistrunk
  Sistrunk noted that EC just had one meeting since the last report and offered to answer questions.

Kaiser noted that a family member had had their proscription insurance coverage suspended at an area pharmacy and were told that Anthem Blue Cross coverage was suspended. What will we do? Kitchell answered that she was unaware there were area pharmacies doing this. She said she would find out about this question, because the parties are still in negotiations.

6. **Statewide Academic Senate Report** – Ford/ Boyd
   [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/) (1:03:52-1:18:43)

- **ASCSU Resolutions & Summaries**
  Ford reported that the Statewide Academic Senate does not meet again until the first week of
November. At our last meeting the document about the Tenets of System Level Governance that was crafted by the Statewide Executive and the Chancellor’s Office representatives was shared. He hoped feedback would be given to him and Betsy so they could take Chico’s ideas forward. He read a selection from the second to last paragraph of the Tenets document:

“Each party recognizes that there will be occasional circumstances in which time constraints do not allow for normal systems of consultation to work effectively. The formal consultation process will therefore make provision to allow for an explicit agreement between ASCSU and the chancellor to engage in a mutually agreed-upon process of expedited consultation in such cases, while still recognizing the formal role of the academic senates as the faculty voice on such matters under consideration. In the unlikely event that agreement cannot be reached, he chancellor will decide. Because an expedited process is not the most optimal form of consultation and shortchanges robust shared governance process, its use should be limited to those rare circumstances that justify departing from the more comprehensive process intended by this document.”

Ford noted that this section had generated much conversation and many state-wide senators did not like the idea of opening the door to an expedited process that short-circuits shared governance.

Others also thought that EO 1100 and 1110 were so egregious in the process that enacted them that something should be done about them. Ford recognized this, but thought that the leadership of the State-wide Senate and the Chancellor’s office recognize that they need to work to move past this. He personally thought this was healthy. He would like feedback on these issues especially.

Sistrunk mentioned that at CSU Northridge students had just occupied their academic Senate in protest of the EO provisions and that things are not quiet everywhere.

He also wanted to object to the notion that provisions must be made for short-term emergency policy making at the statewide level. At the local level we have provisions to conduct business over the summer if it becomes absolutely necessary, but then such provisions are double-checked in the fall by the full senate. He asked for an example of when the state as a whole would need to act so precipitously.

Kaiser noted that this EO 1110 had distinguished us enough that representatives from Chico Unified K-12 education were going to a national conference to talk about how they will try to share data about their students’ college preparation with the CSU. There is currently no data to examine the results of four year English education requirements, for example.

The standards for quantitative reasoning (the EO requires four courses from high schoolers to be ready for university level education) have also never been studied. Various school districts don’t have the money to offer four courses and scheduling can also be difficult.

Boyd asked if Kaiser thought we could have benefitted from more consultation about these new requirements, especially for their implications to K-12 education. She did.
Donze asked if this was like national federal problems created because the executive was relying on executive orders more than congressional action.

Boyd pointed out that the references to sources of policy in the Tenets document appealed to the Higher Education Employee Relations Act (HEERA) that has specific provisions that recognize that faculty are responsible for curriculum. The Chancellor’s Office EO’s were passed over the summers ago without adequate consultation because faculty were on break. They were distributed in draft form, and when finally released, were different than what had been posited originally. These EOs have significant impacts on curriculum across the state. The Tenets are an attempt to bring some shared perspective back to the process, but many do not think this is adequate. This is somewhat removed from national circumstances.

Ford noted that the Chancellor’s Office is under pressure from the Department of Finance and from the Legislature to react to Graduation Initiative funding and other issues. The legislature is becoming more obtrusive and interested in micro-managing education in general. He said the pressure was definitely real for the Chancellor’s Office to act. This helped pave the way for the additional funding we got this summer.

In contrast, he said that the Community Colleges have not taken a proactive stance and Assembly bill 705 has taken control of the curriculum from the faculty.

Sistrunk wanted to send more comments forward and wondered if we should pass some form of resolution.


Hutchinson
She repeated that the Campus Climate Survey was on her desk and would go out tomorrow.

The search for the Vice President of Business and Finance has determined finalists and they will be coming to cams soon.

Zartman reported that the first two candidates (from SLO and Arizona) would be coming Monday and Wednesday next week and two weeks later on October 25th the third candidate (from San Francisco) will be coming. The itineraries of the candidates will be posted online tomorrow. He said that many constituency groups had already been contacted with meeting possibilities with the candidates. The hope was to have a successful candidate chosen by the end of October.

The semi-finalists were impressive. Hutchinson concurred and congratulated the search committee of 23 people for their commendable work as well. She thanked Zartman particularly.

Hutchinson gave a shout out to those doing the planning to move the Master Plan and Strategic Plan forward.
Larson
Larson reminded everyone that the next University Budget Committee (UBC) meeting would be held tomorrow morning. She noted that communication about how we are sending our money and what is coming in are central.

Kate McCarthy has sent out an appeal for proposal to fund high impact practices to spend the Graduation Initiative funds we have received this year ($274,000). This includes course redesign and other ideas. We are particularly interested in improving the equity completion gap for our under-represented students. The proposals are due October 26.

Sistrunk noted that Larson had said there will be 20 new tenure-track hires this year. He wondered how many of those were added because of the GI funds.

Larson said the rules about how to use GI funding became clearer every year. The Chancellor’s Office calculated that the $25M assigned to hiring tenure-track faculty was 33% of the entire $75M. Our share of that at Chico would be about $850,000. In Academic Affairs we allocated $1M of the $1.9M that came to the division for faculty hires. This is essentially 8 positions since we have to cover benefits as well.

The $75M is permanent base budget. In addition there was $250,000 one-time money. This meant $100,000 for high enrollment courses and $150,000 to implement EO 1110 specifically for English and Math.

Wyrick said that Hutchinson thought the other division leaders could report and he called on Vice President of Student Affairs Lang.

Lang
Lang reported that there have been climate issues on campus and Student Affairs staff has been working with students to talk about ways to deal with these kind of issues on campus and in the community. He said he had spoken with 35 to 40 students at the Cross-Cultural Leadership office and he was very proud of our students.

They want to partner with us to make this a very inclusive campus. They want to pull together a student council to think with us about campus climate issues. He said that his division will work to supply this committee and help put it together to make it as diverse as we can. We want to celebrate with them but also rely on our students as a thinking partners to help us get out of negative situations that may arise. This is exciting.

Lang was also excited about his new role as Chief Diversity Officer. He thought there are many things we can do on this campus and the only way to do this was to work together. He looked forward to working with the Provost and the Cabinet and all of us to examine were we are at around diversity and examining ourselves in serving diversity.

Donze expressed her interest in helping with work on Campus Climate, and Hutchinson asked her to check in with her about the efforts that are ongoing already on this campus.
Sistrunk recalled that questions about gender and other diversity dimensions of our classrooms had been raised in UBC and Jeff Bell said that he has asked HR for this kind of information, and was told they did not have it. Sistrunk said our efforts at promoting diversity and inclusion should be everywhere and they might be helped by our data-gathering efforts to think about the funding of the colleges.

Larson said that as we make progress on our data structure on campus she hoped that information like this will be gathered. She thought there would be many things like diversity that one could query using the basic dashboards.

**Kitchell**

Kitchell reported that the division has been working on establishing membership for several committees that have not been meeting over the last couple of years:

- The Public Safety Committee met earlier this week.
- The Campus Sustainability Committee will meet this coming Monday and she is excited to get these committees going.
- The UBC meeting tomorrow will have an interactive exercise so folks can practice digging for data themselves online.

The division is also working on implementing varied software.

- We already saw the CSU Learn program.
- They are also working on Concur an online travel application that is being rolled out to several departments. This is an initiative with seven other CSUs this year.
- RSS software is being initiated. This is a result of the Health and Safety Audit that prompted us especially to update our laboratory monitoring protocols. This is also a system-wide effort and so it is a little slower. It should be implemented by December.
- Finally, the division is working on another central management software application that will help with routing forms and lessoning paper use.

**Boura**

Boura noted that at tomorrow’s UBC Advancement would report on their successful work. We are just shy of $70M in our capital campaign. In this financial year, we just passed $1.6M. We are working very closely with many colleagues and the College of Engineering. Things are unfolding rapidly and well.

On October 10, there will be a ground breaking ceremony for the science building which will be an opportunity for the community to celebrate our accomplishments.


Akinwande added some highlights from the written report. Last week the students hosted the CSSA, the California State Student Association meeting and representatives from 23 CSU visited. He said it was a beautiful event. President Hutchinson welcomed everyone and spoke about shared governance. Students felt proud that the can feel connected to campus administration. The other campuses are jealous of our collegiality.
The other student visitors were impressed by our sustainability efforts. They admire our food pantry and student support efforts. Although we have work to do, we should be proud of what we have accomplished. Our students took other student representatives around to our AS programs and other University efforts. We have things they don’t, like the Cross Cultural Center. We outperform other Universities with more funds.

The two student academic positions have been filled.

AS is still interviewing for the Director of Legislative Affairs. This position would join he and Alisha Sharma at CSSA events.

There are still councils and committees that need student representatives. We need 100 students and have about 25. These people are necessary to support students. Please send students to AS!

The CCLC will host a diversity summit this weekend.

There was no report. The next meeting will be on Tuesday.

11. Selection of Member for CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee (1:44:30-1:45:26)
Wyrick noted that he had sent out an email extending the time limit to submit an application. The first nominee had to withdraw and tomorrow at noon will be the next deadline.

12. Ask the Administrator (1:45:26-1:47:45)
Kaiser noted that the K-12 state dashboard will tell you if the males in a class did better or worse than the females by instructor. That is very useful data. She did not know the depth of the University dashboards.

Larson said there is a dashboard on the public site called IR factbook. It gives restricted access to only Deans and above to classes by instructor. It will take shared governance and more consultation to determine how access will work.

Blackboard Predict can provide that kind of data. But this is not moving forward.

Wyrick reiterated that UBC will meet tomorrow morning at 8:00 in this room. Participants should bring laptops to explore data. Everyone is invited to UBC. It is a twice a semester meeting to learn from the President and Cabinet how allocations are made.

Meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary