

California State University, Chico

Academic Senate

(530) 898-6201, Zip 020

MEMORANDUM

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, May 9, 2019, 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, Akinwande, Allen, Altfeld, Boyd, Connolly, Day, Donze, Ferrari, Ford, Gruber, Hart, Herman, Hidalgo, Horst, Hostetter-Lewis (Herman), Hutchinson, Kaiser, Kim, Lang, Livingston, McConkey, Mitchell-Brown, Paiva, Peterson, Pittman, Sharma, Shepherd (Ferrari), Sistrunk, Sudick, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood, Watkins, Wyrick (Chair), Zartman

ABSENT: Boura, Kaiser, Larson

Wyrick called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m. [4:30-5:03]

1. Approve Minutes of April 25, 2019 [5:03-5:21]

Minutes Approved.

2. Approve Agenda. [5:22-5:59]

Boyd requested that a time certain be added to Item 8: Proposed Executive Memorandum: Meriam Library Public Use Policy of (2:40)

Amended Agenda was approved.

The sudden passing of a former member and a past chair of the Department of Sociology, Jerry Manaker, was marked by a moment of silence

3. Chair's Prerogative

- Diversity and Inclusion Update –Milton Lang/Tray Robinson/Michelle Morris [7:26-37:34]

Lang, said this report was a snapshot of many of the efforts that have been ongoing on our campus about diversity and inclusion. He noted that Hutchinson had appointed him Chief Diversity Officer about four months ago. He thought there was much good work that had been ongoing and there was much to build on. We are working on institutionalizing diversity and inclusion on his campus by having the Chief Diversity Officer as part of the cabinet to bring recommendations directly to them and to the Deans and chairs and students and staff across this campus to really move this effort so that it becomes part of everything that we do.

[Slide 2] Lang said he thought this work should really be considered in the context of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. The organizational chart adumbrates our current structure.

- He pointed out that having a Tribal Relations Director, Rachel McBride, will help our outreach to area tribes which is important for Chico State.
- He noted that our director of Latinx Equity and Success, Teresita Curiel, will augment and expand what we mean when we claim we are a Hispanic Serving Institution.
- Tray Robinson, as Director of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion has been pulling programs and training together and will expand his efforts.
- Michelle Morris as Faculty Diversity Officer works with Faculty, Tray Robinson and the Provost among others to explore what equity, diversity and inclusion mean to the academic side of the house.
- The University Diversity Council is made up of many people from across the campus who are thinking partners about the work

[Slide 3] articulates the UDC Council charge.

Lang read the highlights of the charge on [Slide 4].

[Slide 5] shows the make-up of the council and the different university divisions engaged. This group of thinkers includes all of them and underlines how wide-spread our intentions are across the university.

[Slide 6] Michelle Morris explained the 6 priorities. (Some of these are the same created at the committee's inception in 2014). She noted that some had fallen off since they have been accomplished. (such as creating a strategic priority for the whole University to embrace inclusions and diversity).

- Increase Workforce Diversity
- Annual Diversity Report
- Campus Climate Considerations
- Funding for UDC Priorities & KPIs
- UDC Communication Plan
- Social Justice, Diversity & Inclusion Across the Curriculum

The final priority was added partly as a response to the system wide Ethnic Studies report in 2016 as well as the faculty staff diversity summit held last spring.

[Slide 7] depicts the UDC Workgroups that get the work done. These are members of the UDC assigned to specific areas but can participate in other areas in sessions. They all come back together as a large group to report and collaborate. Each workgroup is chaired by a member of the executive committee so they can report back to the Chief Diversity Officer. These workgroups welcome other members across campus who may have expertise to contribute. (please reach out).

[Slide 8] There are 24 performance indicators are more specific measurable outcomes being worked on with a specific timeframe to keep us on track to fully fill the 6 strategic priorities.

- An example is that all Division Vice-Presidents and the Deans will be getting information

about the racial make-up of their employees and asked to provide ideas about goals or strategies to respond to the dynamic changes of the student body. They will think about recruiting and retaining a more diverse workforce.

- Another example: HR and Business and Finance will make staff training about avoiding bias training mandatory for those serving on search committees.
- A final example is working on increasing the retention, tenure and promotion of faculty of color through many complicated possibilities:
 1. in cooperation with the OAPL and the Academic Affairs Diversity Committee and faculty Development by working on best practices for hiring committees
 2. increase our web presence to make Chico communicative about our priorities so that it is attractive to people looking for career opportunities in this work
 3. Michelle Morris read through all the 45 department RTP standards across this campus and this work could be replicated by the departments looking for inclusive language, equity-minded evaluation and perhaps adding to older standards to include such things as awarding inclusive pedagogy and equity minded evaluation (to accommodate such things as “invisible labor,” or cultural taxation that impacts diverse faculty significantly and may not be recognized).

Tray Robinson noted that the AS student officer names had been left off the lists of taskforce members because they will be newly elected next semester.

[Slide 9] lists the members of the Division Diversity Committees that work on division specific goals and issues. There are forums and meetings promoted over the year so that the divisions are communicating and efforts are not being replicated. He said that promoting this interdivisional dialog will continue. He encouraged people interested in participating to contact their divisional committee leaders.

[Slide 10] On the Horizon:

• Diversity Annual Report

This will highlight the work of the UDC. Lang will also request information from the division heads about their efforts so that the community can see what we are doing to advance the work.

• State of Diversity Address

This will happen in the Fall and give us the opportunity to showcase what we are doing. We want everyone to report out on all the things they are doing so that the community can see we have all hands on deck.

• Diversity grant program

UDC will provide opportunities for faculty and staff to advance diversity on campus by providing 2, 3 or \$5,000 grants to support programs, to do trainings, etc. This is targeted at folks in the academic area.

• Diversity speaker series

We will invest in national speakers to come to campus to talk about national and international issues related to equity, diversity and inclusion

- STAR Center

We will continue to develop our Student Transition and Retention Center to focus on low income and first generation students, Latinx and black students and success and retention. This will be opened next Fall.

Questions were asked:

- How many Native American students are enrolled next Fall? Hutchinson noted that 14 graduated last night. There is growing interest in Chico from native peoples our Tribal Director, Rachel McBride is doing great work reaching very many people. We are also thinking of creating summer school and other outreach opportunities for high-school age students.
- Hutchinson said that she was appointed by the Chancellor for a new role in the CSU system as the Presidential Native American Liaison. She will promote the system Native American Initiative that has been around for many years. The intent is to step up efforts in the future at Chico and across the system.
- Are there programs we are not offering now that would be attractive to students and potential faculty?
- Hutchinson noted that we need more participation from faculty who are engaged in the search and hiring process to think about steps and strategies we have not thought of before to attract a more diverse faculty pool. This should be one of our highest priorities.
- Lang reported that he and Larson had met with EMAC to think about developing a strategic enrollment management plan.
- Michelle Morris was asked to share the best practices and RTP recommendations she will find out with the Senate so we can create policy to strengthen them
- Peterson reported that the Staff Council “Wildcat Sponsorship Award” was won by the Native American Club this year. A check for \$2,478.00 will be awarded to them at 8:45am next Tuesday in Kendall 207-209.

Wyrick skipped to Item 8. as a time certain (passed due):

8. Proposed Executive Memorandum: Meriam Library Public Use Policy – FASP –

Action Item [37:34-53:19]

Pittman noted that this policy was delayed at Action because there were concerns regarding the tone of some of the provisions that made the policy seem like it was targeting the homeless population. People did not want to amend the document without representation from the Library present, but they had concerns about section B, bullet 2 about strong smells and Section b, bullet 7, about sleeping and blankets especially.

Patrick Newell, Dean of the Library, said our policy was developed by copying several CSU library policies and they included language about strong odors. Librarians take their responsibility to preserve access very seriously but the library learned this semester that unless there are plain local rules about behavior that will create a disturbance and define the repercussions of that behavior, the police have no grounds to eject someone who might be causing some real disturbance to someone else.

Patrick Newell said that librarians are extremely sensitive to issues about the homeless. He is working with the county on grant proposals to fund library social workers who could serve the needs of visitors. The librarians have had vigorous discussions about restricting anyone's access but we need the ability to regulate behavior in extreme circumstances.

Various observations were made:

- It was pointed out that smell is not a behavior and we should not conflate them
- we should not criminalize odors which are often unintentional or unpreventable
- do we have the same policy in classrooms? Should we call the police on students in a classroom for odors?
- International students often use heavy colognes and also smoke as well

Patrick Newell said the intent is not to criminalize behavior. There will be training this summer for library staff as they will be the first to try to mitigate problematic circumstances. Butte County will also provide training in helping accommodate homeless.

It was moved and seconded to strike section B, bullet 2. Seconded

Motion passed.

Pittman moved to add language after the first paragraph of the policy sent by Donze. She said this came from article 16 in the CBA and she added "housing status" at the end. Seconded.

"This policy shall be administered in a manner that insures equal treatment on the basis of race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, genetic information, marital status, pregnancy, age, disability, medical condition, veteran's status and housing status."

Motion passed.

Action item passed.

Chair's Prerogative. (Cont.)

- **Catherine Nelson, ASCSU Chair [53:32-1:03:37]**

Wyrick welcomed Catherine Nelson who gave a brief overview of the business of the Statewide Academic Senate. She noted there are 53 senators, 2 from each campus and the seven larger campuses have 3. We are institutionally and legally recognized as responsible to give feedback to the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees on academic policy including curricular matters, graduation requirements and things like that and budget as it affects faculty at the system-wide level.

- There are four standing committees which senators are assigned to after their first year, and taskforces.
- The ASCSU meets five times a year and speaks to resolutions
- They follow information and action item presentations just as the Board of Trustees
- She pointed out how to use the search functions of the website to find plenary meetings, taskforce reports, public feedback, and committee membership

She congratulated us on our very able and vocal representatives (Boyd and Ford). She gave a couple of updates on issues coming forward state-wide:

- She noted that 12 campus senates have sent comments on the General Education Taskforce Report. 10 say to reject the report and 2 suggest leaving it without comment. San Jose is still gathering faculty input and Fresno wants it to be taken up but not do anything until the ASCSU has heard from all the Senates.
There are two resolutions to be addressed next week about what to do with the report. One says reject it and the other says to acknowledge receipt of the report and refer it back to standing committees.
- AB1460 establishes a system-wide graduation requirement about ethnic studies that every student would have to fulfill in one way or another. It says the Ethnic Studies Taskforce and the Academic Senate should work together to establish core competencies.
The ASCSU opposed this legislation. It inserts the legislature directly into curriculum and gets to establish the course and the unit it would be in. The idea of Ethnic studies as a requirement was not objected to. The impact on existing programs, especially after the implementation of EO 1100 and 1110 will be expensive and create undo workload.

Questions were asked:

- Why is it that senators are not assigned to a committee until after their first year?
Catherine Nelson said there are not enough resources to give people assigned time for all three years of their term.
 - It was hoped that information literacy in GE would continue to receive attention
 - It was pointed out that Chico was one of the first to vote to reject the GE Taskforce report completely and we still adhere to this position
-
- **2020-21 Academic Calendar Draft** – Holly Ferguson [1:03:37-1:33:35]
Holly Ferguson, Admin. Analyst/Specialist, Academic Publications and Scheduling said that informal feedback was solicited. Some changes have been made including:
 - Grades are due on December 23 (which is the last faculty workday)
 - December 31 is the official grade conferral date
 - Some have said this is not user friendly, other campus options are being considered.

Holly Ferguson asked for other comments, concerns they can email her:

- It was asked if the five days from the last final to when grades are due is quicker than the past. Ferguson explained that the due date used to be the 31st of May and December. The last few calendars are shifting to align this with the last faculty staff work day

Michael Allen, University Registrar, said the due date for grades will vary with the faculty work calendar into the future and will keep changing. All the dates are worked out by staff HR and the Office of Academic Personnel (OAPL). This calendar is abiding by all faculty and staff contracts and CSU requirements. There is the threat that any late grades will have to be processed as individual grade-change

forms.

- The difficulties that will be faced by faculty with classes on the last day of finals who then attend Commencement over the weekend and will be unable to grade qualitative work within three days was outlined. This then will require manual grade changes signed by chairs and Deans to rectify.
- It was asked why the change was made? Holly Ferguson said there is concern about working outside the contract, but also late grades can impact students applying to schools or jobs, etc.
- Instead of using individual grade change forms, is it possible to get a print-out of a roster and submit that with a single signature? Michael Allen said that was possible, and the Provost has authority to order that.
- It was pointed out that every semester will differ in the occasions that happen in the final days (like holidays and commencement), but they are all full. Ferguson noted for this calendar the due dates fall the Wednesday after finals (this is three working days technically). She said changes occur every year and they are doing their best to balance all the requirements out.
- How do grade mistakes get rectified?
- It was pointed out that the fiction of workdays marked on the calendar as somehow authoritative does not apply to lecturers who are not paid to go to orientations during the first three days they are supposed to be at work and receiving remuneration. Evanne O'Donnell, (Interim VP OAPL) said that lecturers are paid based on a time-base they have for teaching or specific duties, these are not the same expectations to be at work as the regular faculty. Normally orientation to the job has not been part of the lecturer contract.
- Is this negotiable, and can this be revised if it does not work? Ferguson could not answer that.
- It was pointed out that when we have these conversations, it is common that there is no one to answer the questions
- This is a significant change that will effect faculty. At some point we will need answers. Appeals to the limitations of the contract are inadequate.
- Wyrick reported that Hutchinson suggested taking these questions up in EC over the summer
- This does not seem to be largely known among faculty
- It was pointed out that no faculty have ever launched a union grievance because they had to turn in their grades after the work days ended.
- Will the last weekday be even shorter than the mere five days

Evanne O'Donnell said the committee that puts together the faculty/staff work calendar will continue to deal with all the complications. For example, the previous President established policy that Commencement would not interfere with Memorial Day weekend to accommodate members of the town. This sets a boundary to the calendar. Supposedly it was student complaints that prompted these changes for earlier grade due dates. Other concerns are that we don't want people working when they are not on contract.

Wyrick said there seemed to be two major issues.

1. The registrar's office would like a hard deadline instead of the older more flexible

practice

2. The Provost has insisted there be a rigorous alignment between the last workday and the day that grades are due

More observations were made:

- This is a heavy workload issue and many practical barriers will exist to maintaining quality instruction with such time constraints.
- The idea of a waiver should be considered –individual faculty might negotiate ore time
- This will change pedagogy and meaningful essays and organization of culminating activities. This is personally challenging and feels punitive which is ugly.
- Students should be considered as they need to have the opportunity to move forward with their lives and some students are truly being hurt
- Faculty were encouraged to consult with faculty who have taught in different systems and see the advantages they have experienced
- It would be nice to have data about the number of faculty who are actually late turning in grades. The registrar said that in Fall 2018, when grades were due December 31, as of January 1st, there were 1,030 students missing at least one grade. By January 4, there were 120 students with grades not turned in yet.

This conversation will continue in EC.

4. Annual Reports [1:33:36- 1:54:51]

- **Graduation Initiative Advisory Team** (Kate McCarthy)

Kate McCarthy, Interim Dean of Undergraduate Education noted that her report was linked and she was happy to answer any questions. Wyrick commended the speed and clarity of the report. McCarthy thanked faculty for their support of this enormous and very active team.

- **Executive Management Evaluation and Development** (Chuck Zartman)

Chuck Zartman, Chair of EMEDC noted that the report was linked for review. He said EMEDC serves to safeguard processes that insure broad input from many constituents to gather, consider, review and communicate in the supervising of administrators. This air of impartiality preserves the public trust when executives are hired or reviewed. This is consistent with contemporary business management theories as EMEDC talks about stakeholders determining practice.

On this campus an effort is being launched to move interim positions to permanent status through a process that sidesteps the process he just described somewhat. Although it is not the venue to discuss this, he does not support processes that allow administrators to sweep away this role of EMEDC that has been built over long decades in an effort to right a wrong that does exist on this campus. That wrong is that we have too many wonderful administrators serving in an interim role. But in taking care of this problem we should not short-circuit a shared governance ethos on this campus that is such a part of the DNA at CSU, Chico.

So, with a final statement the only idea that matters is an adherence to the shared principles of whether a specific course of action either builds or deludes shared governance and impartiality in safeguarding the public trust.

- **Enrollment Management Advisory Committee** (Michael Rehg)
Ford spoke on behalf of Michael Rehg, Chair of EMAC, and said he would answer questions and hit a few highlights of the committee's work.
 - He said the committee is revising their EM and will be done with this next Fall.
 - The committee encouraged the President to lobby for a 2% enrollment target growth for AY 2020. We are funded in the current system for 1.5% growth. Our targets internal to that are higher and we were even expecting 2 - 2.5% growth and now we might even have negative growth.
 - It looks like we will come in 100, 200 or maybe more students below our target and this will have impacts across the university

Questions were asked:

- Is there an explanation for this enrollment decline?
Ford thought #1 should be publicity from the Camp Fire
But, up to 30 days ago all indicators (housing, initial intents to enroll, applications, everything suggested we would be running significantly over target
In 30 days, something happened but we are still unsure what

Hutchinson wanted to reiterate some of what was said. This downturn came as surprising news to us.

- There was an economic summit yesterday evening for the ridge and the area and an expert from Sonoma State spoke about their similar situation after their fires and how they had an unexpected dip in enrollment.
- She also was at a Cabinet meeting with Butte College Monday to share data about enrollment. The President there knew some 800 students were impacted, but did not know what that would do to enrollment. Butte is a transfer college to us and their impacts will be ours eventually.
- We are in an interesting situation because beside the fire, we know there is increasing competition for students
- For this reason, back in November she asked the Chancellor's Office to "hold us harmless" to see what else we might do as we move through this

Paiva observed that in her department they are seeing students shifting from choosing on campus classrooms to online options. Is this being tracked?

Hutchinson thought that was a good question to raise. She also wanted to raise awareness about how we speak about the Fire. We owe it to our students to continue to provide a high quality education and we have a lot to offer. We know there are challenges, but we know we still have housing available for a number of populations. We need to counter the exaggerations of news outlets and tell our truth. We need to work to get more students here.

Paiva qualified some of the data about available student housing. Our availability is better for unmarried students without children of a certain social class. Some of this is because our regional housing rents have gone up. Hutchinson does not dispute any of this, but publicizing this the way it has been publicized is hurting us.

Ford noted that our target for the last few years for resident enrollment has been 15,250. Last year we hit 15,750 and were far over target. This year we ended up at 15,633, which means we hit high again just not as badly. This accounts for the dip. Economic impacts for going under target don't seem significant as no campus has ever been penalized for this yet.

- **Academic Integrity Council** (Rebecca Ormond)

Rebecca Ormond, Media Arts, Design and Technology, reported that one of the major issues the Council is dealing with this year is plagiarism and online cheating. Right now the committee is researching plagiarism sites online and evaluating their impact on certain disciplines. Others in the committee have been looking at other university's policies and are finding more information from other departments.

The committee has been working with student government to promote a social media campaign to promote outreach about the issue itself and the problems it engenders. She hopes faculty will reach out to this committee with their experiences because the committee is developing advice and ideas about how to meet the challenges.

Are there legal consequences for companies that indulge in plagiarism and sell other's work? Rebecca Ormond said that her committee could give advice and tips but combating this would have to happen at a higher level than an individual CSU because of the scale of the problem. Her committee is not talking about approaching lawyers at the moment. Having said this, she knew that some departments that have been heavily impacted are already looking into these possibilities.

The faculty we have talked to have noted that these companies are very sophisticated and a moving target that continually evolves. One idea is to reach out to students and let them know what the long term consequences of using these services is. Some departments elsewhere are putting warning in their syllabi which might work for us.

- **University Budget Committee** (Jed Wyrick)

Wyrick noted that the report is included and reminded everyone that the fourth UBC meeting is this coming Monday in this room from 3-5:00pm. There are interesting and challenging issues to discuss.

- **Academic Senate** (Jed Wyrick)

Wyrick said that senators can read the report at their leisure since they were here and they know.

5. **Presentation of the Graduates (BA/BS Graduates) (MA/MS Graduates)** [1:54:51-1:59:42]

Wyrick introduced all the Deans who presented together. Eddie Vela said that the Deans had decided to present a collective presentation and invite everyone to celebrate our students across the respective units. He thought that if this continued in the future that they could have a time certain fixed earlier. He thanked Dean Lau for pulling the numbers together.

- **College of Agriculture**
- **College of Behavioral and Social Sciences**
- **College of Business**
- **College of Communication and Education**
- **College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Education**
- **College of Humanities and Fine Arts**
- **College of Natural Sciences**
- **Graduate Studies**

6. Farewell to Outgoing Senators/Welcome Incoming Senators [1:54:52-2:06:17]

Wyrick read the names of the outgoing senators as they came forward to receive a plaque commemorating their service.

Outgoing:

Shelley Hart
Nanhee Kim
Barbara Sudick
Greg Watkins
Michelle McConkey
Carl Pittman
Fay Mitchell-Brown
Alisha Sharma
Sam Akinwande

Incoming

Nate Millard
Doris Schartmueller
Rebecca Ormond
Ben Seipel
Paul Bailey
Trevor Guthrie
Alejandro Alfaro Ramirez
Ana Medic

Hutchinson thanked Wyrick for his seasoned and reasoned leadership and gave him a plaque with a wooden gavel on it. Wyrick said we really have a great environment where we sit together and work with the President which does not happen everywhere.

Wyrick noted that two more students and two more staff will be joining senate next year because we changed our constitution.

Wyrick read the names of the two at-large senators reelected:

Tim Sistrunk, Marianne Paiva,
And College of BSS representative: Mahalley Allen, and College of Business representative: Jeff Trailer

7. Election of Senate Officers [2:06:17-2:07:36]

Wyrick read the names of the nominees:

- **Nominee for Academic Senate Chair – Chiara Ferrari**
- **Nominee for Academic Senate Vice Chair – Marianne Paiva**
- **Nominee for Academic Senate Secretary – Tim Sistrunk**

- **Nominee for EPPC Chair – Mahalley Allen**
- **Nominee for FASP Chair – Jennifer Underwood**

Sistrunk as Secretary of the Senate recognized the nominees presented as officially elected to their positions. He congratulated them all.

Wyrick noted that all the officers take on their duties the day after commencement.

9. Proposed Changes to FPPP: Chairs' Responsibilities, Evaluation, and Support – FASP

Action Item [2:07:36-2:15:10]

Boyd moved to accept a substitute document she sent to senators electronically with changes brought forward to alter the proposed amendments to the FPPP presented before. This document was held so that it could be brought to the Chairs' Council for comments before coming back to the senate today. Within the substitute document there are a few highlighted word changes in yellow that demarcate the differences between this document and the original.

They are found on:

Page 1, the title of the section 17.0 is changed from "...responsibilities, review and support" to "...responsibilities, review selection, and support"

Page 4, 17.2.4.b. add word "a" to line three to read: "specified in a hiring" and reword the last line of the section to read: "term limits and negotiate an equitable workload (e.g., time base, AY or twelve month appointment, summer salary, staff support, etc.) for the position based on the responsibilities and the size and scope of the unit.

Page 4, 17.2.4.d. strike second sentence, and add language to third sentence and strike two words as well: ~~The nominee and the dean will negotiate an equitable workload (e.g., time base, AY or twelve month appointment, summer salary, staff support, etc.) for the position based on the responsibilities and the size and scope of the unit. After successful negotiation the The dean... statement of the conditions of appointment and compensation workload negotiated to the Provost...."~~

Page 4, 17.2.5.c. add six words: "in consultation with department, school, or unit faculty and the dean...."

Substitute document passed.

Action item passed.

10. Proposed Changes to FPPP: Date of Appointment and Review Window – FASP – Action Item [2:15:11-3:11:28]

Pittman explained that this item was held over to address concerns expressed by the OAPL. Boyd said this item was reconsidered in the light of potentially new information presented by people at the Chancellor's Office.

Evanne O'Donnell reported that people at the Chancellor's Office were not used to seeing an RTP periodic and performance review go back to a period before the candidate is employed. We tried

to make the look back period go back to the beginning of the summer someone was employed on May 31. The Chancellor's Office thought this might encourage faculty to work before they were actually accepted. It seems simpler to them to start at the date their contract was signed. She said that she explained that the deans sometimes negotiate with faculty to give them a start date that takes into account some summer work they do, or the kind of start-up money they get, or a negotiated credit for a publication that is under review, and due to be published soon though it may not be yet. These things are sometimes included in the offer letter and sometimes used in their review process.

O'Donnell sent some suggested language last week to several people. We really need to keep our review lookback date to the appointment definition (the start date of employment). This is not such a dramatic change in the language, it is a dramatic change for this campus. It is not the norm everyone is used to.

Wyrick asked about what he called a black hole. You apply for a job and your work is assessed in your CV up to the time you get the job. In between the time you apply and the time you get the job, your work vanishes into the black hole. They don't get credit as they are waiting for the job and they don't after they get it.

O'Donnell said the employer is not just looking at what the candidate has done, but the work that might still be pending (as in being ABD or waiting for a publication). It becomes a grey area when one asks was that used to hire them, or is it something else because it will be used again to evaluate them after they are hired for a tenure review for instance. This does not seem like a problem for most people but it can become one of the negotiated terms that are put in the hiring document if need be.

Boyd noted that an offer letter is a contract, but isn't the FPPP contractual as well since it defines our practice on this campus. If we define our practice in the FPPP as opposed to defining the date of appointment in a letter what is the problem with doing this? This would make the date uniform for all faculty instead of having each faculty individually negotiate it. The Chancellor's office is going to say you should move your lookback period to the date of appointment.

Boyd said that one problem that we were trying to solve is to make the dates uniform instead of various based on what individuals negotiated.

Many other observations were made:

- Is there language that should always be inserted in the offer letter?
- The offer letter date as a start date is very confusing to people because the dates vary so much –they seem to be unfair or negotiated by people who know how the system works better
- The whole point was to resolve the inequity that can occur when the employee does not have adequate knowledge or the employer wants to favor a candidate in fixing the start date
- Everyone will get the same uniform coverage, this does not seem to be prohibited by the CBA
- This will actually support faculty working if they want to between when they get the job

and actually start working

- The person negotiating a job won't have access to the FPPP, but they will have the offer letter
- The university should give instruction about how to negotiate
- Chairs should work with their deans to help the faculty member
- Someone may not know that an accomplishment is coming that should be recognized
- What is the issue to make everything uniform – someone might have a lookback date of 2 months versus someone who has seven months
- This seems like a healthy move forward
- This document tracks the CBA and system-wide policies
- Where we are now is the appointment letter date decides your review period and this sets it for everyone to the summer
- Are we exposing the university to risk and liability by doing this
- Faculty will be working no matter what and no matter what the university thinks or worries about
- Whatever is clear and consistent produces the best performance reviews
- This timeframe was chosen so that everyone gets 12 months
- Does the university have liability for the service credit that faculty negotiate? If not, why would they have it in the summer then?
- Most of the people we employ here are employed elsewhere so we don't need to cover the summer
- Are we just asking for a date we all want to be consistent
- We have service credit in our contract and also we have an absence of this with a hiring letter
- The chair might not know they can negotiate
- Some other CSUs have this kind of provision to fix the black hole
- Things happen at different times in the year and this impacts the offer letter dates sometimes widely

Action item passed.

11. **Proposed Changes to EM 06-084: Policy on Information Technology Governance – FASP – Introduction Item** [3:11:28-3:15:38]]

Ferrari noted that the second paragraph on page two should have been underlined to signify that all of it is new to the document.

She also added six words to the second paragraph after “(ICUAM), CSU system-wide policies and guidance, and other relevant....”

She explained that the ICUAM manual might not be as comprehensive as thought so these words were added.

Motion passed.

The first time ITEC is mentioned at the top of page two it should be spelled out fully as well.

Action item passed.

12. University Report – Hutchinson/Larson [3:15:50]

No one remains.

13. Statewide Academic Senate Report – Ford/ Boyd [3:15:51-3:16:28]

<https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate>

- [ASCSU Resolutions & Summaries](#)

Ford reminded everyone there was an excellent report from the Statewide Chair.

Boyd noted they will be at the plenary meeting of the ASCSU next week feel free to share comments on the agenda.

14. Associated Students Report – Sharma/Akinwande [3:16:28-3:16:31]

The students are gone to study

15. Standing Committee Reports [3:16:36-3:17:03]

- [Executive Committee](#) – Sistrunk

Sistrunk noted that EC will continue to meet over the summer.

16. Staff Council Report – Peterson [3:17:03-3:17:08]

Peterson was no longer in attendance.

17. Kathy Kaiser Academic Senate Service Award – nominations close May 10, 2019 – Information Item [3:17:08-3:17:17]

Wyrick noted that nominations close tomorrow.

18. Ask the Administrator [3:17:17-3:18:27]

Wyrick said that here are a couple of administrators still at the meeting.

Boyd thanked the heroes who remained and she wanted to thank O'Donnell for being so helpful with policy questions.

Wyrick echoed this sentiment.

19. Announcements. [3:16:27-3:18:47]

Wyrick said that those leaving the senate could take their nameplates

20. Other. [3:18:48-3:19:46]

Boyd wanted to express her appreciation to the current officer group that would be outgoing. She particularly appreciated many of the positive changes under Wyrick's leadership in managing the changes the constitution.

21. Adjourn. [3:19:47]

Meeting adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary