

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, April 26, 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 (Sistrunk), Camacho, Connolly, Cross, Day, Ferrari, Ford, Hidalgo, Hostetter-Lewis, Hutchinson, Kim (Ferrari), Larson, Livingston, McConkey, McLemore, Pittman, Roll, Rowberg (Hostetter-Lewis), Sharma, Shepherd, Schulte (Thompson), Selvester, Shepherd, Sistrunk, Stivers, Sudick, Teague-Miller, Thompson, Trailer, Underwood, Watkins, Wilking, Wyrick (Chair), Zartman

ABSENT: Boura, Lang, Scholz,

Wyrick welcomed everyone to the meeting at 2:30 p.m. (4:19-4:27)

1. Approve [Minutes of April 5, 2018](#). (4:27-4:35)

The minutes were approved.

2. Approve [Agenda](#). (4:36-9:48)

Day moved to put items 3, 4 and 5 after item 20 to dispense with all the action and introduction items more quickly. Wyrick said some items under item 4 were time certain. The proposal was then that item 3 and item 5 (ask the Administrator) be moved to after item 20. Some rationale was sought and the motion changed so that only item 5 be moved to after 20. Passed. Livingston moved to discuss item 8 immediately after item 6 since Dean Vela would need to be present at both. Passed.

The agenda was approved as amended.

3. Announcements. (6:48-13:56)

- Cameron Ford, Wildcat Store Technology Manager, announced that the Wildcat Store would be holding a sale May 4 that was 8% off the pre-existing educational discount. Pre-Orders were welcomed from now through the 4th. This does not exclude Microsoft or Dell and trade-ins are offered as well.
- Roll announced that we will host a candidate forum [Meet the Candidates](#) for U.S. Representative District 1 candidates on April 30 in PAC 144 at 7:00 p.m. (sponsored by the League of Women Voters of Butte County, Associated Students and the Office of Civic Engagement at Chico State).
- Sistrunk said 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.

- Hutchinson introduced the new Chico General Counsel, Sasha Danna.
- Dean Hassenzahl said that on May 3 at noon in Colusa Hall there will be another town hall meeting about the new Science building. It will focus on the scheduling of how the building will roll out and how the building will be used to drive curriculum.
- He also observed that the Chico Campus Climate Commitment that was made in 2007 and that President Hutchinson renewed when she arrived has been measured and we are five years ahead of our target. (This is posted on the Second Nature website).
- Teague-Miller said the Department of Music and Theater is presenting the spring musical Avenue Q from May 2-6 at 7:30 in Laxson Auditorium. Not recommended for children under 16.

4. Chair's Prerogative. (13:56-17:59)

- **Degree Progress Report Coding/Change/Writing Requirement Update – Baumgartner Lee/Armitage**

Wyrick introduced Kaitlyn Baumgartner Lee, Director Academic Advising Programs, and Charlene Armitage, Assistant Registrar, and Shannon Hall, Senior Advising Coordinator for Operations and Outreach, Academic Advising Programs.

Baumgartner Lee noted that our writing requirements have undergone revision and that beginning in Fall 2019 the designators that indicate writing courses will change to reflect the changing curriculum. The number of required writing courses has not changed but their designations will.

Charlene Armitage explained the new designators. The writing courses will not be labeled (Z) “capstones” but (W) “upper division writing courses”; instead of (I) “writing intensive courses” they will be labeled “writing courses” (W). All substitutions blessed by CAB will still be honored. Continuing students were told about these changes and a FAQ page was provided to explain to students.

Advisors received this notification.

- **WASC Update – Larson (17:59-21:03)**

Larson reported that a draft version of the self-study will go out soon to the entire campus. Vice Provost Daniel Grassian had been working very hard and the draft will be sent for faculty and staff feedback. (See, WASC Website updates <http://www.csuchico.edu/wasc/wasc-accreditation-process.shtml>).

She said the report highlighted the strengths and character of Chico State and the consistent things we have thought we want to improve on.

She reminded people that the student success dashboards had been established on the “Fact Book” on the IR website. These dashboards have useful information like enrollment figures. This is only phase one of the dashboards, there will be two other phases ahead, but the building blocks are up and running.

The program portfolios are almost done. Provost Larson thanked everyone for their involvement.

5. **Proposed Reclassification of Multicultural & Gender Studies from Program to Department – EPPC- Action Item.** (21:04-22:59)

Ferrari invited Sara Cooper, Director of the program in Multicultural and Gender Studies to add anything to last week's discussion.

Sara Cooper reminded everyone that the program had been acting as a department in most ways. She said that with the support of Dean Vela, the program had expanded.

- An ASC had been hired just for MCGS
 - A Director was found
 - The first new successful faculty hire that will be fully in MCGS had been made
- MCGS is a thriving program. They would like for their students who graduate with the major to have the added prestige of receiving a degree from a department.

Action Item passed.

6. **Proposed Reorganization of the Geographic Information Center (GIC) and the Center for Economic Development (CED) to the Northstate Planning & Development Collective / visual map – EPPC - Action Item** (22:59-27:21)

Ferrari explained that the order of the items was changed so Dean Vela could be present at the two agenda items that impact BSS. She reminded senators that the merging of two centers would more effectively use resources.

Dean Vela repeated that he saw this as a “win, win, win” situation and an example in an academic setting of how we can collapse silos. The CED lost its major federal grant donor that funded its Director and six sub-centers whose mission was economic development. The CED plays a very important role in fostering economic development in the Northstate. This provided the opportunity to bring two projects together creatively to promote synergies to do something new in a thoughtful way with GIC.

The President, Provost and Directors of the two centers were consulted and it was determined that GIC had the capacity to support the remaining grants of the CED (these are 2 EDA grants). It can also provide analysts, oversee the grants and even assure growth in CED. Many of the grants acquired by GIC have clear economic implications (for example, providing broadband services to rural areas). Cooperation will lead to further grants.

Action Item passed.

7. **Proposed Significant Change to BA in Liberal Studies, New Option in Multiple Subjects Credential, and New Option in Multiple Subjects Credential, and Education Specialist (see Summary of Proposed Changes in Liberal Studies Program and PowerPoint Presentation) –EPPC - Action Item.** (27:22-47:40)

- [Proposed Changes for Action](#)

Ferrari asked Selvester for comments about the major, the two options and the summary of all the changes provided.

Selvester said the significant change to the BA integrates the two options (which provide the possibility to pursue two different teaching credentials) into the major. The significant changes allow our program to be in compliance with several EMs and EOs:

- We have 4 writing courses
- Our options needed to comply with EO 1071
All our options have the same major core
- Title Five education elementary subject matter standards set by the CTC changed and no longer make students pass the California subject matter exam
- The program accommodates transfer students and late declaring students who were participating in general education courses (as EO 1100 requires).

The program should be up and running in Fall 2019.

She offered an edited version of page 41 of the Proposed Significant Change to the BA in Liberal Studies. This part of the proposal treats the Liberal Arts Option that is for students who do not want to pursue a teaching credential:

Students taking this option will complete the requirements for the major when they have finished the Liberal Studies major core program of 63 units (see above). This option is designed for students who want a broad liberal arts and sciences degree but are not interested in pursuing the teaching credential. **A minor or second major is highly recommended for this option. Public school experience is not required for the non-credential option.** It is important to see an advisor for help in planning your program. Normally, students selecting this pattern complete the following program:

~~The Liberal Studies major core program of 69-63 units; 8-14 units in an Area of Concentration; and 15 units or more for a minor. instead of the Professional Prerequisites. Students who select a second major of 30 units or more will fulfill the Area of Concentration requirements.~~

Selvester explained that many students who take this path are in the program but realize that they don't want to be teachers.

Ferrari said she received a question about the Executive Summary of Proposed Changes why some courses that were previously required are now recommended as electives. The questioner hoped the new catalog would say clearly that these courses are now recommended.

Selvester said that this represents a full disclosure because the courses did not address subject matters standards required by the CTC, nor did they address the GE areas that the program wanted to open up for students. The courses should meet the elementary subject matter standards defined by the domain in which the class appears (not just parts of them). For example: We have a US History domain, we have a history course; we have an Art domain, we have an art course; we have a Music domain, we have a music course.

She explained that the set of courses that are under the set: recommended will change regularly. Thus, she hesitates to include a list of them in the catalog since they might change every year, which would take much work to note (it is hard to maintain an updated list). She also thought other departments would step forward with their ideas. All of the highly recommended courses can be accommodated through advising.

Selvester said that mandatory advising will let students know what is recommended. Students have a version of the Progress report that they must fill in before registering (or they can't register). There is a BBL cite, constant advising about tests and requirements, communication through social media and many ways that Liberal Studies communicates with students since it deals with so many departments.

Ford said he knew this list of courses that used to be required and are now recommended went through the Liberal Studies Advisory Board and the All University Responsibility Teacher Education Council (AURTEC). What will be the mechanism for future consideration of courses for the recommended list, or what will be the oversight for those changes? Should future changes be restricted in this same way?

Ferrari said she recognized that Liberal Studies advising recommended many courses, but are these that have been recommended by AURTEC more strongly recommended? Could there be some evidence for these in the catalog. Selvester said she wanted to be clear with students, but a list of recommended electives would lead students to select electives that would not help them in the Options they really wanted. An example is the 300 level courses. Some of them might count for GE, but will not count for a credential.

She said that the Summary is just a description of what was done, not what will be going into the catalog. The catalog is a clear description of what students should do, and will be very tight if a student wants to follow the integrated major. If community colleges looked at a list of recommended courses and started offering what they deem to be equivalents, they would also be misled.

Aird asked what the list of highly recommended courses accomplishes. Selvester said it helps the students maximized their effort. Since they have so many electives, they might be able to do a double major, for instance, as many do in child development. It's nice if they pick an area and go deeply into it, so that they come out with a Liberal Studies degree and a minor in something else. It is a stronger degree choice to go out and get a job.

Ford wanted to know if this represents a change to what AURTEC and the Liberal Studies Advisory Board saw. Selvester said "no." They saw lists of the major core courses multiple times, they also saw lists of courses for the options (which will vary later). Ford asked if the reactivation process done through CTC would have to be changed or was it valid. Selvester said it is valid because it was predicated on the fact that elementary subject matter would be taught by certain courses, and these were only courses in this new program.

Action Item passed.

8. **Proposed New Minor in Mathematics Education** – EPPC- Action Item. (47:52-49:30)

M.E. Mathews, Faculty in the Mathematics and Statistics Department, spoke about this minor trying to create highly qualified middle school math teachers who can teach up through algebra. She said this would enable people to take a major in say Liberal Studies and still get a minor in Math. One could take some courses from an engineering degree and end up with a credential or waiver to teach math. She said there are other pathways that will allow students to end up with a teaching credential.

Action Item passed.

9. **Proposed Policy on Policies, Procedures and Guidelines** – FASP – Action Item. (49:31-55:28)

Pittman generalized that we have policies and procedures and we need a guide about how to write them and how they are managed. FASP developed guidelines about what should go into policy, how to archive them, how to suspend older policy, how to note when policy has been superseded. This can bring some symmetry and uniformity to our efforts and make them easy to find and easy to read.

Wyrick noted that he had found a mistake in a policy just this morning.

Sistrunk said he was proud that FASP had done this as it has been discussed for a long time as a means of organizing our permanent committees which are the linchpin of shared governance. This is how faculty, staff and student voices can participate to create our magnificent university, and he was happy that Jennifer Wilking was able to move this through.

Brooke Banks noted that our existing technology makes it hard to track the complete history of a revised EM. The last few cases she had to implement a rewritten policy, she has had to revise the older one and we have lost the old language of the previous policy.

Sistrunk said this new policy calls for an archive in which older policies that are not used anymore are put in a different place. Pitman said that the Library had a new hire to work on digital archiving so we can see what previous iterations are and the later ones.

Patrick Newell, Dean of the Library, said there is a new hire in the Library who has been here for two weeks who is training on the technology use of an institutional repository that will be used system wide. She will help the Academic Senate and the President's Office to keep as many versions as we like. This is one of her summer projects.

Action Item passed.

10. **Academic Senate Bylaws Revision** – EC Information Item. (55:31-

Wyrick explained that this is the second item after the Policy on Policies to come from the Senate Retreat last August. He pointed out that the last measure in the Bylaws allowed that changes could be made to them by a 2/3rd vote of the members attending after they have been

introduced at the previous meeting. This is the introductory meeting. He asked for questions of himself or the other members of the sub-committee. (He identified the members in attendance: Camacho, Sistrunk, Ferrari, Aird). Senate will consider the changes at the next meeting.

11. Proposed New Option in Foundational Mathematics Education – EPPC – Introduction Item. (55:11-59:04)

M.E. Matthews this option will allow a student to get an option in mathematics with a foundational waiver to teach and the changes in the core address the requirements of EO 1071 to put options into compliance.

Introduction Item passed.

12. 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 – Introduction Item. (59:08-1:02:47)

Ferrari said that EPPC had discussed all three of the items above at the same time they 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. Ferrari said that FASP members had asked about the similarity of the name to the Department of Public Health, but EPPC members had thought the department had made the choice to go this way.

She said this represents the elevation of an Option to a Degree based on the requirements of EO 1071. These types of changes will be coming next year.

Nevarez 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.

Introduction Item passed

13. Proposed BS Degree Name Change from Health Science to Public Health – EPPC – Introduction Item. (1:02:47-1:03:43)

Introduction Item passed.

14. Proposed Department Name Change from Health & Community Services to Public Health & Health Services Administration – EPPC - Introduction Item. (1:03:44-1:04:25)

Introduction Item passed.

15. Proposed Revisions to FPPP regarding Early Tenure – FASP – Introduction Item.

(1:04:32-1:27:37)

Livingston reported that this was something the Provost asked to look at last Fall and a subcommittee worked on it all of last semester. It was brought to FASP this semester and underwent a series of iterations and vigorous discussion. The idea was to introduce some uniformity across the campus to qualifications for early tenure since there has been wild difference over the colleges and departments.

Wyrick asked about section 10.5.7: “to be promoted, such candidates must meet the criteria for ‘exceptional’ (see above 10.5.3).” He said he did not see the criteria for what exceptional are at 10.5.3. He thought it should be more clear what this means.

Ferrari wondered why we ask for exceptional qualifications just because the tenure is early. If someone reached the requirements of tenure a year earlier, why are they asked to perform at better levels than someone a year later? This is exceptional tenure, not early tenure. Early tenure is just reaching the standards for tenure earlier, and this should be reviewed just like regular tenure on a longer timeframe.

Wilking reported that FASP had this discussion. The Provost raised the issue that most people need the full six years to become “acculturated” to all the responsibilities of tenure and learn our norms about what it is to be an academic. We are open to changing our language, but we also talked about the need to go above and beyond the ordinary to go up early. Maybe we can call it exceptional tenure rather than early tenure.

Larson thought we needed to remind ourselves why we go through the process of promotion and tenure. She thought it was clear we don’t know why we go through the process. It imparts an exceptional privilege and with the privilege comes responsibility. She said there is an enculturation that time in rank helps us absorb. Time is part of the way we determine if the faculty will be ready to take on the long term responsibilities and participate in the position. The candidate must show they can balance the passions and values we enter the academy with and the practicalities in an effective way.

Larson said the disparity we show in the ambiguous standards we have will lead to all kinds of problems. We should begin to standardize our practice in the FPPPP based on what is done in the rest of the United States around this accelerated tenure and promotion. She asserted that it is highly unusual that someone is granted tenure two years early, but we do that normally.

Pittman noted that FASP had lengthy discussions and determined that achieving the standards for tenure early was exceptional.

Allen said she shared concerns about the length of the probationary period. She thought the six years was a useful period to demonstrate a pattern of accomplishment. Shortening the evaluative period gives us less evidence (fewer courses taught, less semesters of service, fewer semesters of research) to look for sustained patterns. If we are going to reduce the time to discern these patterns the trade-off should be much higher accomplishments. Guaranteeing someone a decade’s long job should be truly exceptional. The candidate must show

extraordinary achievement in all areas to be worth the trade-off.

Ferrari said she was not against standards, but wondered if “early” was the right term.

Roll asked about the meaning of the last sentence in 10.5.4: “All recommending bodies must clearly identify those activities and achievements which demonstrate fulfillment of this requirement.” Wilking said the reference is to the different levels of review in the college. Roll asked if this meant the department had to be unanimous in that decision. She said she is concerned about what that could mean and would want this to be clearer.

Connolly thought the discussion about what tenure means should come before the policy. He did not believe that any probationary faculty should strive to be ranked superior in service. Research and teaching should occupy them until they get tenure. If they were superior in these they could qualify for early tenure.

Thompson pointed out that faculty go up early because of structural financial issues around pay. This is a really important point. We can have a discussion about the long-term qualities of the committed candidate who can earn our security, but there are also issues about taking care of families, relocating our lives and so on.

Larson said she heard loud and clear about the struggles faculty have around salaries. She hoped we would not mix issues around accelerated tenure and promotion with another issue. This will create difficulties in applying policies and understanding why we have tenure. Thompson agreed that we can’t create a new conception about professional identity and RTP unless that is decoupled from cost of living.

Allen asked about 10.5.3 that said a candidate must be ranked superior in all three categories of evaluation. She noted in her department the Chair does their own level of review and that using the normal criteria she is already tasked with using in the normal progression and using it in this different process would actually lower the bar to gain early tenure. Determining that someone did a superior job does not mean they did a superior job toward early tenure.

Sistrunk pointed out that discussions about the value of tenure are wide and deep. We are talking about the majesty of our profession, the integrity of the intellectual enterprise and the necessity of protecting it and all the questions about academic freedom. There is much discourse about these matters in our professional bodies that talk about this at length. He did not think this is what was lacking in talking about how we will treat each other in shorter term little capital categories.

Wyrick reminded senators that voting at Introduction meant the item was still worthy of discussion. He said that amendments can be offered at action and that a subcommittee of FASP might think about offering a substitute document that took the conversation today into account.

Adamian asked about 10.5.3.2 where it says that a candidate should demonstrate the likelihood for exceptional performance to continue, is this section in response to section

10.5.3.1 when it says the candidate should be ranked superior in all three categories. Does this define what it means to be exceptional? She thought it is unclear what exceptional means.

Introduction Item passed.

16. Proposed Revisions to EM 03-010: Executive Management Evaluation and Development – FASP- Introduction Item. (1:27:39-2:05:10)

Wilking asked Trailer to speak to the proposed changes.

Trailer explained that FASP was given a list of issues by The President's Office and administrators to address, especially about reorganizing the structure of the committee. He had questions from a member of EPPC as well.

He discussed the more substantive changes.

- I. Scope a. i. limits focus of EMEDC work to a specific core group of offices
I. Scope b. iii. provides some flexibility to encompass other offices that may emerge in the fluid nature of changing bureaucracy

Wyrick asked about I. Scope b. i., why Vice Provosts was plural. Trailer answered that the older policy had said this. Ford said that this office was supposed to be the equivalent rank of Assistant Vice Presidents in other divisions. He thought the passage should read "Vice Provosts and Assistant Vice Presidents".

Trailer continued with substantive changes:

- II. Policy a. iv Selection and Term of the Chair
There was a request for review of reappointment and term limits for the Chair. Two changes resulted.

II. Policy a.iv.3

Seeks to address the manner in which an election occurs. If the whole committee was in the room, social pressure might be too strong. This election will now be run as a secret ballot managed through the Senate office, which will make it easier to separate personal issues and politics from the process.

II. Policy a.iv.4

FASP decided that the term of the Chair is limited in that they cannot serve for more than six consecutive years (or annual terms).

- The next request was to reconsider how the policy focused on the character of the reviews. There was a hope that shaping the scope and design of the task of reviewing the offices would be fully collaborative. FASP rearranged the older provisions already in place to demonstrate more clearly how they encourage such collaboration.

See, II. Policy a.vi.2 Scope and Process, sections a, b and f.

Trailer turned to the EPPC questions.

- I. Scope a. i. Did this section include non-College Deans? Maybe this should be specified. Trailer answered: This was intended to be vague as the section I. Scope b. iii includes the general category of those with "significant impact on academic mission". Allen asked why the bullet under I. Scope b. ii the line about "Other Academic Deans" was struck. Wyrick thought this section b. ii should now read "College Deans and other Academic Deans".
It was pointed out that the Dean of the Library is an academic dean.
EMEDC is not the process by which a college dean is selected.
Larson thought "academic dean" is a supra category that includes the more specific college deans.
- II. Policy a.i.4: Could there be a conflict of interest for the dean not slated for review. Trailer thought this was fairly common in almost everything we do as faculty. It should remain.
- II. Policy a.iii. Terms .1. What is the term for the Dean on the committee? Trailer recognized that he had never noticed this before and that it has been missed for years. A two year term for the Dean should be added in.
- II. Policy a.iv. 4 ("The term may be extended by the Executive Committee") Why? Trailer explained that discussion at FASP was that the committee needed a chair experienced in the role. Approving such a person for a number of reasons might be necessary. Allen wondered why have a term limit that is so easy to overawe? Why not qualify this somehow (like limit this to one year, or state possible reasons)
Larson noted that the policy will be revisited every five years.

Wilking said we learned in the course of discussion that in the last 28 years there have been only 4 chairs of the committee. We had three lengthy discussions in FASP that a term limit is a way to facilitate change.

Brook Banks thought it was a way to insure appropriate succession planning so that we are investing in new people to be chair.

Jason Nice, History faculty and EMEDC member, pointed out that the chair term was one year. He said that all the EMEDC members were new to the committee except the chair. If the chair was forced out because of a rule, there would be no expertise on the committee left. This would be the strong rationale to make renewal flexible. He added that the committee had all voted that Chuck Zartman serve as chair again next year. Jim Aird affirmed this notion.

Wyrick reminded people to focus on the policy and not an individual.

Zartman said he had not even known that the committee was going to elect him chair.

Roll asked if some language about succession planning could be put in the policy alongside term limits.

Pittman said that allowing the Executive Committee to extend the chair's service was a compromise in FASP to resolve the dilemma of those who did not favor term limits to allow some flexibility.

Ferrari wondered why it couldn't happen that someone could be on EMEDC and not be the chair and still contribute their experience anyway.

Jennifer Meadows, Chair of MADT and member of EMEDC, said that membership terms on the committee were two years staggered and remembering the tumultuous times of the past when reviews were delayed, someone could have served on the committee a year and never conducted an evaluation or a search. She did not reject term limits, but if we get into circumstances like we have now when evaluations have not been undertaken for years, we need experienced leadership.

She said being on the committee for the first time made her recognize how much institutional knowledge was needed to conduct just the searches.

Ferrari reiterated that such knowledge could come from someone who was not the chair.

Selvester asked if the former chair could serve in an ex officio position to help the committee the year after they termed out. Meadows thought an ex officio position would ruin the balance between the colleges on the committee which is an issue during searches.

Sudick wanted to inform the senate that the current membership of EMDC came to FASP with a letter that asked specifically to extend the tenure of the current chair because of circumstances. She wanted to put the letter in the record.

Wiling thought that we are discussing policy and not a person so that this might confound the conversation. She pointed out that the policy was not retroactive in defining a term limit so it would not impact the current chair.

- II. Policy. a.vi.d. the language about presidential appointees reads that “one of these may be the presidential appointee”. Why is this “may” and not “shall” like the next line. Trailer said he did not know, it was part of the old language. Wyrick said this could be taken under consideration.
- II. Policy. a.vi.d. Is the presidential appointee who is a “dean not currently under review” the same dean mentioned above (II.a.i.4). Trailer said typically this would be that dean. We could potentially add that language.
- II. Policy. a.vi.e. is in reference to the college of Agriculture. The other references to chairs in the policy appears below. This section can be stricken.
- II. Policy. a.vii.h. is the same clause, only now it is in the proper spot. Why is it in

parentheses? Trailer did not know.

- II. Policy. a.vii.i. This allows the Provost to augment review committees. This potentially gives the Provost a lot of power to direct the review committee. Allen also did not understand exactly what is meant by “not upsetting the balance of the various college constituencies”. Trailer thought that this is potentially why the committee is so big. It would be hard to exploit. Allen said she had wondered what augmentation accomplished without clear definition.

Introduction Item passed.

17. Propose Revisions to EM 04-043: Executive Management Selection Committee – FASP – Introduction Item. (2:05:11-2:10:13)

Trailer noted that this policy has fewer issues. The older document depicted the college dean selection committee, but it did not have this in the title. The document was then restructured from the top down mostly just to organize and clean up the text and remove redundancies.

The substantive changes include the question about the role of the chair of EMDC in college dean searches. If multiple searches are underway, the policy needed to create another mechanism for simultaneous searches. II.Policy. a.iii. allows another chair to be appointed from among the EMEDC members. It was past practice that an EMEDC member join the College Dean Selection Committee as a non-voting member and this was added to the document (II.b.i.e.). The old process determined that the chair of the College Dean Selection Committee will be selected by, and from the CDSC college members and this was also added to the text explicitly (II.b.iii.1).

Evanne O’Donnell, Interim Associate Provost of Academic Personnel, noted that in both EMEDC EMs discussed today there is a reference to a Vice Provost of Human Resources. That office no longer exists. This role is now split in two between the Assistant Vice President of Staff Human Resources, and her current office.

Introduction Item passed.

18. Proposed EM Establishing Title IX Advisory Committee – FASP – Introduction Item. (2:10:13-2:19:54)

Gloria Godinez, Labor Relations and Compliance Manager, answered questions for Dylan Saake, Title IX Coordinator. She explained that this EM is an attempt to formalize the Title IX Advisory Committee as required under several EOs.

Roll asked why the membership of the committee was described with the qualification that “the membership of the Title IX Committee may include” the following list of people. Gloria Godinez replied that the list was intentionally tentative because attendance at the meetings did not always include the same members. It must be as fluid as possible so that different entities can send representatives as available and appropriate.

Roll wondered about the list of people who could be notified of meeting. She suggested

adding GSAC and the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and from the community, Catalyst and the Rape Crisis Center. (Gloria Godinez said that GSAC, Catalyst and the Rape Crisis Center were always included but listing them was a good idea).

Aird asked about representation from Staff Council. Gloria Godinez noted that they had discussed including formal representation from the Staff Council, but most of the membership are staff. One of the representatives is on Staff Council.

Selvester wondered about the flexible language of saying the committee may include certain people. She thought the committee had to have an essential core to function and create institutional knowledge built over time. She said that essential members could be afforded designees who somehow made sure they showed up regularly.

It is typical to describe how the Chair of the committee is decided and how the meetings will be called. Sistrunk explained that EO 1095 defined the need for the committee and designates the role of the Title IX coordinator to run it. Selvester said this should be written down.

Teague-Miller thanked the Title IX members for their work. He wondered if there was a way to get more student involvement in the committee. The AS President or designee is listed, and GSAC, but there might be other outreach to do.

Camacho asked how the committee decided when a quorum was present to make decisions. Gloria Godinez explained that the committee does not take action by quorum. They discuss issues and items for action and people voice their opinions, and work from consensus.

Wyrick asked if the committee had by-laws or established actions and he was told no, but that they are charged with responding to the EOs.

Introduction Item passed.

19. Proposed Revisions to EM 12-065 Conflict of Interest in Grants and Contracts – FASP – Introduction Item. (2:29:55-2:29:09)

Wilkling introduced Mathew Bently, Director of Contracts and Development, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, who has worked assiduously to revise this whole EM in response to much input from many different perspectives in the University.

Matthew Bently said he was tasked with how we do our conflict of interest forms and how we comply with the Fair Political Practices Act. Our EM was not in compliance with state law and after general collaboration with many and the Office of General Counsel, we developed this policy.

This morning, he received extremely important additional comments from the Office of General Counsel which will be valuable to allow us to have a complete and final document. He said he needed to collaborate with the General Counsel to make the final edits and could bring a substitute document back for final consideration.

He said he had received comments from Roll and asked for other questions that he would be more than happy to consider as he worked on the final document.

Thompson asked for clarification about the interim 700U form that is discussed on page 6, section 5A. She wanted to know what would happen if someone did not do this. Matthew Bently answered that we are required by statute to have an initial 700U form at the beginning of the contract. The secondary or interim form is if we have an extension of funding and we must modify the contract to receive the additional funding. If we don't receive the form, we will not accept the award. She asked if these consequences could be stated explicitly in the policy, and Bently said he would be glad to do this.

Roll commented that Matthew Bently had addressed her questions and she was glad that the revised policy will reduce workload for RESP and primary investigators. Bently said that workload would be reduced since it would no longer be necessary to produce the forms every time we receive funding from a non-governmental agency, or as a final form at the end of the project. This will be done only to support research.

Since this is only about research that is sponsored work through RESP, Larson asked how we are thinking about the broader context of conflict of interest in general. She was told that there is another EM about conflict of interest.

Wyrick said we will postpone final discussion of this EM until after next week when there is an opportunity to address the comments of the General Counsel. Selvester thought this was fine, but pointed out that two weeks from today is the last senate meeting and the document would then have to go through the entire senate process again next year since policy does not carry over the summer.

Watkins asked if education grants were impacted by this policy since they are not research grants by statute, and he was told they are not.

Introduction Item passed.

20. Ask the Administrator (2:29:35-2:33:45)

Wyrick announced that a section was added to the Senate webpage that allows people to ask questions in advance so that feedback can be prepared and the appropriate people can come to senate if necessary to answer questions.

Ferrari noted that the release time given to Pathway coordinators in General Education is being reduced from one course release per semester to one course release per year. She said her concern was that this is the year that the Curriculum Advisory Board (CAB) will rewrite the 5 year plan for General Education and make recommendations for possible changes. Next year will be particularly busy for CAB and another year of full support might be important.

Larson said she could take this under consideration. She said they are trying hard to stop all the funding coming off the top at the Provost's Office in order to stop deficit spending that has depleted our reserves so significantly. She said she would ask Kate McCarthy, Interim Dean

of Undergraduate Education, and Daniel Grassian, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, to look into it.

Ferrari said she did not think it was unreasonable to look at Pathway coordinators responsibilities, but perhaps not next year. Larson said it has become clear from the GE self-study that many students are not getting their advising from Pathway coordinators. There are also pathways that are not well enrolled and it begs the question of the efficiency of purchasing that time when it is so expensive.

21. Standing Committee Reports. (2:33:45-2:37:51)

Ferrari added to her report that EPPC passed the item about the new center, Accounting Student Strategic Initiatives. There was discussion about the need for a new EM about the approval of centers, and the Provost determined that we should wait on this item until this EM was composed to move forward with new centers.

Larson added that the Accounting department and the College of Business asked for reconsideration of moving this item as an introductory item to the Academic Senate next week. She reluctantly agreed, but will go into her concerns more deeply at the next senate meeting. In the spirit of shared governance she thought the proposal could go forward and hoped productive conversation could help in writing the new EM.

Roll asked if we should prepare for the conversation. Larson noted the proposal itself will be important and more conversation should be invoked. Ferrari said she would share the EO from the Chancellor's Office and the current EM about centers and they will be linked to the agenda.

Selvester asked if the interim Dean and Chair could also attend senate.

• Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Ferrari

Ferrari offered her report for comment. She said that certain items are forthcoming, including a proposal from Health and Community Services and a new center proposal from Accounting. This will probably be all EPPC can consider this year. She reminded that various permanent committees attached to EPPC oversight that they must submit their reports for Senate.

EPPC Summary – April 12, 2018, Kendall Hall room 207, 2:30 p.m.

The following item was passed as action item and forwarded to the Academic Senate office for inclusion as introduction item on the Academic Senate agenda for April 26, 2018.

- Option in Foundational Mathematics Education The following items were passed as introduction items and returned as action items on the EPPC agenda for April 19, 2018.

- Elevation of Health Services Administration Option to Degree

- Discontinuation of Health Services Administration Option

- Significant Change to BS Health Science, including discontinuation of the option in

Health Education

- Degree Name Change from Health Science to Public Health
- Department Name Change to Public Health
- New Center for Accounting Student Strategic Initiatives

EPPC Summary – April 19, 2018, Kendall Hall room 207, 2:30 p.m.

The following items were passed as action items and forwarded to the Academic Senate office for inclusion as introduction item on the Academic Senate agenda for April 26, 2018.

- Elevation of Health Services Administration Option to Degree
- Discontinuation of Health Services Administration Option
- Significant Change to BS Health Science, including discontinuation of the option in Health Education

- Degree Name Change from Health Science to Public Health

- Department Name Change to Public Health

- New Center for Accounting Student Strategic Initiatives This item generated considerable discussion in relation to the need to finalize and approve an executive memorandum on the creation of new centers before approving new ones. Upon further consultation between the Provost and College of Business interim Dean Ken Chapman, the Provost has requested to wait for the approval of a new executive memorandum before proceeding further with this proposal. This item, therefore, will not be forwarded to the Academic Senate for inclusion in the agenda for April 26th.

The following items were also presented and discussed:

- Update on General Education 5-year review report
- Update on implementation of EO 1110 (specifically, Mathematics co-requisite courses).

• **Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Wilking**

Wilking proffered the following report and asked for questions.

April 12 Meeting

- The committee discussed whether language regarding the evaluation, appointment and responsibilities of Chairs should appear in the FPPP or as Executive Memoranda.
- The proposed changes to the FPPP regarding early tenure passed at action. Several changes were moved and passed. For early tenure, candidates will be required to receive superiors in all categories of evaluation. The proposed language refers readers to the definition of superior in FPPP section 10.3.4.
- Proposed revisions to the EMEDC EMs - 03-010 and 04-043 also passed at action

April 19 Meeting

- A proposed EM establishing the Title IX Oversight committee passed at introduction. The rules were suspended, and the item passed as an action item, without amendment.
- Proposed revisions to EM 12-065 regarding Conflicts of Interest in Grants and Contracts passed at introduction. The rules were suspended, and the item passed as an action item, without amendment.

- The committee discussed and listed outstanding items not passed by FASP in the AY 17- 18 year, as well as new items to be taken up by FASP in AY 18-19.

• **Executive Committee – Sistrunk**

Sistrunk said that synopses of two meetings were attached and he offered to answer questions.

Executive Committee Synopsis Friday, April 13, 2018, 8:00 a.m., K 103

• Discussion of a hypothetical “Student Success Summit” for January 17 to pull the campus together to address advising, business processes, the equity gap and student population characteristics. Potential tracks:

- 1) student data exploration
- 2) academic excellence (pedagogy, mentoring, RTP, etc.) and
- 3) Culture of caring (advising, basic needs, trauma informed institution, etc.)

- WASC Update
- Possible 5th University Budget Committee (UBC) meeting after Governor’s May revise
- Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaws
- Revised EM 02-109: Enrollment Management Advisory Committee
- New Internship Policy
- Ombuds Office staffing and mission
- Organization of TLP
- Public Safety Committee nomination
- Fee increase forums
- Academic Affairs searches
- Director for Student Health Services search
- EPPC and FASP future business

Executive Committee Synopsis Friday, April 20, 2018, 8:00 a.m., K 103

- Need to add Faculty Advisory Board to hypothetical “Student Success Summit” - problems of scheduling; place of CELT conference
- WASC Update (dashboards rolling out)
- Presidential fund raising and advocacy
- Need for advocacy for the CSU
- Value of MPP work for the University
- Executive Director of the Research Foundation and the Interim Director of OIE
- Disapprobation of Statewide Academic Senate excessive deference to Chancellor’s Office EOs
- Value of Institutes and Centers
- Approve Academic Senate Agenda (4.26.18)
- Approve UBC Agenda (4.27.18)
- Ideas for vision and charge for revised EM 02-109: Enrollment Management Advisory Committee
- EMEDC EMs and needed clarification about administrator valuation
- EM 17-012/Upper Division Units
- Need for EM defining AD-SUA Space Allocation Group

- Need for EM defining purpose/mission/charge of Graduation Initiative Team
- Future of Diversity Committee
- Control of confidentiality and dashboards about WDF rates

22. Statewide Academic Senate – Ford/Selvester. <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/> (2:37:51-2:41:33)

Ford reported that Chancellor White announced last Friday that the Board of Trustees will not be considering a tuition increase for 2018-19 academic year.

He added that there had been a lot of activity regarding the interpretation of EO 1100. There has been concern expressed about our areas C1 and C2. He reported that there had been much negotiation by the Statewide senate executive committee and the Chancellor’s Office to get some of the interpretation rolled back and there has been some significant success. Flexibility in interpreting EO 1100 seems to be being restored somewhat. Colleagues in statewide are pleased that this is happening but it is not going far enough.

Selvester said this was discussed in the Academic Affairs committee briefly, but things seemed to be changing rapidly at the time they met. She said there will be some resolution sent out in two weeks before the next plenary meeting, and the Senate Executive Committee is still meeting with Vice Chancellor Blanchard in discussion.

Ford added that Vice Chancellor Blanchard had sent a memo on April 17 addressing the idea of partitioning areas. The memo specifically said that a reasonable adjustment to EO 1100 was that a campus might break area C into subareas (C1 arts, C2 humanities, C3 for upper division arts or humanities) and similarly area D could be broken up. It is unclear how this should be read exactly.

- **ASCSU [Resolutions](#) & [Summaries](#)**

Wyrick said he had spoken with Kate McCarthy and Daniel Grassian asking whether we are out of compliance because we have areas D1 and D2. There might be extenuating circumstances.

23. University Report – Hutchinson / Larson (2:41:33-2:42:19)

Larson thanked everyone for participating in the ongoing searches:

- 1) 3 candidates came to campus for the Executive Director at the Research Foundation
- 2) 2 candidates are being interviewed for the interim Director of the Office of International Education
- 3) The search for the Dean of the College of Business is underway

24. [Associated Students Report](#) – Sharma (2:42:28-2:42:41)

Camacho said the report was included and asked for questions.

25. Staff Council Report – Aird (2:42:42-2:43:36)

Aird noted that the minutes of the Staff meeting will be posted in the future.

He reported that the Staff Council raffle had allowed them to give \$2000 to the PATH student group (Promoting Student Achievement through Hope).

The council is busy planning the luncheon.

Discussions are ongoing about how to embrace a more active role in shared governance on campus.

26. Annual Reports (2:43:36-2:49:25)

Wyrick introduced Jinsong Zhang, Chair of FRAS and Professor in the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department, to answer any questions about her report.

- **Faculty Recognition and Support (FRAS) Committee – Zhang**

Jinsong Zhang reported that there were 19 members on the committee who reviewed about 30 nominations to make recommendations to the President and the Provost. 6 outstanding faculty awards were given, outstanding achievement honors were given and a national Humanities stipend was recommended to RESP as well. A subcommittee recommended 6 candidates for the system-wide Wang Family Excellence award.

She worked with Wyrick and Boura to think about creating a few more awards and increasing the monetary amount for them from \$1,500 to \$2,500-4,000. She said the committee continues to promote college and department nomination of their outstanding faculty.

She thanked the President and Provost and the Senate Office for their support over the year.

Roll added that RESP has been adding awards in part from the Inspire event. Now there is a new community engaged scholar award and others. She hoped this committee would communicate with RESP to coordinate awards more.

Zhang said that in the last three years RESP has awarded faculty the RISE awards which are reviewed by another committee of college representatives. She did not know about the Inspire awards. Roll said they did not have a committee or a solid process in place and that they might learn from FRAS.

Larson said she thought Richard Tafalla, Associate Vice President of Research and Sponsored Projects, was interested in revising the process used for the RESP awards. Zhang thought that the Inspire event could recognize FRAS awardees as well.

- **Executive Management Evaluation & Development Committee (EMEDC) – Zartman**

Zartman offered to answer questions on the report. Wyrick thanked the committee for all their work which has been revealed in our consideration of the EMs that outline all the efforts they put in for the University.

- **Service Learning Advisory Committee - Roll**

Roll had nothing to add to her report.

27. Nominations for Academic Senate Officer Positions close 4/26/18. Elections will take place at the 5/10/18 Academic Senate Meeting – Information Item. (2:49:25-2:49:44)

28. Kathy Kaiser Academic Senate Service Award nominations open 4/26/17 and close 5/11/18 – Information Item. (2:49:44-2:50:54)

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

Thompson asked who composed the selection committee. She was told it was made up of three past Chairs of the Senate.

29. Other. (2:50:54-2:54:21)

Wyrick announced that the University Budget Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 8:00-10:00 in KNDL 207-209. He noted that among other matters the college allocation model will be discussed. Larson added the task force that was considering the model this year will be discussed and will provide an overall context to understand it.

Zartman wanted to note that Monday is Debra Barger’s final day on campus. He wanted to express the thanks of the senate for her knowledge and expertise and her insights. A reception for her will be held Friday, April 27 in Colusa 100 starting at 3:30.

Larson said there will be a Lecturer Appreciation Event in the BMU auditorium at 4:00 tomorrow as well.

Larson also recognized that Daniel Parks, the Registrar, is leaving us and wanted to be sure to give the University’s thanks for his great service.

Thompson wanted to note that many current senators will be leaving this Spring and she hoped others would step forward to serve as senators in their places.

30. Adjourn. (2:54:21)

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary