

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
Thursday, April 25, 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, Boura, Boyd, Connolly, Day, Ferrari, Ford, Gruber, Hart (Allen), Herman, Hidalgo, Horst, Hutchinson, Kaiser, Livingston, McConkey, Mitchell-Brown, Paiva, Peterson, Pittman, Sharma, Shepherd, Sistrunk, Sudick, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood, Watkins, Wyrick (Chair), Zartman

ABSENT: Sherman

[2:11-2:54] Wyrick called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. He recognized everyone would speak to the proposals and move to “postpone definitely to the next meeting” if things were going on too long.

1. Approve [Minutes of April 4, 2019](#) [2:54-3:03]
Minutes were approved.

2. Approve [Agenda](#). [3:04-3:10]
Agenda was approved.

3. [Proposed Resolution Regarding Equity Gaps in Student Achievement](#) – EPPC – Action Item [3:15-21:15]
Adamian explained the changes made to a substitute document offered after a subcommittee met with Rachel McBride Praetorius, Director of Tribal Relations, students of the Native American club, members of the Cross-Cultural Resource Center staff, and others.

[Proposed Substitute Document](#)

- As a result of these collaborations the title of the Resolution has been changed
- The first Whereas clause was altered to name the groups used by the Chancellor’s Office
- A second Whereas clause was added explaining how the term URM does not fully acknowledge the identities of our students of color
- A third Whereas clause defines equity and the problems addressed in the resolution

Substitute document passed.

Kaiser moved two amendments:

- 1) End of 6th Resolution clause stuck one word and added 13 words "...in a clear, contextualized, ~~and~~ confidential manner and course based resources that may be needed to help reduce this gap, and be it further

Passed

- 2) Language added to the 8th Resolution clause "...the experiences of colleagues at our own campus and other universities and invite representatives of successful programs to campus to share...."

Passed

It was pointed out that we have data in the IR fact book to help us address institutionalized practices that might be leading to these unsuccessful results. For example, we can gather macro-level information about Equity gaps relative to retention from the dashboards. The GI2025 team is also focusing on figuring out approaches to uncover why this is happening.

Ferrari noted that this resolution will open the door as it represents our committing ourselves to finding out how to address all the elements about why this is happening. Kaiser thought we should not just focus on classrooms, but also on teams and programs that have been successful.

Adamian pointed out that this resolution names institutional racism and advances a critical consciousness on our campus that centers our students of color as a focus of our efforts to address the institutional problems we all face. We will work on translating these understandings into practice to confront the violence at an institutional level.

Ferrari moved to add the CSU, Chico Division of University Advancement and the CSU, Chico Division of Business and Finance to the list of units to which the resolution will be distributed.

Seconded and passed.

Action Item passed.

4. Proposed Revisions to EM 18-005: General Education Program – EPPC – Introduction Item [21:22-1:33:02]

- [Clean Copy](#)
- [Summary of Changes](#)
- [Proposed Substitute Document](#)
- [Summary of Changes within Proposed Substitute](#)

Ferrari explained that she will step aside as EPPC Chair while this item is discussed because she is a faculty Coordinator on the Curriculum Advisory Board. Allen explained the some of the changes contemplated for General Education.

She outlined some of the revisions being brought forward.

- Students will no longer be required to follow a pathway in their lower division

coursework

- They will follow the general GE categories
- The term “Pathway” will be retained for the nine units of upper division courses required and also for the interdisciplinary GE minors that will correspond to these upper division themes
- As required by EO1100, EPPC added the requirement that students enrolled in upper division GE courses shall have completed the required lower division courses in written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning
- To promote coherence each GE minor will have at least three upper and three lower division courses
- There will continue to be between 5 and 10 upper division pathways and minors

Jason Nice met with some First-year experience students, some Reach student peer mentors, and the Greek counsel and they all were supportive of these changes.

Sharma clarified that the measure that just was voted on last week by the students advises faculty incorporate discussions of climate change in all of their courses and asks the Associated Students to urge that the University do so. This is because climate change is so relevant.

Several senators met to address comments from constituents and senators. Paiva articulated the overall goals in the proffered substitute document.

- Enhance the integrity of the GE through the mechanisms of evaluation and assessment across the curriculum at the course level and at set intervals
- Reduce the impaction of high demand stones by providing mechanisms to add courses based on data of historical demands
- The changes start on page 3, with clarification of when courses may be removed from GE
- Top of page 6, notes that all upper division pathways must include all GE learning outcomes
- Top of page 10, depicts a system of oversight about adding new course proposals to GE based on data about high student demand in lower division areas and subareas as well as upper division pathways. This process will utilize an ad hoc committee of Deans
- On page 10, the requirement to review GE every five years to insure EO 1100 compliance and Pathway thematic coherence was spelled out
- The addendum on the last page describes how CAB will implement these changes

Questions were asked and clarification offered:

- Subareas will remain as described by EO1100
- Lower division “pathway designated” courses will remain in a smaller number (see, page 6)
 - all the other lower division GE courses will serve in general for GE areas of study
- Does the reliance on an ad hoc committee of deans (page 10) effectively take CAB’s role away? The deans must sign off on class proposals in the first place anyway.
 - this is an attempt to make sure the courses can be offered and avoid redundancy.
 - it also offers a way to restrict the number of new course proposals by tying them to data provided by Enrollment Management Advisory Committee to ensure that they are

needed

-it can also serve to uncover where there is need for more courses

- This process will not supersede the Senate process of adding or eliminating pathways, only individual courses can be added or removed by CAB
- each pathway minor will have a separate EM

Sharma noted that the Student Academic Senate is in favor of these changes.

Substitute document accepted.

Page 8, add language to section “Students, after completing the diversity courses, will have knowledge of:”

- Relationships between different ethnic groups and cultures

Passed.

A long discussion of the requirements of EO 1100 that students complete the 4 lower division GE subject areas before moving on to upper division courses ensued under the heading: Upper Division Pathways (bottom of page 5 and top of page 6). Many comments focused on the next to last sentence of the paragraph and supported striking it:

- Current operating capability does not allow us to do this, we will put students in a position to fail
- we will be audited and found not in compliance
- We don't currently have capacity to step up
- This will not be implemented until 2021
- This is unfriendly to GI 2025
- much work to get to implementation –how are others operationalizing this (strike this)
- We will not turn on a dime –we have much work to do to get ready to do this
- CAB doesn't care about striking it
- It will impact transfer students
- We need to prevent huge bottle neck and holding up people waiting for courses
- This was added in EPPC
- We don't know what CO will do yet –sentence above this already provides for us covering these
- Don't get documents about transfer students before they enroll can mean delays
- general education advising is done all over the place (not like a single department)
- We need to reach out to other CSUs to learn how they are responding to this EO
- We should reach out to the person in CO who is adding this language and ask about exceptions
- Students may have these skills without the classes – they are only struggling with scheduling
- How about students who can't finish earlier courses (like those who fear oral reports)
- This is a nightmare for study abroad advising

Those opposed to striking the language made some of the following arguments:

- We need to keep this in –the EM is bringing us into compliance with EO1100 and 1110
- An ASCSU resolution charged all local Senates to do what they feel is best for students and they need prerequisites for upper division courses
- This is a relatively minor requirement since students are supposed to take two of these as freshman
- Not good reply to policy to say we will not put it in our document –still required to do it
- We routinely deal with transfer students without great difficulties
- It is not argument not to enforce reasonable prerequisites
- This won't delay degrees
- It maintains the academic integrity of curriculum
- There was consensus among those who teach at CAB that students need these basic skill sets
- Not requiring these necessitates creating trainings and course work while having to catch people up during upper division instruction
- quality of the upper division classroom is impacted
- it is pedagogically necessary
- Integrity of program –student success –need minimum level of competency to go to 300 and 400 level competency
- We do not enforce this now
- How many are actually affected by having to take lower division –how many want to take upper division without taking lower
- Students need to be adequately prepared –there are already some coded prerequisites for GE classes

Larson thought people were jumping to implementation in discussion too much. She noted we can reopen our EM if necessary, but that we should acknowledge that we can't change our practice immediately. We should recognize that we need to maintain our pedagogy and acknowledge the problems of doing it, but we should start moving toward a transitional plan. She signaled her intention to add to the EM addendum language that we would move toward implementing EO 1100 sec. 2.2.3 ideas as part of our planning.

The vote to strike the next to last sentence of this paragraph (pages 5-6) was taken.

“...Normally, students may not use an upper division course for GE credit unless they have completed at least forty-five semester units prior to enrolling in the course. ~~Students enrolling in upper division GE courses shall have completed required lower division GE courses in written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and [page 6] mathematics/quantitative reasoning.~~ Upper-division....”

Motion passed.

A sentence was added just before the last sentence of the Addendum: Implementation of Revisions (page 11):

“... new courses to GE that will take effect immediately. Also beginning immediately, the CAB will work with relevant units to transition our practices to support EO 1100, sec. 2.2.3. This EM shall be reviewed....”

Addition passed.

Page 8, add language to section “Students, after completing the diversity courses, will have knowledge of:” bullet number three:

- The social construction of class, race, ethnicity, ~~or~~ gender, or nationality

Passed.

Action Item postponed definitely until the next Academic Senate meeting.

5. Proposed Center in Regenerative Agriculture and Resilient Systems – EPPC - Introduction Item [1:33:02-1:55:45]

- RAI Total Sources and Uses Budget Plan
- Interim EM for Oversight of Ancillary Units

Ferrari noted that the attached documents included the Interim EM about Oversight of Ancillary Units to give guidance about how to consider this proposal if needed.

Cindy Daley, Faculty College of Agriculture, Director of the Organic Dairy Unit, introduced the proposal for the Center in Regenerative Agriculture and Resilient Systems. She explained that this center is one component of sustainability efforts on campus. This initiative began in 2016 as consortium between faculty and industry folks and collaborative partners. This effort has gained funding since it is addressing coming impacts of climate change predicted to impact production agriculture in California with erratic weather patterns and more drought.

This is a long term effort in agriculture as we have continued to work on our food system security addressing challenges like erosion while aligning our work with state and national developments. We are more conscious now of the need to curb our green-house gas emissions and shift to a more sustainable model. The attempt is to develop systems to sequester more carbon through various efforts and remain committed to the long term viability of the soil and shift to a regenerative model.

Regenerative agriculture is guided by four tenets:

- Leave the soil undisturbed
- Keep the soil covered
- Keep the living root
- Add biomass

Implementation of these tenets provides a global service to humanity’s common efforts. The center is designed to help producers transition to more regenerative practice to sequester carbon, rebuild soils, and create a more resilient landscape.

The proposal defines the strategic priorities of the center and refines its mission.

Kaiser thought that K-12 and FFA could be included in the proposal to target education at a very early level since most of the elementary schools have gardens in our area.

Cindy Dailey mentioned that all the seminar presentations of the center are published on the website along with many resources.

Boura commended the leadership of Cindy Dailey and the many experts she has engaged. He noted that this has allowed advancement to attract many benefactors to the sustainability work being done here at Chico state.

Cindy Daley explained how the Center is dedicated to supporting the This Way to Sustainability Conference in all its complexity and passed out a revisioning document that posits many ideas about the future of the conference. She invited input and participation.

She also described that latest conference this March that benefitted from the cooperation of Cheri Chastain, Sustainability Programs Manager, and FMS, Nate Millard, Colleen Hatfield, Nani Teves and many others. There were six keynote speakers from many fields, and the idea is to continue to promote this campus wide effort as we move forward. Perhaps every college could find how they will promote sustainable efforts from their disciplinary perspectives. Four other campuses were represented this year and there were 1200 registered participants.

Larson acknowledged the RAI proposal as a model for organizing a center and serves as a wonderful example.

Introduction item passed.

Moved and seconded to suspend the rules and consider as an action item. Passed.

Concerns were expressed about the lack of broad based sustainability efforts on our campus. There was a fear that all of our practice will be focused only in this particular center.

Larson commended the RAI for taking on the This Way to Sustainability Conference this year and said that University attention will continue to grow through the Campus Sustainability Committee. This committee has drafted an EM and will provide leadership about how to address the broader aspects of sustainability on this campus. She also noted the current efforts of FMS and Cheri Chastain and the various AS student organizations who are active.

Ferrari said that EPPC also had a good and strong conversation about making sure that sustainability is alive and diverse on our campus.

Hutchinson noted that the RAI has invited us to consider resilient systems and take a broad approach to developing sustainability practices. She remarked that the University strategic planning has embraced the principles of sustainability in its broadest definitions as essential to our mission. She said we have a renewed commitment and she was excited by the varied and numerous efforts ongoing across campus.

Boyd hoped we will pursue conversations about sustainability on this campus further. Since we don't have an Institute for Sustainable Development anymore, she praised Cindy Dailey for taking on the [This Way to Sustainability Conference](#) and working on keeping it vibrant and finding ways to promote wide participation in thinking about sustainability at our University. She said it speaks to the mindset of the folks associated with the center and Cindy Dailey's leadership.

Larson said that the Campus Sustainability Committee will be sending its EM to the Academic Senate and promote this wider conversation. Boura noted that our campus wide commitment to sustainability will continue to generate interest and support of our campus with our community.

Action Item passed.

6. [Proposed BS in Geography](#) – EPPC – Introduction Item [1:55:58-2:28:35]

Ferrari said that notification of some areas of concentration designed for advising in this degree were sent out to senators as an addendum to the proposal. These will not be mandatory or present in the catalog. She asked LaDona Knigge, Chair of Geography and Planning Department, and Dean Fairbanks to address the proposal.

LaDona Knigge said the proposal was the work of several years.

- Currently there is a BA in Geography that has two options. This new BS would displace the option in Physical geography.
- The notion comes from conversation with many older administrators and with students considering their employment options.
- When they leave Geography they need more science and math courses to get jobs working with ecological resources and other opportunities
- This proposal is budget neutral
- Some of the new courses come from other colleges and departments

Daniel Grassian, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, commended the work put into the proposal and expressed some concerns:

- He noted that enrollment in the BA in Geography has declined over the last several years
- student interest needed to be demonstrated with data
- What would be the impact on the BA in Geography
There are currently 21 in the BA and 29 in what would become the BS option
- What happens if the projected 55 in the BS in 4 years does not occur?
- How will the degree be marketed to students
- would the program consider something that would be more interdisciplinary in nature
- there might be potential collaboration with the Geosciences possible
- the curriculum would rise from about 45 units to 60-63 units (a high unit major)
- the reason why 14 different courses have been added must be clearer to withstand Chancellor's Office scrutiny
- some of the classes overlap in the competencies they impart (why couldn't these be options and not required)

- it is unclear if the proposal is really cost neutral if other departments must bear the costs
- costs of instruction might rise if enrollment continues to decline

LaDona Knigge said that Geography departments typically have both a human and a physical option. They are different curricular areas though there are some basic skills that overlap. This program offers Geography and Planning which makes us unique in the central valley.

Dean Fairbanks explained some of his department's thinking.

- 4 schools in California offer a BS in Geography
- The average BA is about 46 units (we will be 45)
- The average BS is 66.5 units (we are low at 60-63)
- Building an assessment plan is difficult before the plan goes to the Chancellor's Office
- The outside courses being offered are traditionally taught and would welcome the extra students
- A new STEM degree on campus is a positive thing
- This is a collaboration with four different colleges –collaboration will increase
- Geography is traditionally a small major

Russell Shapiro, Chair, Geological and Environmental Sciences Department, came to present ideas of the Dean of Natural Sciences and others in the college.

His department is missing as a collaborator in this proposal, though they do support a BS in Geography. This is true because many federal jobs require this degree, and they want to support students. His department's students are sent to Geography constantly for the geospatial courses in particular.

He had some concerns that he thought could be repaired:

- The documents that his department received earlier are different than those that appeared in EPPC
- He wondered whether the changes showed the attempt to turn the BS in Geography to get jobs, or whether it is turning into a version of his department's BS in environmental sciences
- The claims that a student could use the BS in Geography for many of the same things they are qualified for with his department's degree is untrue
- He knows what employers are looking for as his department has 150-160 majors and they have more hard science training
- There is duplication of some of the courses required in his department's degree as well

Ferrari explained that curriculum documents might change over the course of their approval as different parties weigh in.

Steven Robinow, Associate Dean of College of Natural Sciences, said that we may need to take more time to be sure everyone has seen the appropriate versions of the proposal. He noted that the College of Natural Sciences is concerned with the Ecology Resource Management option in this degree which they think overlaps too much with their offering in Applied Ecology.

Larson is concerned that we do not end up with two BS degrees in Environmental Sciences. Our campus cannot afford duplication or mostly duplicated programs. She hoped the two departments could collaborate more.

Hutchinson thought that the concerns raised this afternoon should not be resolved on the floor of the Senate, but earlier. This suggests it should be returned to EPPC.

Ferrari thought that if the proposal was postponed until next year, it should come back with a clear proposal about what will happen to the BA at the same time.

Moved to refer the proposal back to EPPC next Fall, and ask that it be revisited beside a proposal for a revised BA in Geography and Planning as well. Seconded, Passed.

Item postponed until next Fall.

7. Proposed Executive Memorandum: Classroom Recording Policy – FASP – Introduction Item [2:28:35-2:40:27]

Pittman noted that this policy is a response to recent events that have occurred on this campus and elsewhere regarding unauthorized recording in the classroom.

Livingston said this was the work of a FASP subcommittee and Asa Mittman, Chair of the Art Department, and Emily Peart, Student Rights and Responsibilities, and Holly Hunt, Director of Accessibility Resources Center, and Jennifer Haffner, Acting Director for Labor Relations.

It applies to all students and to all classes no matter what the mode of delivery. No one can record or film anyone without the express permission of the instructor and fellow students. Additional parameters governing permission by instructors were barrowed from the contract students sign with ARC.

Paiva noted that this is already state law that in private or confidential meetings it is illegal to record or film without consent. Why do we need these extra provisions and why isn't Accessibility Resources policy sufficient? Ferrari wondered why it can't be part of the student Academic Integrity policy.

Pittman noted that there has been considerable question whether a classroom is a public space or a quasi-public space. This policy is quite reflective of the ARC policy but that policy only applies to students who are qualified to record as a result of a needing special accommodation. This policy applies this understanding to all students.

Last year it was not thought acceptable to include this in the student Academic Integrity policy and the student rights and conduct people thought this added policy would be necessary.

Sandy Parsons-Ellis, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, observed that the classroom is a grey area and when she spoke to general counsel the classroom is thought to be quasi-public. Recording without permission can be a conduct violation if someone has something in their syllabus against it, and the student does it anyway. Some faculty

felt strongly that this was needed generally for all faculty.

Introduction item passed.

8. Proposed Executive Memorandum: Lecturer Council – FASP –Introduction Item

[2:40:27-2:44:51]

Sistrunk observed that this policy replicates what's done in other CSU's, for example, at San Francisco State. He credited the Provost with this great idea that it would be nice if lecturers got together and communicated what they are thinking about. This EM provides for Lecturers across the colleges to elect representatives and there is a place for the conversations to happen.

Larson thanked Sistrunk for the kudos and said she had been organizing coffees with the Provost for Lecturers. She has appreciated these opportunities to sit in small groups with people. She recognized that Lecturers have very important things to say, and they are very important people on our campus.

Pittman noted that the policy says the council can confer with FASP or Senate and send issues forward if they desire. It was felt in FASP that the Lecturers could form their own guidelines about electing their chair and the terms of office and such matters.

Introduction item passed.

9. Proposed Executive Memorandum: Meriam Library Public Use Policy – FASP – Introduction Item [2:44:52-2:53:25]

Pittman noted that this policy came forward in response to various issues about safety in the library. This is an attempt to modernize the older library use policy and make it plainer for the public. There was a request from law enforcement that the policy be clear about safety standards so that they have grounds to assist if asked.

Patrick Newell, Dean of the Library, said that during some recent problems in the library, Chief Reed has had no legal standing on which to act. There must be plain local rules about behavior that will create a disturbance and define the repercussions of that behavior. This policy defines what will create a disturbance and result in someone being asked to leave the library and be referred to the police or student judicial affairs.

Patrick Newell said that there were questions in FASP about behavior like sleeping. He said the library is too lightly staffed to police such behavior, but they need to have cause to act and call the police if the behavior becomes egregious. This is a response to what has been happening locally, but is similar to developments across the system.

Akinwande admitted that when he is studying in the library he sometimes needs to take a quick nap to carry on with his work. Patrick Newell said the policy was supposed to allow the library to call the police if someone's behavior is really problematic. If all sleeping resulted in such a response, he thought everyone in the room would have been affected by now.

It was asked if there is a larger policy like this regarding all of our facilities. Hutchinson said

that the University is wrestling with these issues. The campus is a public space and thinking about public space, freedom of speech and other activities, we are trying to determine where the line is when behavior disrupts education. The library is the first step, and where we can, we will implement more of these constraints as needed.

Donze pointed out that many behaviors can be perceived as problematic by different people in different contexts. She hoped the policy could add some general overarching statement that it is dedicated to service regardless of race, gender and every other possibility. Such a statement will make sure that the policy is not used with the opposite impact than intended. Pittman thought this would be an important amendment to suggest at action.

Introduction item passed.

10. Proposed Changes to FPPP: Chair's Responsibilities, Evaluation, and Support – FASP – Introduction Item [2:53:55-2:59:41]

Boyd gave an overview of these suggested changes to the FPPP:

- These ideas were brought forward several years ago as 2 EMs about chair responsibilities and evaluation that were not signed
- As we have transitioned to new leadership on campus, it was thought that the FPPP would be a better place for them as it is a living document and is subject to change more easily
- This was written by representatives from the varied colleges
- There was different opinion about how the Chairs might be reviewed and this section will be delayed until a later time
- This carries forward statements about responsibilities, support, selection and some protocols about recalling Chairs
- It is an update to an Academic Affairs memo from 1984-18. The only other guidance for Chairs is a small clause in the CBA
- Most of the Chairs did not find these provisions controversial

Pittman noted that the reason the term “Evaluation” was left in the title though that section was delayed is because it is recognized that it is an important piece of the future policy.

Allen had editorial amendments. She also thought that the term “Selection” could be utilized in the title as more appropriate than “Evaluation” since that is what is actually covered.

Introduction item passed.

[2:59:41-3:15:10] It was moved to group items 11-14 altogether as one agenda item and pass them all at introduction. Seconded, passed.

Ford noted that item 11 will need clarification about whether the start of employment can be the same thing as the start of review. This may need amendment at Action.

Shepherd wondered if the intention of item 11 was to expand the material reviewed during periodic evaluation since that might impact work. Boyd said that previous language provided for

two year reviews that were limited. There were many comments about how problematic this is especially when trying to demonstrate the progress of a faculty member in short bursts of time. This is particularly important for probationary faculty who must demonstrate professional progress over time to advance.

Trailer noted that it is more work in our current practice. With this practice, the dossier is added to periodically and the committee just keeps up with the work incrementally as they already do. Right now, there is great confusion and stress about the different review periods and what should be included for each individual candidate.

We know in measurement theory that the measurement is only valid in terms of the baseline. If you change the baseline, you change the interpretation of the value. What is happening is that people receive a satisfactory rating in one period and not in the next. Comparing them both would show they are making adequate progress overall. Their performance may be uneven in years, but in aggregate it is satisfactory. Or the opposite can be true and mislead a candidate that they are doing well based on the last review. This is a critical change for the integrity of the process.

Ford admitted it has been a problem as evaluators are supposed to conduct their review based on the evidence submitted since the file last closed only. But the benefit is that the file includes previous Department, College and Dean reports and it was more efficient for the committee to focus only on the latest material rather than rehashing the previous years. He thought it is true that different departments will create different baselines and he supports the change.

Hutchinson said that the period of review is important and the only time it is cumulative, is when you are going up for tenure. She admitted that there is variance in establishing the baseline and that committees change membership and understanding. She pointed to Political Science as a department that has persistently trained its personnel to maintain consistent standards in the way they review each other over time.

She reiterated that the documentation is available whoever is reading the file. Sometimes people don't understand how to read the file or fully what the parameters of evaluation are and they can get confused around what the period of review is.

Larson said she supports evaluating all of a person's material as part of their file. She noted that mistakes are consistently made.

Pittman noted that items 12 and 13 address evaluation.

11. [Proposed Changes to FPPP: Date of Appointment and Review Window](#) – FASP – Introduction Item

12. [Proposed Changes to FPPP: Areas of Evaluation](#) – FASP – Introduction Item

13. [Proposed Changes to FPPP 9.1.2.c.2: Service Policy for Lecturers](#) – FASP – Introduction Item

Items 11, 12 and 13 passed as Introduction items.

14. Proposed Changes to EM 14-011: Faculty Recognition and Support (FRAS) Committee

- **Proposed Additional FRAS Awards – FASP –Introduction Item** [3:15:10-]

Jinsong Zhang, Chair of FRAS, announced that FRAS will award two additional awards for outstanding faculty achievement:

- 1) Outstanding Lecturer in Bringing the Profession to the Classroom
- 2) Outstanding Early Career Faculty Award

She explained that the number of nominations for the Outstanding Lecturer Award keeps growing and many awesome candidates cannot be acknowledged. She also pointed out that many Lecturers have deep connections to the community and a lot of experience and expertise that they bring to the classroom. This first award is supposed to be very broad and it will apply to many.

The second award was thought of as a junior faculty distinction that will help us retain new faculty who are doing superior work. Although they are excellent, it is hard to compete with faculty who may have been on campus for 30 years.

Boura has worked hard to add to the award amounts and these awards will increase to \$2,500 each.

Pittman pointed out that the EM is the actual Introduction item.

Introduction item passed.

Motion to suspend the rules and consider as an Action item. Passed.

Jinsong Zhang said that the new award for the Lecturer Bringing the Profession to the Classroom is not explicitly for people with outside careers. Many Lecturers bring different types of experience to the classroom which might be educational or in some other field. She thought most Lecturers would be eligible for this award.

Ferrari moved to strike the second bullet point from **BASIC STRUCTURE, Membership** (this section requires immediate past winners of the awards to serve the next year on FRAS).

This provoked response:

- This is a huge change
- Such a question should go through one of the Standing Committee before it comes to the Senate floor
- It is problematic to force winners to serve on such an onerous committee as part of the award for their efforts to be awarded
- The proposed amendment is in order because when EM and policy come up they are supposed to be considered as a whole
- How is this dissimilar to other changes that can be brought forward

- It was pointed out that in The Policy on Policies that when we revise a policy, we are in fact looking at the entire policy
- It does not allow the whole conversation to occur for a substantive change to come forward when it was not discussed in the Standing Committee

It was moved to suspend the motion until next week to give people time to consult constituents. Seconded.

Jinsong Zhang added that it was advantageous to have the outstanding faculty serve on the committee. It raised the prestige of the awards.

Postponed until next week.

Pittman asked that the item be returned at time certain and put at the top of the agenda.

15. Proposed Changes to EM 06-084: Policy on Information Technology Governance – FASP – Introduction Item [3:30:31-3:31:14]

Moved to postpone item until next Senate meeting. Passed

16. Proposed Resolution: Endorsement of Territorial Acknowledgement Language of Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria – EC – Introduction Item [3:31:14-3:41:21]

Sara Trechter, Interim Associate Vice President, Office of International Education, said she is representing the group formerly known as the Friends of the Mechoopda which wants to acknowledge all the good work of President Hutchinson in signing a new MOU acknowledging their rights in the University.

A few years ago, the Senate commended the example of President Hutchinson in territorially acknowledging of the Mechoopda at important events as is done all over the world with indigenous peoples. This was never really codified and language was not put forward, so that sometimes this acknowledgement is somewhat offensive.

We are presently on land occupied by the Mechoopda Tribe of Chico Rancheria. Rachel McBride Praetorius, Native American Tribal Liaison, and the Tribal council have requested that in written acknowledgements that the specific language they have offered be used. The Mechoopda suggest options for use in writing, websites and on syllabi. There is also suggested language for events although this is recognized as more flexible.

It is hoped that this language will go out to faculty, and especially to new faculty at orientation and during faculty development and that it be shared with the people at the bottom of the resolution.

Hutchinson commended the Friends of the Mechoopda and Rachel McBride for this resolution. She said it is greatly needed and she is appreciative. She hoped it could be sent to student organizations as well.

Sara Trechter reiterated that acknowledgments while people are speaking can be more fluid, but

it is hoped that people will use the language of the Mechoopda themselves in writing, or don't make the acknowledgement at all. She noted that when white people speak, we sometimes don't recognize how sensitive people are to recognition of their rights to the land. This language was written by the Mechoopda council themselves. It is also part of the recognition of their voices on campus.

Introduction Item passed.

Motion to suspend the rules and consider as an Action item. Passed

Sharma moved to amend the last resolution clause to add:

The Associated Students, Board of Directors

Commissioner of Diversity Affairs

and strike ~~the Director of Multicultural Affairs~~

Passed

Sara Trechter said that the intention of sending this notification to the Office of Admissions and Orientation was to catch incoming students.

Boyd moved to add two more offices:

Student Orientation

Student Life and Leadership

Passed

Action Item passed.

17. Proposed Resolution: Supporting Library Collections Necessary for Faculty and Student Success – EC –Introduction Item [3:41:21- 3:46:10]

Shepherd explained that this resolution supports the resolution the ASCSU passed in January to recommend that library resources paid for by the Chancellor's Office be purchased. These don't cost us any money. The fund is \$5M. This year \$600,000 will be cut which will reduce four of the items listed. Unless we fund this and support it this fund will dwindle out.

The resolution states that it is important for us to have these collective resources for student equity across the CSU and that we must maintain our collective buy-in to this fund.

Introduction Item passed.

Move to suspend the rules and consider as an Action Item. Passed.

Boyd noted how important this is to our students to help them attain the resources they need to have access to. This resolution supports the ASCSU resolution. It urges the CO to augment this fund and all the varied campuses speaking out is demonstrating our collective will that this is needful.

Livingston made editorial recommendations and corrected the use of the term “University Senate”.

The ASCSU was added to the distribution list.

Action Item passed.

18. Annual Reports

- **University Advancement & Foundation Update** [3:46:10-]

Boura said that he would give an update on the Foundation and discuss the return on our investment in the Endowment as well. He thanked the Advancement team and pointed out the regional and national awards they have won (clapping ensued!)

The University Foundation exists to support the educational mission. Because of the leadership of our board members we have seen tremendous growth in our endowment. We grew our endowment over the last few years from \$35M to \$64M.

Endowment return 2018 7.3%

We are doing better than anyone else in the CSU. (system wide return was 6.4% return). This will allow us to support scholarship, professorships and work for our programs.

The Capital Campaign as of April 11 has raised: \$75,313,649. This year we have gained \$9.2M so far. The Camp Fire has certainly impacted our efforts, but the fiscal year ends on June 30, so we still have 4 months.

The tower Society continues to grow and inject cash into our programs. The student philanthropy programs are also continuing to grow.

The number of our donors is at an all-time high.

The public launch for the Capital campaign is this Saturday in the BMU and on Kendall lawn from 7:00-9:00.

19. Standing Committees Reports [3:51:17-3:51:21]

Wyrick noted that there are reports from all the standing committee chairs and asked for questions.

- **Educational Policies and Programs Committee – Ferrari**
- **Faculty and Student Policies Committee – Pittman**
- **Executive Committee – Sistrunk**

20. **Statewide Academic Senate Report – Ford/ Boyd** [3:51:22-3:51:57]

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

- **ASCSU Resolutions & Summaries**

Wyrick asked if there were questions for the statewide senators. Boyd requested that their report be postponed until the next meeting to the beginning of the meeting as these are important reports (that have been postponed twice).

- [General Education Taskforce Report – March 2019 ASCSU Plenary](#)
- [General Education Task Force – Full Report](#)
- [Academic Preparation Report, March 2019](#)
- [CSUCO Responses March 2019](#)

21. University Report - Hutchinson/Larson

Hutchinson [3:51:57-4:13:37]

Hutchinson wanted to discuss a serious item, she was sorry that many had had to leave. She noted that when she took office she said that when she made decisions that might be controversial, she would try to set a context as to why. She wanted to speak specifically about the letters she sent to the City Council on April 12 about plans for the low barrier homeless center.

She reported that the feedback she had received had been pretty equally divided in their support, or not for her position. She said she was responding to a growing concern from folks on our campus and the surrounding community about campus safety.

Since she has taken office we have witnessed shooting almost every weekend in the community. We have witnessed assaults even though the crime reports in the city are telling us that maybe domestic assaults are going up, but not in the city itself. The city and campus has been traumatized by the Camp Fire, by crazy storms and by floods. She thought all the considered there are so many variables that our students have developed a sense of fragility and they feel unsafe.

This has meant that one of the most important things she needs to consider is how we work with our students and each other to make people feel safe. The report of the suspicious person in the library was a tipping point that showed this sense of fragility that is palpable and truly felt by our students.

Because of this, she chose to send out the two letters. One was specifically focused on safety. The other reflected on whether this was a good time to bring a low barrier shelter close to the campus. She does not want to criminalize the homeless. She knows there are people experiencing homelessness and there are people who need services, and it is our job as a community to figure out how to do this to our folks in need.

As soon as she sent the letters out, she got on the phone with the director of the Jesus Center, Laura Cootsona, and focused particularly on the sense of safety that our students are lacking. She met with Laura and people from Safe Space and members of Student Affairs to explain our position and listen to them speak about the need for services and how we might start working as a community toward solutions. These meetings will continue.

Lang

Lang said that in working with the city to try to address the problems of safety and homelessness, the University is all in.

He noted that Chico has changed a lot since he went to school here 30 years ago. In terms of safety, student life, security and things of that nature, Chico is a very different place. He said our students are afraid. In the last 14 months that he has been here, we have had 13 shootings and in 2 of them, students were shot. He hears about students feeling harassed downtown and the interactions our students have had with people suffering homelessness or mental illness and racist language. These interactions are dangerous on both sides. We have had 8 suicides on this campus which adds stress to our students' lives.

150 students came safety forum and we had about 2 hours of conversation about their fears. On April 19, we held a safety summit with the City of Chico. This is all to set the context of the conversation about a low barrier homeless shelter. This is coming at the moment our students are struggling. Of course, we need the shelter, but the location is problematic, but at this time given what we are going through, this does not work now. The students themselves are divided.

Senators expressed opinions and administrators responded:

- Some understood the sentiments of the letters and wondered about evidence that homeless shelters present a marked danger
- We are dealing with the perception of danger and not necessarily the facts
- The letter said the campus leadership is united but that is not accurate as we were not consulted about this
- Hutchinson said that sometimes she must act swiftly without time for full consultation
- Just because there is a perception that these shelters are dangerous should not be the end of the conversation –we should be using the opportunity to teach about them
- Hutchinson said that we also have examples of disruption from people experiencing homelessness on campus –but we are still trying to move forward and promote best practice with the community
- We did not have the time to fully process how this might work out

Larson

Larson reported that we have received our Draft WASC Report and we reviewed the report for errors in fact and provided our feedback.

22. Associated Students Report – Sharma/Akinwande [4:13:37-4:14:28]

Alisha wanted to report that students are also divided about the homeless shelter and the location. Students who were against it typically cited safety as their rationale.

23. Staff Council Report – Peterson

Peterson was no longer in attendance.

24. Nominations for Academic Senate Officer Positions open 4/8/19 and close 4/28/19 – Information Item [4:14:29]

Wyrick noted that nominations are closed for Academic Senate officer positions.

25. Ask the Administrator

26. Announcements. [4:14:30-4:16:04]

Wyrick skipped to announcements.

He announced that UBC would be held on May 13 from 3-5:00pm

Sistrunk announced that CFA would host a panel discussion about homelessness in Chico on May 9.

He noted as we are talking about housing insecurity and we have realtors imbedded in our university efforts that we might start advocating for creative answers from them and the city about rent control, public trust land for the poor, or regulations that let people build expensive homes and also they must build inexpensive homes as well.

27. Other. [4:16:05-4:32:19]

Wyrick asked for other topics.

Ford announced that the statewide senator to his left had just received news that she would be a full professor.

Sharma wanted to recognize the student who had been waiting in the gallery to speak.

This student (in their fourth year working for a Social Work degree) addressed the President, the Provost and Vice Presidents about the effects of impaction on his program. He thought this would have a profound effect on the future students coming to Chico to pursue their degrees. This impaction will likely lead to a lack of diversity moving forward as a large proportion of the students of color who are from outside this area will stop enrolling at Chico.

This shows a lack of consideration for students who come from sister high schools in southern California because Chico is affordable. The impacted program represents a false promise to these students as the program will not be available to them. He said there was not great diversity among instructors teaching within the program and this was alienating to students of color as well.

He does not feel heard. He thinks impaction will really effect program quality.

Akinwande said that the BSW program was no longer accepting students from southern California into the program because they need to service their service area. This will impact student diversity a great deal he thought. He said that some of the faculty were upset as well.

Hutchinson asked whether the students could write down their problems so that she and the Provost can investigate. Larson said that impaction was a very intense process which can require a department to first serve their local area. There is more to uncover.

Hutchinson reiterated that the Provost would take these questions up with the Dean of the College and find out more about what was going on.

Ferrari said that this was another example about why faculty stress so much about tenure density because it leads to so many problems and specifically, in this case, the ability to hire faculty of color.

Pittman shared that the School of Nursing had found a way to interpret the Chancellor's Office requirements about impacted programs serving their service area that allowed them to keep hiring among diverse faculty. They could explain how they did this.

Larson said she was familiar with how this was done and she will explore how this might be done creatively in this case if necessary. She wanted to assert that the Dean of this college is committed to a diverse faculty. Hutchinson thought if faculty were upset, they should work with their department to rectify the problems.

28. Adjourn. [4:31:20]

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary