

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

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
Thursday, October 24, 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](mailto:oats@csuchico.edu).*

**PRESENT:** Adamian, Alfaro Ramirez, Allen, Altfeld, Bailey, Boura, Boyd, Buffardi, Connolly, Day, Ferrari (Chair), Ford, Gruber (Westbay), Guthrie, Herman, Hidalgo, Holbert, Horst, Hostetter-Lewis, Irish, Kaiser, Larson, Livingston, Medic, Ormond, Paiva (Horst), Parsons-Ellis, Peterson, Schartmueller, Seipel, Shepherd, Sherman, Sistrunk, Sparks, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood, Westbay, Wright, Wyrick, Zartman

**ABSENT:** Millard, Perez

Ferrari called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. [3:04-3:11]

**1. Approve [Minutes of October 3, 2019](#)** [3:11-6:08]

Sherman clarified the titles of the various Associated Students financial officers who help decide how student fees are spent (on page 3, slide 3). The ASBC is chaired by the AS Vice President of Business and Finance and the BMUC is chaired by the AS Vice President of Facilities and Services.

(page 3, slide 4) The Government Affairs office is led by a Board of Directors that includes the CSU Vice President of Student Affairs and the CSU Vice President for Business and Finance.

Amended Minutes were approved.

**2. Approve [Agenda](#).** [6:10-7:59]

Boyd suggested moving the three AS student resolutions about the quantitative reasoning proposal under the item 12 so that they accompany our discussion about it in this meeting especially.

Potential delay in covering two items was discussed.

Amended Agenda was approved.

**3. Chairs Prerogative** [8:03-12:21]

- **[Voting and Census Discussion](#) (Ann Schulte)**

Ferrari introduced Ann Schulte, Director of Civic Engagement, who with Mary Wallmark, Associate Director of Student Life and Leadership, wanted to make sure faculty, students and staff knew about

voting and the census this coming this Spring.

Ann Schulte pointed out that **March 3, 2020** is our presidential primary election and the Census will count where people are living on **April 1**

She said we should recognize that not all of our students can participate in voting and some may have concerns about the government collection of data, but the hope is that students can have important conversations about participation and representation. She hoped the more complex issues around these events can be discussed, not just as the one day occasion.

Voting will be different in Butte County as the primary will be in March and not in June and everyone will vote by mail. Whether our students vote in their home communities, or in Butte County, everyone will vote by mail.

Examples of conversations to be had with students might include where to register to vote and why one would do that be important to them. In the March election there will be a bond measure that will be on the ballot about educational facilities. It was pointed out that people can vote where they are resident, not necessarily where they are currently living.

This year there will be voting centers (like in the BMU) that will be open 10 days prior to the election to answer questions, provide ballots in other languages, access to assistance and one's ballot can be dropped off there, though postage will be paid so ballots can go directly into the mail.

The census will be in 2020 and most of our students have not participated in a census before. It will be useful to discuss why we have a census, what its benefits are, and questions about it.

The office of Civic Engagement will have information on its website and links to more information. There will be a QR code to register and another to take the census or get questions answered. There are links in the senate agenda. There will also be small student groups who can come and speak to classes and informational videos. If anyone wants to support our outreach efforts the Office of Civic Engagement will follow up in any way that is helpful.

#### **4. APSS Scheduling and Scheduling Policy– Discussion Item (Michael Allen, Holly Ferguson)**

[12:22-24:39]

Ferrari explained that Holly Ferguson, Admin Analyst/Specialist, Academic Publications & Scheduling, and Mike Allen, Registrar, were in attendance to follow up on discussions generated by the Butte Hall Renovations we started this semester in senate. The Butte hall renovation is causing a number of changes in scheduling and policy that go beyond just Butte hall.

Holly Ferguson noted that with Butte Hall coming down in Fall 2021 and Physical Science in Fall 2020 and buildings created after this, there is much conversation going on about scheduling. This has created an opportunity to establish a scheduling policy which is something we have never had before. There are many practices and customs that tat Chico State has always done and the intention is to actually codify these so they are clear.

A large working group has been assembled, with chairs, assistant Deans, advising, scheduling and others. They will meet through the Fall semester –one meeting has occurred and seven more will be conducted. The plan is to bring something to the senate in the Spring.

Questions were raised and answers proffered:

- Butte Hall will be offline for scheduling
- ARC will be consulted so that reasonable accommodation requirements do not cause scheduling hick-ups
- The taskforce is large and no new members will be added, but feedback and comments are always welcomed (contact Holly Ferguson or others in the Taskforce) They can return to senate if needed
- Assembling older practice will allow better ideas and clean-up to occur
- Jennifer Aceves, Academic Scheduling and APDB Specialist, generated an unorganized document with many of the past protocols currently practiced on campus. Mike Allen summarized this document and sent two specific questions to the taskforce. It will try to codify these practices so that all the staff have a common reference and improve them as necessary
- Holly Ferguson said she had initiated the drive for a policy since there is much that we do in practice that is not set down and it is hard to have continuity or consider why we do those things especially as people move through positions. This process is to bring forward practice and make sure that the campus agrees
- The Chair of the Taskforce will be elected at the next meeting
- Mike Allen and Holly Ferguson would like there to be a formal group that is regularly looking at scheduling issues. This will be an ongoing need as we will continue to implement the Master Plan and various buildings will be coming down and others created.
- They would also like to look at potentially creating a cap or percentage limit for classroom use during the primetime of classroom use. They would like to consider whether colleges should be allowed to schedule a certain percentage of their classes at this time
- Scheduling assists departments getting their classes on the schedule. Students registering and getting into the schedule is a different matter.  
-The Registrar said that priority enrollment is done from a pre-established list. 250 students are added every hour (from 8:00am to 5:00pm). This lasts four weeks. Some groups are mandated by law to get priority (for example, veterans).
- State law has changed so that High School classes are supposed to begin at 8:30. This will impact parents and traffic. There have been no discussions on our campus yet about the ramifications.
- The Senate representative is Tim Sistrunk. The Chairs council was asked for volunteers. If others should be consulted beyond the 25 current members, please notify Holly Ferguson because the desire is that this be a campus-wide conversation
- The taskforce will be encouraged to consult with their constituencies since scheduling is so varied across departments

Current Scheduling Taskforce membership:

Jennifer Aceves	LaDona Knigge
Jessie Mendoza	Matt Nyby
Ryan Patten	Cari Phipps
Seema Sehrawat	Ann Sherman

Tim Sistrunk	Thomas Ussery
Alaina Wakefield	Ann Wilson
Tyson Henry	Michael Allen
Summer Armstrong	Kaitlyn Baumgartner-Lee
Jeff Bell	Mary Brownell
Dalen Chian	Sara Cooper
Jonathan Day	Holly Ferguson
Kathleen Gentry	Todd Greene
LaDawn Haws	

**5. Proposed New Graduate Degree Program: Master of Arts in Teaching – EPPC – Introduction Item [24:39-36:40]**

Allen explained that our Department of Education currently serves 1) the pre-service teachers –who are the credential candidates who must attain a credential through post-baccalaureate work, and 2) the in-service teachers -who are already in the pre-K-12 school system. Our university currently offers a Master’s in Education that focusses less on the practical skills rather than the higher principles of educational practice as a whole. This degree focuses on theory, pedagogy, instructional strategy and is a great degree for in-service teachers and students who would like to be school leaders and maybe go on to a doctoral program.

This proposal is for a Master of Arts in Teaching will be a degree centered on more practical skills offering a coordinated series of learning experiences built on a framework around reflection, decision-making, research and collaboration with a strong relationship to the public school system. It will emphasize providing pre-service teachers (our credential students) with opportunities for observations, interaction and instruction in the pre-K-12 learning community. Upon completion of this degree, students would get the masters and be recommended for the teaching credential.

Both these Masters will allow us to better serve our two populations. There are also funding reasons for the refashioned Master’s since some long term significant funding that Chico receives requires us to offer to offer a teaching credential and a Master’s in one degree. This was restructured to comply with EO 1071.

Allen congratulated the School of Education which did much to clarify the program learning outcomes after comment from EPPC.

Seipel offered to answer questions.

Kaiser encouraged Education to reach out to the Director of Secondary Education at Chico Unified to see what they are looking for in teachers and make the connection more overt as it implements the new program. Bailey pointed out that the granting agencies in the federal government specifically did not allow Chico to use Chico Unified for programs like RISE and CLASS

Varied questions were raised and addressed:

- This new program does not target teachers who already have a credential, it is a program that will not be offered to everybody but as a residency based program that will serve to get grants

that require programs that award a Master's and a credential at the same time (like RISE and CLASS)

- The students will receive up to \$25,000 a year to pursue their studies
- This program does not require any new courses and current faculty will be able to cover the offerings
- A correction of a typo on page 7 was offered
- Enrollment will not grow so that there must be additional sections of the same course because the new design is fitted within the RISE program that has already been designed with dedicated seats for extra students

Introduction item passed

**6. Proposed Revisions to EM 11-017 : Campus Sustainability Committee – FASP - Introduction Item [36:40-51:00]**

Underwood explained that this EM would supersede EM 11-017 that established the original Campus Sustainability Committee and EM 00-065 that established the campus Recycling Policy.

She provided a synopsis of the EM. Chico State is committed to promoting sustainable practices, creating an inclusive campus culture and supporting and fostering interdisciplinary learning modalities. This necessitates adherence to the CSU's Sustainability Policy and Chico's goals of achieving climate neutrality by 2030; 80% waste reduction by 2020; remaining responsive to additional sustainability needs; and other ambitious goals.

The aforementioned necessitate the establishment of the Campus Sustainability Committee (CSC) to create an institutional structure, provide leadership, support, and resources to develop and implement programs to complement, facilitate, adhere to, and realize the completion of sustainability endeavors on campus. Establishment of the CSC will facilitate these goals and maintain accountability.

Subcommittees of the CSC will be chaired by CSC members who may join the other subcommittees as needed. Subcommittees will prioritize and focus tasks for completing objectives and they will consist of diverse campus constituents.

Membership is comprised of 20 members of the CSC (as detailed in the proposed EM) who will serve two year appointments and attend monthly meetings of the CSC committee and their subcommittees. The expectations of the Campus Sustainability Manager are provided. A list of initial subcommittees for CSC to include is found in the appendix of this document.

One concern already considered was made by a member of the Campus Vegetation and Arboretum Committee and they were assured that no part of their charge would be taken up by the CSC.

Cheri Chastain, the Campus Sustainability Manger, offered to answer questions.

It was asked if there was direct contact between the University and the city of Chico about their Sustainability efforts. Cheri Chastain said that she is the Chair of the City of Chico Sustainability Taskforce. (Of the seven members of the Chico city Taskforce, three of them are affiliated with the

University). Last Spring the city voted to extend this taskforce into a standing commission. There is a call for community members to join Chico's Climate Action Commission and the applications are due November 1. The council will decide who should serve on this commission but University members may apply.

Cheri Chastain noted that as climate action is established on our campus it must be done in tandem with the city.

The representatives of the Business and Finance division were pointed out: The Vice President of Business and Finance co-chairs the committee, the Campus Sustainability Manager, and the Associate Vice President for Facilities and Capital Projects are also ex officio members.

In sentence three of the Scope, can we expand the sentence to read "interdisciplinary approaches to learning and research."

Do the co-Chairs vote –maybe that should be spelled out.

There are three faculty members on the committee.

Maybe the General Education Sustainability Pathway coordinator should be referred to differently as the pathways have not yet been voted on. It was pointed out that if the title changes it will be editorial to change it in the document later.

It was pointed out that members of all the divisions are met together in this committee and that decisions can be made to move things forward. It is a working committee that we will be proud of.

Introduction item passed

Revisions could be brought forward next time.

**7. Proposed Degree Designation Change from BA to BS Communication Sciences and Disorders – EPPC – Action Item [51:13-1:01:27]**

Ferrari said that Allen would present the next two items together but they would be voted on separately. Allen explained again that these policies (Item 7 and Item 8) served as companions to each other to change the BA to the BS and the MA to the MS.

In January, the accrediting body for this program will start requiring that students have met various science knowledge standards to pursue these fields. These new science courses have already been added to the undergraduate major at Chico State and they are also part of the graduate degree. The names of both of these degrees includes the word "sciences". Other degrees like this are found in other parts of the CSU with the science designation.

Suzanne Miller, Program Director, Communication Sciences and Disorders, was happy to answer any questions.

Larson wanted to confirm that EPPC is taking up the question of distinguishing the BA and the BS and the MA and the MS degrees. Allen answered that a subcommittee of EPPC is taking up this question and looking at the Academic Department Manual for more guidance about what the meaning of these designations should be.

Boyd wanted to know why other members of EPPC thought these degrees should be designated as BS and MS and what some of the distinctions were. Ferrari noted that the Standing Committees serve to vet, address and fix some of the issues that come up before full Senate meets. She suggested that maybe some member of the EPPC members could summarize some of the key issues for FASP members. Allen said that if issues come before EPPC that are controversial, she would make sure the varied positions were presented in full senate.

Susanne Miller said that their program had just submitted catalog changes that shift the focus a little in what her program does.

Wyrick wondered if the BS degree has anything to do with Science as in the natural sciences, but instead might be about knowledge to lead to graduate study and be more intense than an arts degree. He thought it was not centered on the scientia of natural science but something else.

Allen pointed out that the Master's degree is really the minimum qualification to pursue this field. In this case the BS is supposed to lead to the MS.

Susanne Miller said that the BS is 60-62 units which is pretty substantial.

Bailey thought that differentiating the BS from the BA will be the work of the EPPC subcommittee. EPPC looked at the new science courses and decided that since the major already had such a solid core of science offerings that were already embedded it should be a BS degree. The reason it was not a BS degree before had more to do with the number of units offered, and since the orientation was already science content, it made sense to move it forward.

Adamian said EPPC discovered the need for more definition of the differences between the BS and BA and decided that for now the distinction was merited.

Underwood asked about other degrees that were not BS but BA degrees. Susanne Miller noted that about 70% of all Master's degrees were MS's and about 60% of Bachelor degrees were BS's.

Action item passed.

**8. Proposed Degree Designation Change from MA to MS Communication Sciences and Disorders – EPPC - Action Item [51:13-1:01:50]**

Ferrari asked for questions specifically about the Master's Program.

Action item passed.

**9. Standing Committees Reports [1:01:56-1:16:19]**

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

Allen offered to answer any questions about her report.

Sherman asked what EPPC conversation was about the future of EDXCHICO. Allen said that both of the Standing Committees discussed it. EPPC thought perhaps the event should be held in September when it is not so hot and everyone is not so rushed on the first day. This would give faculty more time to talk about it in their classes and explain to students that the event is for them. Some thought Wednesday afternoon would be a good time that students would be around.

Underwood reported that FASP discussion was similar in that the very beginning of the semester seemed too busy. It might be better in conjunction with another large event like Preview Day or something with people around.

Larson wondered if the committees commented on whether the event was worth doing or not. Some people remembered the eclipse as a great event that drew people and this kind of excitement would be great to reproduce. How could we recreate the same kind of fantastic science flavored or academic event in association with the Wildcat Welcome.

Sherman noted that there is a huge amount of effort expended to support this kind of event by facilities. This year was really problematic because it happened on a Sunday evening so there was a significant amount of overtime needed to put the event on at the same time they had just set up all the other welcome back events.

Allen noted that students did not realize the event was for them.

Guthrie said he thought holding the event in Sutter Courtyard would attract students, especially first year students. He thought the event was really good and inspiring. If the first year students were particularly targeted to be inspired about their learning before they begin their chosen careers, he thought the event would be really beneficial especially because people can get caught up in college life and forget they are there for school. This would be great to reinforce at the beginning that they are here for academic purposes.

Alex Smith, Student Academic Senator, HFA thought the event would draw a lot of people especially targeting first year students and also community members who went to Chico or were visiting with their families. This would help students connect to the campus and faculty.

Guthrie thought if the event was held in Sutter Courtyard, university facilities could partner with housing for staff and other support.

- **Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Underwood**

Ferrari asked for questions for FASP.

- **Executive Committee – Sistrunk**

Sistrunk noted that EC met once and asked for questions.

Kaiser asked for elucidation about the discussion of federal regulations (IRB, IACUC) and the Chico

State Enterprise Structure.

Larson said that nothing has changed. The IRB committee is operating with the same processes. They are intact and reviewing proposals. She has been temporarily designated as the Research Integrity Officer (which is a term we have created at Chico –it is not sitting in the federal regulations) but we are getting the idea about what this office is about.

What we have learned as we start to unpeel the onion of RESP and RF is that these had a conflict of interest because the compliance activity should not be within the unit that actually submits the proposals and assesses the proposals. Unpeeling the onion has let us realize that many of our past behaviors were not really best practices. She is working on a solution that will take herself out of the role as Chief Integrity Officer. This will take some work, but we are in a better place than we were before.

Boyd said as Program coordinator in the College of Agriculture she has been asked by her Dean to provide names of people to serve on of the Human Subjects Research Committee (also referred to as Institutional Review Board) or the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and the people serving on those committees were surprised that she was asking for names. She was asked if the names of the members of these Board and Committee members could be posted online with the names of the people serving on them and in what capacities.

Larson said there is an IRB website but we are rebuilding and sometimes there are hick-ups. We have existing EMs that lay out membership and responsibilities, but these are old and out of date and don't portray best practices associated with this work. We have much work to do.

Ferrari said that this is why these matters have been on EC's agenda to give us a chance to discuss the issues and figure out where we need to go to keep us compliant with federal regulations.

Boyd said there is information on the website but not the names and the roles of committee and board members. Ferrari said as a follow up, we can get the names of those people so that we know who our representatives are.

#### **10. EPPC & FASP Ethnic Studies Report – Discussion Item [1:16:19-1:41]**

Ferrari explained that the next item is a discussion item put together by the State-wide Senators based on the discussions that happened at EPPC and in FASP in relation to the questions that the ASCSU has asked campuses to respond to. What we hope to do today is get a possible affirmation of this response so that our State-wide senators can take this to the ASCSU.

Boyd thanked both of the Standing Committees for working with the timeline we had to respond to put this together. She and Ford took notes and utilized previous Senate discussions to formulate our campus responses. She hoped senators would add anything they had learned from their constituents and create a consensus document. She said she and Ford would not move to accept this document themselves since they wrote it.

Ford reminded people that we are trying to meet a November 1 deadline so the hope is to finalize this

response today.

Kaiser moved the draft Chico Response document as an introduction item. Seconded. Ferrari explained that the motion would modify the agenda to consider item 10 as an introduction item if it passed. Kaiser said that the work of our committees and our State-wide senators under an extreme time crunch has resulted in a well-structured accurate summary of our opinion. It will have more impact as a campus response at State-wide.

Sistrunk said he liked the affirmation better, but that an introduction item designed to move onto action is an expression of policy. He thought discussion in FASP was more focused on impressions about the measure. He thought the Response did a nice job articulating the discussion and showed our individual ideas but that considering it as a formal introduction item was too strong.

Irish asked what the actual effect of passing this as an action item do beyond voting for acclamation.

Boyd said it would be nice to have a formal acknowledgement that this is in fact Chico's document bringing it forward. It does not necessarily mean it would be an action item if we passed it as an introduction item since senates often times put position papers out through the formal introduction/action sequence. The benefit of treating the Response as an acclamation is that we can discuss it as a committee of the whole without formal amendments and vote on every change. If it became an introduction item, we would have to suspend the rules to consider it as an action item so that we could amend it. This would be more formal.

Ford noted that we don't modify introduction items, so we would have to suspend the rules to change it and it is unclear whether we want to do that. Whatever happens, the state-wide senators will submit what we have here by the November 1 deadline. The next meeting of our senate is November 7 and we might get to vote on an introduction item if we pass it now which would be before the first plenary of ASCSU.

Bailey thought this document did not represent the real work we would want to do even if we affirm this document.

Ford said there is a potential that a resolution might be passed at the ASCSU plenary meeting that would be crafted with the input of all the campuses. Subcommittees will be meeting the week before the plenary and crafting a document and then it will go to the floor.

Boyd said that the Board of Trustees will take the recommendation of the ASCSU up the chain.

Wyrick thought it was a parliamentary problem that the item had not gone through a committee. He thought the motion should be withdrawn and a vote of affirmation or something like it should be considered.

Kaiser said her concern was that the reason we took such an unusual step was because of a deadline that was being imposed in order to deal with a legislative move anticipated to come back to ASCSU in January. We are trying to jump ahead of a measure that will require uniformity of response from the whole system and no one can graduate without it. She is unsure how strong the support is indicated by

an affirmation.

Ferrari said the affirmation is a more informal endorsement.

Boyd said we have had items introduced on the Senate floor that have gone to action immediately over very important issues.

Wyrick said the motion to change the discussion item to an action item was out of order.

The motion was to consider the Response as an introduction item and if this passes, Ferrari would ask to suspend the rules and consider the item as an action item. The latter would require a 2/3s vote.

Boyd said if senators were not prepared to suspend the rules if the item became an introduction item, one should not vote for it, but if one was prepared to do this, it would help the state-wide senators. The vote of affirmation is not as strong. Ford would prefer if the item went all the way to action.

The motion to amend the agenda did not pass.

Schartmueller asked what other campuses responses were. Ford said that a strong consensus is emerging that is similar to what we have here. Long Beach is in the midst of a controversy about ethnic studies, U.S diversity, and GE and they have opted not to respond because interferes with their ongoing curricular process.

Herman thought both Standing committees had done due diligence on this topic and the state-wide senators had bought a well-thought out and well planned document and he was in favor of giving it strong support. He moved to a vote of affirmation. Seconded.

The vote of affirmation was not unanimous but it passed.

Boyd noted that this document will be taken to ASCSU but asked if those who did not support the document would tell her why so she could better understand at plenary.

Ferrari moved item 13 forward without objection.

**13. Changes to Proposed EM: Library Public Use Policy** – EC - Introduction Item [1:41:01-2:12:43]

Ferrari explained that this EM was originally approved by Senate last year, but that the President's Office had some edits and it was decided to bring the item back as an introduction item for a vote on the substantive changes which are highlighted. One change was the decision to refer to EO 1096 which treats antidiscrimination rules in the CSU and put our original list of protected classes in a footnote.

Ferrari noted that these developments have underlined how important it is to get legal counsel involved at earlier stages in the process, so that we do not have this back and forth about EMs. Proposals include having counsel join deliberations in FASP via Zoom so concerns about legal language can be brought up earlier before Senate approves them.

Brooke Banks, Chief of Staff, observed that all the protected categories we mentioned in our policy are all included in EO 1096 except the language about housing status and this was returned to our policy.

Ferrari asked for comments and questions:

- It was noted that it would be salutary to have legal counsel involved in conversations because there are different ways to cite EO's. Since we were quoting the law and the CBA in our text it would be good to listen to ideas from counsel we do not necessarily agree with even if just about style
- It was asked if anyone was concerned about the wording in the first paragraph under A, that the police would be called if any patron "considered a threat" was too strong and did not provide much wiggle room
- Why was this language changed in this way – jeopardizing safety might be the same as a threat
- Should this be narrowed or more descriptive –should the timing or immediacy of a threat be considered
- Do people agree about what they think is a threat?
- The police will determine if someone is considered a threat. Library staff are trained to evaluate time, place and manner of behavior before they call the police
- This wording makes me uncomfortable since it is the same language that is used currently to justify a lot of "security responses" that one would not like to see on campus regarding what police think is a threat to themselves or others in Chico or the news
- The Library would like to have a conversation about when the police get involved (if it is a mental health issue, for example). But there is nothing that the library can do without a larger campus conversation. These words can be taken out, but the library staff are not making this determination
- "considering someone a threat" is too broad
- The term "threat" is used in bullet 6 on page three and the language on page 2 seems in line with that
- If the police are called, they will come –they will determine something is a threat on a case by case basis
- The policy actually says that "any patron" can make the decision that someone is a threat
- Must we deal with the problem of "Barbeque Becky" –the white woman who calls the police based on unfounded racist fear
- It is true in the Library that sometimes people consider someone a threat when they are not
- This paragraph is confusing –it is a moot point who gets to call the police anyone will call if they feel threatened. We think more about what the library should be about with a reference that UPD will respond to requests
- When the police arrive on a scene they follow the penal code to determine how to respond to a criminal threat –is this a nuisance or a criminal threat – the police are trained to decide
- Patrick Newall suggested that "by any patron" be struck on page 2, section A.  
-he reminded everyone that the library has not had a policy about how to eject people  
-the library is where all the public conversation comes together
- This language has been used to shield individuals who are abusing policy that is already in place –it seems problematic to use the same language law enforcement has used to justify escalation of force –we are just adding to the problems

- General counsel’s notes say that the previous language seems to be a promise that all occasions were a feeling of safety is at stake, the police will be called. This language is an attempt to provide for reasonable differences in opinion about constitutes a threat
- Could we say: “or actions by any patron that endanger the safety” instead of “considered a threat”
- We should just reject the general counsel’s suggested language “is considered a threat to” and return what we had before
- How flexible will general counsel be
- If we keep our language in in sentence four but amend the first word of sentence three as the counsel said and say: “Any” instead of “All” we would be fine
- We should put the word “reasonable” before “threat”
- We could say “clearly” or “obviously”

Ferrari said we can pass this as introduction today and consult with legal consul about using the qualifying word “reasonable” and remove the word “threat” and if this is not possible how can our concerns be addressed?

Introduction item passed.

**11. Statewide Academic Senate Report – Ford/ Boyd [2:12:46-2:13:22]**

<http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/>

- [ASCSU Resolutions & Summaries](#)

Boyd and Ford had nothing to report.

**12. [Fourth Year Quantitative Reasoning CSU Admissions Proposal](#) – Discussion Item [2:13:22-2:43:05]**

- [Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed Addition of a Fourth-Year Quantitative Reasoning Requirement for Admission to the CSU](#)
- [Calstate Student Association Statement](#)
- [Mathematics Coursetaking and California State University Eligibility](#)

Ferrari noted that the Quantitative Reasoning discussion is part of an ongoing discussion within the ASCSU. The Associated students have also offered material, so she did not want to subsume this solely under the ASCSU report or the AS report.

Ford said that the ASCSU committee Academic policies and programs would meet tomorrow and they will be discussing the second reading of the Fourth Year Quantitative Reasoning CSU Admissions Proposal and our discussions today are germane.

Ferrari reported that the CSU Senate Chairs had met in a conference call with the associate Chancellor, Loren Blanchard, and he said he could not go to the grocery store without having a discussion about Quantitative Reasoning. She noted that Ford and Boyd provided a link to information that traces some of the history of this proposal and provides answers to some of the questions brought up in our Senate last time. The students have also supplied their resolutions both local and from the CSSA. She asked Boyd and Ford to speak to the documents they provided.

Boyd said she and Ford had provided the document above as a working document that can be added to as questions arise going forward. Particularly, if they are not able to answer questions today.

1. The first document is an overview of what the Trustees proposal is that includes existing and proposed requirements.  
She noted that understanding the proposal requires understanding the a-g requirements for the schools are in California (found on page 1, #1 of the Information Document). There is a link to these requirements now.
2. Responses to the specific questions we discussed and a few to some specific student resolution clauses. There are links to the Board of Trustees presentations, resolutions from the ASCSU, the Quantitative Reasoning Taskforce Report, and other things. She said student representatives of AS added many good points that will be taken to state-wide as well.

She asked for questions.

Kaiser congratulated the AS representatives for finding and citing University Eligibility Study for Public High School Class of 2015 released by the Governor's Office since very little has changed in public education. She recounted some of the history of California public education science education and her own history. She noted that California is very near the bottom for public education and the report cited above shows that there are huge geographical divisions in the state and some high schools have extremely limited course offerings. There is no funding to support all the varied plans.

Ford noted that the Board of Trustees is scheduled to vote on the 4<sup>th</sup> year requirement for Qualitative Reasoning in November and will probably delay until January. There has been much effort to mitigate the problems that will occur if the standards are changed.

He noted that the CFA has taken a stand against this proposal in front of the board. He said that faculty around the CSU are not unified.

Seipel wanted to emphasize the report Kaiser referenced which shows that schools in the North State in particular do not have the student bodies to support more faculty to master the skills required to teach another year of quantitative reasoning, especially some of the courses suggested as alternatives. He also asked what courses are being eliminated so that students can take another quantitative reasoning class (like art and other courses). He liked the purposes of the proposal but did not approve of the mechanisms by which it was accomplished.

Amanda Widgay, Student Academic Senator, CME noted that the students recognize the data that if students take an extra year of quantitative reasoning will promote students in completing their degrees, however, the Student Academic Senate of Chico and the CFA have issues about support systems and access to resources. Rural students, students of color and non-traditional and underrepresented minorities will suffer the most. They already face so many barriers getting into higher education adding another hurdle without explicit detail about funding for computers or textbooks and tutors outside their school that can help them catch up or understand the material. They are without family support and experience in higher education. The CSU plans are not explicit about the support networks that will be needed or detailed plans about how the CSU will help to fund the legislature.

Ford said his understanding of where Chico State Academic Senate currently sits is that we have endorsed strongly the quantitative reasoning taskforce report and its recommendations. One of the recommendations was adding a fourth year of quantitative reasoning.

This is not equivalent to endorsing the specific proposal in front of the Board of Trustees which calls for many caveats like an expanded definition of what quantitative reasoning is to allow for more courses. Another caveat is giving students an exception if they cannot find a suitable quantitative reasoning course. The board of trustees proposal is distinct from what we weighed in on and we might need to open this up again and debate the actual proposal.

Wyrick noted that when we endorsed the report, we did not have all of the information that we now have. I would hesitate to say we strongly endorsed it. We did at that point, but way about now?

Boyd said is this an issue of being opposed to the quantitative reasoning itself or the issue of an additional requirement. Is it about the course itself or students knowing what course to take? Will those in the know continue to be in the know? What about the issue of equity and access which perpetuates itself because of communication. Boyd said she will raise these issues at state-wide.

Livingston wondered if we are imposing unfunded mandates on the school districts. We can say we have seven years to figure out the funding, but he does not believe this.

Adamian wanted to know when the serious discussion about resources and the problems with the proposal happen. Ferrari asked if we needed to respond to the resolution sometime. Adamian said we should have some time to prepare seriously if it is a real conversation.

Sherman said she thought we do not have the time because it looks now as if the Board of Trustees will vote for the proposal.

Bailey hoped we would consider how this effects our plans for outreach in our service area. We already don't serve a large number of folks. A lot of this has to do with requirements, lack of access and resources. This requirement will just exacerbate things and we will serve the students we do not now, even less.

Ford said there is about 50% impaction because so many California students fit the eligibility index. He pointed out that 100% of the students in the North state who meet the eligibility index of 2950 are accepted to Chico State. He emphasized that students living in the North State have a tremendous advantage getting in to their local CSU compared to more populated areas. When we talk about access, we also need to talk about capacity.

Bailey clarified that he is concerned about students who don't qualify because they live in our service area.

Trailer said that an education system is a complex system. The intuitive answer is not always the correct answer. It is right to protect people without adequate resources, but the path being taken will make the situation worse. If you don't raise the standards, you will get what the system reinforces. Changing the

standard will bring attention to the fact that there is a resource inequity, which will have to be resolved. You cannot be shocked if you don't try to change the system.

Adamian asked if there would be an opportunity to contribute to this situation on a way that is meaningful. She was not at Chico in 2016 so she is not down with the situation. She asked if it was over?

Sherman did not know but she thought so and it looks like the Board will vote this way.

Seipel said that pushing the requirement down to the high school level may negate our responsibility to help the students we have here. Pushing the requirement down may not be raising the standard, there could be a different understanding.

Ferrari hoped the state-wide senators had collected enough information to go back to state-wide. She hoped they would report back and let us know if we need some kind of formal participation.

#### **14. University Report - Hutchinson/Larson [2:43:05-2:49:16]**

##### **Larson**

Larson reminded everyone that the call for a faculty STEP Fellow had gone out for someone to collaborate with the CSU STEP Act Initiative. It is a pilot program under Frank Gomez in the Chancellor's Office who is looking for a few CSU's to participate. The faculty member would receive release time in the Spring and Fall and a \$5000 stipend as well.

Kate McCarthy, Dean of Undergraduate Education, has made a call for curricular redesign to participate in the several foundation grants to participate with the Chancellor's Office to facilitate and deliberate about revising curricula to promote student success. They are looking for departments to participate by November 1.

A team went to Sacramento to participate in the GI 2025 Symposium this year. She felt the activities were interesting and worthwhile. They all enjoyed listening to the new Governor Gavin Newsom on Friday morning.

Chico State received its progress report about our GI 2025 goals. We are making very good progress on our four year graduation rate, good progress on our two year goals, graduation rates for our transfer students, we are making moderate progress toward our six year graduation goal, moderate progress on our four year graduation goal, and we have gone backwards in reducing our equity gap. This is significant and troubling.

GI 2025 team are working to address this problem. Larson hoped faculty and staff would think about attaining GI funding to help address these issues. We need to take a hard look some of our curriculum, how we organize our pedagogy and encourage greater access and opportunities in student success overall and especially for ideas that might help us with our equity gap.

Kate McCarthy has sent a message to all of the deans to acquaint them, with the CO student success equity dashboard. We have eight programs on our campus with big gaps relative to serving our

students. She has reached out to every college (since they all have them) and is strongly encouraging faculty to participate in an FLC to really work in a directed way on these achievement gaps. She said we are welcomed to go to the dashboard and find the information ourselves.

Ferrari said we are progressing with the policy about faculty grade access which can hopefully come to Senate this semester.

Brooke Banks hoped everyone saw the announcement about the Strategic plan and could look at the brochures.

**15. Associated Students Report – Guthrie/Alfaro Ramirez [2:49:16-2:49:44]**

Ferrari noted that Guthrie and Alfaro Ramirez had to leave. Please email them or Ferrari who will send emails on if you have questions.

**16. Staff Council Report – Peterson [2:49:45-2:50:09]**

Westbay explained that Peterson could be emailed if there are questions

**17. Ask the Administrator [2:50:09-2:50:18]**

None.

**18. Announcements. [2:50:18-2:52:42]**

- Ferrari said there is a warm clothing give-away November 6, 11:00am to 2:00pm in BMU 203
- The insect cinema cult classic theatre night is November 6, starting from 5:30-6:00 in a room not yet discovered. Students will prepare different insect cuisine items and there will be a dramatic horrible older film.
- Shepherd said that clothes and blankets can be dropped off on the first floor of the library as well.
- Boyd gave a shout-out to Hutchinson for representing Chico at the agricultural summit meeting today at the capital.

**19. Other. [2:52:43]**

None

**20. Adjourn. [2:52:46]**

Meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary