

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
Thursday, May 3, 2018, 2:30 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. CSU, Chico is committed to making its resources accessible for all audiences. If you have accessibility-related difficulties with any of these documents, please email oats@csuchico.edu.

PRESENT: Adamian, Aird, Allen, Boyd, Boura, Camacho, Connolly, Day, Ferrari, Ford, Hidalgo, Hostetter-Lewis (Pittman), Hutchinson, Kim, Larson, Livingston, McConkey, McLemore, Pittman, Roll, Rowberg (Wilking), Sharma, Shepherd, Schulte, Selvester (Thompson), Shepherd (Ferrari), Sistrunk, Sudick, Teague-Miller, Thompson, Trailer, Underwood, Watkins (Roll), Wilking, Wyrick (Chair), Zartman

ABSENT: Cross, Scholz, Stivers

Wyrick welcomed everyone to the meeting at 2:34 p.m. (1:44-1:50)

1. Approve [Minutes of April 26, 2018](#). (1:51-2:03)

The minutes were approved.

2. Approve [Agenda](#). (2:04-2:31)

The agenda was approved.

3. Announcements. (2:34-3:33)

- Sistrunk announced that the California Faculty Association will hold an [Area Labor Unions Fair](#) on May 4 from 10-2:00 on the Glen Lawn and booth areas.

4. Chair's Prerogative. (3:34-7:50)

- **[GE Review](#) – McCarthy**

Wyrick introduced Kate McCarthy, Interim Dean of Undergraduate Education, who gave an update of the Five year review of the GE pathways program launched in 2012. [Slide 2] The review was conducted by the Curriculum Advisory Board (CAB). They collected data and analyzed it:

- GE SLO assessments (12 over 5 years)
- Enrollment patterns
- Student, faculty, and staff surveys
- Department focus groups with departments heavily involved in GE
- Student focus groups (declared Pathway minors)

There was then full CAB discussion over multiple meetings to discuss the data to find areas of strength and areas of inquiry. This self-study was sent to the external reviewer (and posted on the GE website). The reviewer, Janet H., from Sacramento State spent a full day at Chico and will send her report this week. The final report will then be assembled.

[Slide 3] Several areas of strength and inquiry have been identified to pursue in the coming year. The external reviewer agreed with our list of strengths and affirmed the pathway structure, although she suggested some tweaks to it which we did ourselves. CAB wondered about the utility of measuring the GE “values” like creativity and global engagement as opposed to the core competencies. There are questions about the coherence of the pathways and the number of them in each disciplinary area as well as the number of courses. We have already addressed the complexity of the writing intensive courses and the capstone requirements.

The external review will be discussed this year if it is received, but next fall we will look at potential changes to the policy that governs GE.

Ferrari said that there was a commitment to consider these changes at the first meeting of EPPC in the Fall.

- **Campus Implementation of EO 1110 – Boyd/Ford/Hassenzahl (7:51-32:09)**

Boyd explained that the team was providing an update on a complex situation that represents a big shift in the way CSU prepares students to be college-ready particularly in English and mathematics. EO 1100 and 1110 have been revised and impact how we work with students to get them to the next level.

[Slide 2] provides the timeline of the Chancellor’s Office policy development. The ASCSU started some time ago working with a Quantitative Reasoning Taskforce to reconsider mathematics instruction in the system. Many of its recommendations were set aside when the EOs were finally released in August 2017. The EOs called for implementation in the Fall and the implementation guidelines were not released until September and November. This has caused a challenge to staff and faculty.

[Slide 3] summarizes many of the old EO provisions and the new ones side by side. The new provisions require freshmen to enroll in GE math and English their first year and instead of the old placement tests, they will use “multiple measures” to gage their preparedness.

In the past, faculty served as the majority oversight of the placement standards. In the old standards developmental prerequisites were mandated but now concurrent support is. This means that a developmental course must now be limited to one unit and paired with a college level course.

In the past, students at many levels of preparedness were required to take Early Start courses in the summer before they began University study, and now those who are almost ready for college can skip this. Before the new EOs there was a specified level for community college transfers (intermediate algebra) and now this is gone.

[Slide 5] depicts specifically how we are implementing EO 1110 at Chico. We are one of the most thorough programs. The concurrent courses we will offer are listed in the top table and distinguished as for the least prepared (category IV) and almost ready (category III). The courses listed are being prepared as co-req 1 unit courses to be taken with regular math courses. The teams working on the offerings are listed.

[Slide 6] compares the new and old models of course work. In the new model, students will take a GE math class with a concurrent support course. We are the only program to integrate GE Science into the new category IV so that our students are not required to take an extraneous course. We are also the only campus to include GE mathematics in the GE category.

[Slide 7] compares our campus to the others in the system. The campuses are going with a stretch model or a co-requisite model.

[Slide 8] shows the two colleges and the multiple departments involved in this project so far at Chico as well as the staff and administrators. Boyd noted the many contributions made to the project.

Roll observed that the work looks interdisciplinary and wondered if faculty are being compensated for this redevelopment and where the money is coming from. Ford said that the money for this was coming from the Chancellor's Office from money that was awarded in April and then directed to this end. Boyd said multiple learning communities have been meeting on a weekly basis and they are being compensated. Hassenzahl pointed out that there is a lot of administrative effort going into this effort.

Rolled noted that it seemed that other campuses were including the humanities in their redesign. Ford said is a longstanding course in the humanities for non-technical math for liberal arts majors. This is math 101 which is taught in two tracks, one for majors going into STEM and the other that is terminal for liberal arts majors. The iteration listed in our courses is the one for those going into STEM.

Larson said that English is already employing a stretch model so it did not need further development. Roll asked if we looked at any other colleges. Hassenthal said that we had had to move with alacrity and hoped that in the future other kinds of courses could be added as co-requisites. Over the next year, the team should look farther abroad at other colleges. Ford said other departments had been approached and did not have the right kind of classes yet.

Sistrunk asked about the older faculty control of advising and Ford answered that advising used to be run by faculty and the educational testing service used to be run by faculty to create the ELM test. This will now be done by the Admissions Advisory Council with minority faculty membership. Sistrunk asked why? Boyd said there was no explanation of the changes to the EOs.

Schulte asked how the stretch model was functionally different than what used to be done. Boyd said the 3-6 units would give a student extra units they could count as electives.

Aird asked why we enroll people who don't meet the minimums. Ford said there is sensitivity to the demographics of the populations that would be hurt the most makes this untenable. Thompson said the majority of California students are deeply underserved in K-12. This is a reflection of their lack of opportunity, not their ability. Hassenzahl said this reflects on their preparation, not their ability to do math. The students have met the admissions requirements of the CSU and when it is discovered through testing and other measures that they are not ready with math skills, the attempt is to remove the stigma that used to accompany this background.

M.E. Matthews pointed out that Chico is not separating a STEM pathway from a non-STEM pathway, for equity reasons. We don't want students to feel lie that cannot go into a STEM field because they haven't had the support in their K-12 education. She said there is pressure to provide more money for faculty professional development to change the pedagogy to meet and engage students in deep thinking in these classes, not just learning through tests.

- **WASC Update – Larson (32:10-35:04)**

Larson recognized Vice Provost Daniel Grassian to give the update. (See, WASC Website updates <http://www.csuchico.edu/wasc/wasc-accreditation-process.shtml>). He said we are at version 6 of the self-study that went out to all faculty and staff a few days ago. He invited feedback until next week.

He said our completion date for the report is September. Over the summer work will be done to make sure all the hyper-links are working, the compliance documents are finished, and that all the supplemental materials including the WASC website are up to speed. He said we are making good progress and might be done ahead of schedule in July or August.

In December there will be an offsite review with WASC officials to get preliminary feedback about the self-study and share with us “lines of inquiry” which give an indication of what they will look at when they come and visit. This is a preferable process than the past. The actual WASC visit will be March 5-7. He said he hoped as many people as possible will be present then since the inspectors can change itineraries up to their visit and it is useful if people are around.

There will be events in the Spring and early Fall to discuss the site visit. He thought we were well along.

5. **Proposed New Option in Foundational Mathematics Education – EPPC – Action Item.**
(35:05-36:43)

Ferrari said that this new pathway provides an option to get a BA while also getting a waiver to enter a credential program.

M.E. Matthews pointed out that there is great need for well-trained teachers in K-12 education who can teach up through Algebra II. The changes made to the core bring all of our options

into compliance with EO 1071.

Action Item passed.

6. **Proposed Elevation and Discontinuation of the Option in Health Services Administration to the BS in Health Services Administration and Significant Change to the BS in Health Science and Elimination of Option in Health Education** – EPPC – **Action Item.** (36:49-42:50)

Ferrari reminded senators that we discussed all three of the items above at the same time we did the two name changes suggested below. She proposed that Holly Nevarez, Chair, Health and Community Services Department, discuss them all though they will be voted on separately.

Nevarez said these proposals were a result of EO 1071. She explained that we currently offer a degree in Health Science with two options. These options have four courses in them total (15 units). This is out of compliance with EO 1071 which requires that 50% of a major's coursework be offered in common. The two options offered are accredited by two different professional governing bodies. As an alternative to losing them, her department would like to elevate one of the options to make it a stand-alone degree. The name changes then go along with this process.

Hutchinson asked if there would be unintended impact on underrepresented students in the major since there are important communities in this major. Nevarez said she did not think this would happen since the department polled students last Spring and overwhelmingly they supported these changes.

Hutchinson asked if students interested in nursing would be attracted to the degree. Nevarez answered that this was already the majority of their students and the name clarity will be more helpful. The degree change decreases the overlap between the major and the nursing program since they are looking for students who want to work in public health. She said her work with a nursing program taskforce has revealed that students do not know about all the other career options in health.

Pitman observed as a member of the school of nursing that they are excited about the degree clarification since their program is so impacted. He said every semester there are many students who have been working to get into the nursing program, but there is no room for them. This degree gives students the ability to use many of their courses to go into this program.

Action Item passed

7. **Proposed BS Degree Name Change from Health Science to Public Health** – EPPC – **Action Item.** (42:51-43:20)

Action Item passed.

8. [Proposed Department Name Change from Health & Community Services to Public Health & Health Services Administration](#) – EPPC - Introduction Item. (43:21-44:11)

Action Item passed.

9. [Proposed Revisions to FPPP regarding Early Tenure](#) – FASP – Action Item. (44:21-1:41:23)

- [Proposed Substitute](#)

Wilkings said that FASP has a proposed substitute document to consider. The motion to accept the document was seconded, and Livingston spoke to the changes made since introduction. He noted that this substitute document responded to concerns brought up last week. These include:

- 10.5.3: “early tenure” was changed to “accelerated tenure”, “ranked” was changed to “rated”.
- 10.5.2: In response to questions about the time needed to provide evidence for the requirements of tenure, language was added to note this and underline how accelerated tenure is not normal but must meet a higher standard that is “exceptional”. This description was added to 11.1.3 as well.
- Other wording was moved around that did not impact substance.

The proposed substitute document was accepted.

Concerns were raised about several issues in the passages under consideration:

- 1) What does “exceptional” record mean (the answer is found in 10.5.2, 10.5.3 and 10.5.7)
- 2) The dangers of providing that a candidate get superior ratings at each level of review (this would seem to create too high a bar in that each level could veto the whole process, a Chair could thwart the Department –appeal is built into each level but is this enough?)
- 3) Isn’t a rating (of superior or not) restricted to the specific period of time under review? The review does not necessarily encompass the whole dossier. This was questioned. 10.5.3.2 was cited as mitigating this.
- 4) Math thinks that two “superiors” and one “effective” should suffice for tenure
- 5) If this is passed as worded the rebuttal or minority report will not have any effect (it was pointed out that these are just recommendations anyway –should there be language that a department can change its recommendation in response to a rebuttal? Can’t a higher level determine that a ranking from below is not accurate?).

Other information was provided:

- 1) The FPPP 10.3.4 provides the many definitions of “superior” in each area of evaluation.
- 2) There are three “Levels of Review”: a) Department and Chair; b) Dean and College; and finally c) Provost
- 3) One always has a right to rebut at all levels (procedure not followed, mistakes were made, bias, etc.). This can go all the way to a formal grievance and arbitration. A rebuttal does not refute the standards only the conclusions drawn about performance.

Amendments to the policy:

10.5.5, end of second and third lines was amended: “...justification as ranked superior in each

category at each level of review.” “...justification as ~~ranked superior in each category~~ an exceptional record at each level of review.”

10.5.5, motion to strike “at each level of review” did not pass.

Some recommended language not voted on: (Please also see the rebuttal process in FPPP 10.2.8).

It was moved to postpone this Action item definitely until next week. A group of senators will work on alternatives. Passed.

10. Proposed Revisions to EM 03-010: Executive Management Evaluation and Development
– **FASP- Action Item.** (1:41:35-2:11:01)

• **Proposed Substitute**

Trailer handed out a paper copy of a proposed substitute document and explained why the new document should be considered.

The changes made after discussion at the last meeting were described:

I. Scope a.i the titles of who has a performance review were up dated

I.Scope a.ii was deleted

I. Scope b.i and ii officers were added as instructed

II. Policy a.i.4 and ii.4 and iii.1 the dean member’s two year term was depicted

II. Policy a.iii.1 the staff member term was assigned 1 year

II. Policy a.iv.4 chair succession planning statement was added

II. Policy a.vi Assistant Vice Presidents were added to the list

II. Policy a.vi.e was struck per discussion from the last meeting

II. Policy a.vi. 3 Data Gathering b and c new office title names were added

II. Policy a.vii. Review process for College Deans 3. b and c these officer titles must be updated

Wyrick asked if there were other comments on accepting the substitute document.

Hutchinson commended the efforts of Trailer and the FASP committee, and asked about the definition of executive as within the purview of the policy. She wondered about including the Vice Presidents in the lists of officers under consideration by EMEDC. She said there are Assistant Vice Presidents who have the administrator classification of 1, 2 or 3. She said she thought of Administration leadership or executives as Admin. 4 and above. She hoped we were not hung up on titles, but needed to think about what executive leadership means. She said that Admin 3 are staff and should not have the same evaluation as upper administrators.

Trailer asked if she was requesting that the language be changed to refer to Admin. 4 and above. Hutchinson said she had been wondering about the titles added above (II.a.vi.). She said that earlier (I.a.i) the document refers to Assistant or Associate Vice Presidents in

Academic Affairs. She said some categories of administrators were definitely executive, but others might be doing more technical staff work than actual managerial leadership.

Zartman questioned this quoted I.Scope. b.iii which requires the President to hash out together with the Academic Senate Executive which administrators should be reviewed by defining them as: "Other senior managerial positions with significant impact on the academic program...". There are some Admin 3 that have significant impact on the academic program and they should be considered for evaluation as appropriate.

Hutchinson said this need further investigation since we are not consistent with our classifications. She thought there were many Admin. 3's serving in roles of staff function, but there are also 3's that fall within the definition of "managerial positions with significant impact on the academic mission". She did not want to eliminate the category, but wants some consistency. Maybe there are some Assistant Vice Provosts or Vice Presidents who are Admin. 3s, she would want consultation to see if they truly have significant impact. She wants to be sure EMEDC is focused on these folks with significant impact.

Zartman said the focus is Academic Affairs.

Ford said he did not know the Admin. ranks of all the administrators. He wondered what the mechanisms were for upgrading and downgrading positions. An Admin. 4 might have a change of responsibilities but the title of the office won't change. Hutchinson said we might want to use the language that recognized EMEDC's purview as "Admin. 3 and 4 with significant impact ... as determined in consultation with the President, Cabinet and Academic Senate Executive".

Wyrick thought the document should say in Academic Affairs any time it mentions Vice Presidents. The language about executives with significant impact on the academic mission will catch the rest.

Trailer said that "executive officers" was used in general and then defined specifically in section (I.a.i). Maybe for simplicity we should return to the direct statement without the list and then define the list once below in I.b.i and ii.

Hutchinson said titles will change but Admin. 3 and 4 with significant impact will not as reviewed with President and Provost with the Academic Senate Executive committee. This could be reviewed again as needed.

Boyd moved to vote on this document as the substitute document and then change it next week. Motion passed.

Wilkings asked who would make the changes. Trailer said he could make the changes. Jason Nice said that the document is essential for shared governance and it cannot be postponed past this Spring.

Sheryl Woodward, Assistant Vice President for Staff and Human Resources, said that there

are a handful of procedural changes that ought to be noted in the policy. For instance, under skills and process II.Policy 2. There is no scope and process for reviewing the Associate Vice Presidents. She said she a few more that she is happy to give to someone.

Ferrari recognized that her constituents had suggested some changes. She said the I.b.ii. mentions College Deans and the Meriam Library Dean, but in II.a.vii. we do not add Meriam Library Dean to this heading. She thought II.a.vii.1.b should read: “Two full-time faculty members from the college or Meriam Library...” This would serve to treat the Library as a college and not as a college with an untraditional structure.

Allen asked about II.a.vi: the title ends with the words “and Other Academic Deans”. In I.b.ii the list reads: “College Deans and the Meriam Library Dean.” This does not say other academic Deans, unless these are assumed to be the “other senior managerial positions” referred to below (I.b.iii). The other Deans should be specified and this clarity should extend to I.b.ii as well.

Trailer wondered if we should supply a definition of deanships. McConkey thought it would just be easier to list the other Deans: the Undergraduate Dean, the Graduate School Dean, the Dean of RCE.

Wyrick thanked everyone for their attention and comments and patience.

Boyd suggested a few editorial changes. In II.a.ii.4 the word “next” should be added (or kept) in front of “2 cycles”. The words “next” should be removed from II.a.i.4.

On page four II.a.vi.3.b President is spelled wrong.

She requested that when the Executive committee is referred to it be called the “Academic Senate Executive Committee” since it I a recognized formal body on campus.

It was moved to postpone this Action item to the next Senate meeting. Approved.

Livingston moved to amend the agenda so that Item 11 was postponed until after Item 12 was considered because Dylan Saake had to leave. Seconded and passed.

11. Proposed EM Establishing Title IX Advisory Committee – FASP – Action Item.

(2:12:42-2:18:02)

- **Proposed Substitute**

Dylan Saake, Title IX Coordinator, explained that the policy describing the Title IX Advisory Committee had undergone changes after it was introduced last week.

Notably, the committee core was defined with the language that “it shall include” a specific membership.

The folks invited to the meeting formally was expanded to include the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Members of the Butte County Sexual Assault Response Team. The latter

includes Catalyst, Rape Crisis Center, Stonewall Alliance, and an Enloe nurse who does medical exams.

Wilking moved to accept the substitute document. Approved.

Dylan Saake noted that language was added at the end of the document that the Title IX Coordinator will call the meetings and facilitate them. Votes were identified as ratified by a quorum.

Sistrunk asked if there was anyone who was the Dean of Students anymore. Sandy Parsons used to send a designee to represent the Office of Student Judicial Affairs (which has changed its name). Saake thought the office was appropriate to invite to the meetings.

Wyrick said the third bullet of the groups to be notified should read the Office of Student Conduct, Rights and Responsibilities. The third care member title should read Administrator.

It was asked what a quorum is. This can be defined in the bylaws.

Action Item passed.

12. **Propose Revisions to EM 04-043: Executive Management Selection Committee** – FASP – **Action Item.** (2:18:07-the recorder battery failed at 2:18:48)

- **Proposed Substitute**

The substitute paper document was passed around. A motion to accept the substitute document was seconded and approved. Trailer explained that he had made 16 word changes to the document since last week that were fairly modest and only served to clean it up.

The most significant of these changes were the titles of important Academic Affairs executive personnel who would need to be consulted to facilitate Dean searches. These include the Associate Provost of Academic Personnel and the Assistant Vice President of Staff Human Resources.

Elsewhere the term “quality” was replaced by the word “equity”

Action Item passed.

13. **Proposed New Center: Accounting Student’s Center for Strategic Initiatives** – EPPC – **Introduction Item.**

- **EM 02-007/EO 751**

Ferrari introduced the proposal for this new center that will serve Department of Accounting students and explained that EO 751 and EM 02-007 were linked to provide guidance about the general qualities of centers and describe the application procedure. There are plans next semester to rewrite our local EM of 2002 to add to the guidelines already articulated. She introduced Tim Kizirian, Chair of the Department of Accounting, to give an overview of the center.

Tim Kizirian highlighted the ways that this new center is designed to foster student preparedness for the accounting marketplace and support their career advancement. He gave a number of examples of activities the center will cultivate beyond the classroom including sending students to national accounting meetings, visiting accounting firms throughout California and hosting professionals for technical meetings and professional training. Other activities will include community outreach of the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Program (VITA) which is run and staffed by students. Future plans of this group include tax assistance for people in the North state and tax consultation for the elderly.

The center will bundle an extensive list of diverse student career and placement activities. It will serve as an identifiable entity to provide department, students, recruiters, donors and alumni with a focus of the activity and as a locus of donor and gift support. He said there are already donors and alumni lined up to give to such a center with as much as \$1.2M in prospective funds that will come to Chico.

Larson appreciated the passion behind the proposal but was not supportive of the idea of a center currently. She said she did not see the difference between the center's services and a department's. She feared that the two entities would serve to confuse donors about which to give to since Kizirian would be both the Chair of the department and Director of the center.

She said the University wanted to rewrite our current EM governing centers to treat the global questions they raise more thoroughly and she said we should hold off on creating centers right now.

Finally, she thought that the center's finances should be spelled out clearly. She would like to see a budget and the link between the center and general fund dollars needed to be clear.

Kizirian answered that there is no way the department can handle this level of activity. He hoped holding up the creation of the center would not chill donor enthusiasm as they were looking forward to supporting it. He said he was guided by the procedures spelled out in our current EM, and we should not wait for a future EM to solve problems we have right now.

Boyd said she needed more budget information to explain the difference between the department and the center. She asked if there were donors lined up and suggested that they would add to the strength of the proposal. Ferrari asked Boura to give advice about the fundraising for a department and a center.

Kizirian said alumni were waiting to give and that it was prudent to depict the rough costs of a center as he did in the application since center activities will vary depending on the giving of donors.

Boura said that Kizirian had been tremendous help in identifying people as potential donors and that the department had raised \$40,000 or so with expectations that more will be coming. He explained that he can support whatever faculty decide they want and that the creation of a center can lead to an uptick in funding for both a department and the center. He said the support of the college is essential since the infrastructure to support a center is necessary. He

congratulated Kizirian as a terrific partner in raising funds.

Larson said she thought the structure of the center should be spelled out more so that department and center activity is not duplicated. Kizirian answered that center activity would not duplicate department work and that a center was critical to promote student centered activities.

Ken Chapman, Interim Dean of the College of Business, pointed out the value added by the focus the planned center will bring to activities around the Accounting department which is supposed to have co-ownership of the center. The center will raise student club activity to a higher status and thus provide invaluable professional and educational advantages to the students. The center will facilitate Advancement's fundraising by making accounting activities more marketable with approved legitimacy directed to a student focus. He said he has received a number of letters from people expressing their support and excitement from CPA firms about this direction.

Ford pointed out this center would be self-supporting and wondered what the obligation the University would have to provide resources might be in the future.

Introduction Item did not pass.

Kizirian was welcomed to bring the proposal back in the Fall when the new EM is in place.

14. Proposed Significant Change to the MS in Electrical and Computer Engineering – EPPC – Introduction Item

Ferrari introduced Kathleen Meehan, Chair Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

The MSECE degree currently has two options in Electronic Engineering and Computer Engineering. This proposal seeks to discontinue these options. The primary reasons for the elimination of options are to (1) streamline the program administration and (2) achieve efficient course offering to provide a better alignment of closely related fields of computer engineering and electrical/electronic engineering.

The consolidated degree will require a minimum of 30 units of which 18 units must be from EECE courses. At least 18 of the required 30 units must be from 600-level courses. Three core courses are required including EECE 615, EECE 643, and EECE 682. Other requirements remain unchanged.

Introduction Item passed.

Motion to suspend the rules and vote as an Action Item passed.

Action Item passed.

15. University Report

Hutchinson addressed the questions about NSPR provided in the “Ask the Administrator” tab on the Senate website.

1. Where is the search for the General Manger position and what is the timeline for a hire?
2. Will there be a public forum and how will it be publicized?
3. Why was a freelance reporter hired/offered a contract (after a national search) only to have the contract revoked by the research foundation?

Hutchinson said the search was underway and that the finalists will meet the community for public questions this week. She said that funds did not allow the hiring of the reporter to continue.

Hutchinson reported that the Student fees would be increased so that they are phased in over the next three semesters. She said the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC) had been supportive of the fee increases.

Sistrunk said that he was disappointed by the President’s breach of faith with the students in a vote that had been historically high. He wondered how the University will regain their trust.

Hutchinson said the vote had always been advisory and that she expected we would all work to regain student trust.

Larson reported that the search for the Dean of Business was underway and that finalists would visit campus soon.

16. [Associated Students Report](#) – Sharma

Camacho had had to leave.

17. **Staff Council Report** – Aird

There was no report. Aird had had to leave.

26. **Annual Reports**

Wyrick.

- [University Advancement and University Foundation Report](#) – Boura

Boura, Vice President for University Advancement, went through the report highlighting the news it presents.

He began with the Capital Campaign: Transform Tomorrow [slide 2] and praised the progress so far. [Slide 3] shows the total amount raised this year so far with Cash In (\$5,692,304), Pledge Balance (\$883,731) and Deferred Commitments noted (\$2,618,566).

The Tower Society has shown impressive increases in the 2017-18 giving year [Slide 4].

The Chico State Student Philanthropy Council has grown and has done amazing work [Slide 5].

We have continued to garner awards from the Council for Advancement and Support Education [Slide 6]. Notable was the Best Articles of the Year Gold Award for “In the Wake of Crisis”.

Chico outreach to alumni and donors continues to grow [Slide 8]. As does our effort to create a culture of social and professional networking [Slide 7].

Boura described the University Foundation funds (\$62,215,119) [Slide 14] and the Endowment Performance since March 31, 2018 [Slide 15].

- **University Technology Advisory Committee – Guenter**

Cris Guenter, Faculty, School of Education, and Chair of UTAC, added to her report that the number of faculty and staff falling for phishing scams on the internet has declined at Chico.

She said there are three openings on the committee.

- **Enrollment Management Advisory Committee - Rehg**

Michael Rehg, Chair, Department of Management, and Chair of EMAC, noted some highlights of his report.

The number of resident students enrolled this academic year was 3.5% over resident target

Resident FTES growth since 2014-15 is 5.3%, while total student FTES growth has been 3.1%. Tenure density growth since 2014-15 has been 2% and has therefore not kept pace with the Senate resolution of 2015 that required staff and faculty hiring to match whatever the enrollment percentage increase was [taken from the year 204-15].

19. Kathy Kaiser Academic Senate Service Award nominations open 4/26/17 and close 5/11/18 – Information Item.

Wyrick clarified that the awards are open now and they will close on the 11th. He hoped people would nominate worthy candidates.

20. Ask the Administrator

Ferrari asked Larson whether she had reconsidered appointing the full complement of Pathway coordinators to full year release-time so that they can participate in the substantial work of writing the Five Year Review of GE that will have to be completed next year. She answered that she will take it up with PAC and underlined that \$2.5M is a lot of money.

Lang reported that the Dream Center will not be eliminated and that Teresita Curiel had been hired to direct the center. The Center will spend the summer training students and will receive a .5 student service professional aide.

Larson noted that no decision has been made about discontinuing the Institute for Sustainable Development. There has been some investigation of reassigning staff to Natural Sciences and figuring out how the center can continue its work.

The financial obligations of centers and institutes could be brought up at the University Budget Committee meeting on May 14 when we are discussing off the top moneys and general funds in Academic Affairs. We do not currently have a list of centers or institutes on this campus

29. Other.

Wyrick announced that there are two openings for faculty members to join the Research Foundation Board. The original intention was that the terms of the two would be staggered so that faculty experience and representation would not be lost.

30. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary