

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
Thursday, May 2, 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 (Hart), Altfeld, Boyd, Connolly, Day, Ferrari, Ford, Gruber, Hart, Herman, Hidalgo (Paiva), Horst, Hostetter-Lewis, Hutchinson, Kaiser, Kim, Livingston, McConkey, Mitchell-Brown, Paiva, Peterson, Pittman, Sharma (Akinwande), Shepherd (Ferrari), Sistrunk, Sudick, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Underwood, Watkins, Wyrick (Chair), Zartman

ABSENT: Boura, Lang

Wyrick called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. [3:57-4:28]

1. Approve Minutes of April 25, 2019 [4:28-4:31]

No Minutes.

2. Approve Agenda. [4:31-4:40]

Agenda was approved.

3. Statewide Academic Senate Report – Ford/ Boyd [4:40-21:44]

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

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

Boyd and Ford described highlights of activity by the ASCSU since the last report of the March plenary meeting.

- The Senate nominee for faculty representative to the Board of Trustees were sent to the Governor (John Trajan and Romey Sabalius)
- The Board of Trustees was presented the concept of the requirement of a fourth year of quantitative reasoning. Subsequent to this the Admission and Advisory Council discussed rolling out this requirement, and they were sensitive to questions of equity and

the challenges of schools who cannot offer a fourth year for different reasons. The roll out date looks like it might be 2025.

Hutchinson asked how schools with less resources will be able to accomplish this by 2025? She wondered if the legislature would need to come forward with any type of funding for these schools. Ford said an inventory of how many there are needs to be completed and the next step would be to figure out how the 4th year requirement could fit in several different areas.

The Quantitative Reasoning Center is supposed to help develop these possibilities and remain flexible about the types of courses that could fulfill this requirement.

Ford said it probably will not come up as an action item to the Board of Trustees until next September.

Kaiser pointed out that surveys of California K-12 issues rarely go north of Sacramento and they miss our small schools, native populations and number of qualified teachers.

- Boyd pointed out how to read the ASCSU resolutions and reports. The plenary resolutions are primarily what happens at the full senate meetings. The website provides further guidance of activities and the organization of the senate.
- Several resolutions address legislation passing through the State Assembly
- The Math Council and English Councils passed resolutions asking for flexibility about implementing Early Start programs on campuses to “opt in” or “opt out” and the Chancellor’s Office has replied “no” to these
- Ferrari noted that it is very hard to find information on the Chancellor’s and ASCSU’s website. She said there should be a search tab
- Boyd spoke about the General Education Taskforce Report which she said was given to the ASCSU as an overview and general characterization of recommendations. Almost unanimous word from the campuses is that this is a “no go” – a majority of the campuses are not in favor of these changes.

ASCSU Chair Nelson reported to the Board of Trustees and a report was sent to the ASCSU plenary. The taskforce said their report was intended to be a draft for conversation. Two resolutions came to the ASCSU:

1. Accept the Report (receive it)
2. Reject the Report (not even receive it)

The committees that brought these resolutions forward were asked to meet and combine their efforts. Our campus sent a clear resolution to reject (or not receive) the report, draft or not.

The combined resolution will be brought forward at the May plenary meeting in two weeks.

Boyd said that the Taskforce that wrote the draft GE report had concluded that they

probably should have disbanded after EO 1100 was issued without adequate faculty input. She said there is still some confusion about whether it is necessary to receive a report before it is rejected and there is different opinion about this "technical" issue.

- The state-wide senators need input about the Master Plan for Education in the State of California. This plan says 33% of graduating seniors in the state of California who apply are eligible for enrollment in the CSU. The latest assessment shows that 41% are eligible and ASCSU and the Board of Trustees are looking at this difference. There will probably be a survey to get our feedback on this.
- Related to this, the Board of Trustees asked for a 5% enrollment increase from the Governor. The CSU has budgeted for a 2% enrollment growth, and Chico has already allocated for a 1.5% enrollment growth. The Enrollment Management Committee has voted to lobby for funding of a full 2%.
- Fall data has been given to the ASCSU about the impact of EO 1110 and original impression is that 1000's of Freshman will be completing their GE requirements at least a semester sooner
- The Chancellor's Office has responded to all of the resolutions passed by the ASCSU (link above).

Wyrick reported that Catherine Nelson, Chair of the ASCSU, will visit our Senate next week.

4. Annual Reports

- University Technology Advisory Committee (Kim Jaxon) [22:06-25:37]
Kim Jaxon, English Department, Chair of UTAC, offered to answer questions about the report. She noted that the committee is fairly large and made up mostly of IT staff.

They are charged to think broadly about technology questions and get in the weeds about technical questions like Desktop security, wireless access, data retention, etc.

She said that this year a lot of time was devoted to composing a new policy about digital learning to replace the older Policy for Online Education. This is an attempt to honor the fact that probably every course in the university has some digital tech component. She said they are trying to make students aware of the kind of courses they are signing up for as well.

Kaiser asked about the problem of intellectual property protection of faculty and student work from commercial websites posting course material and work online without permission. Kim Jaxon said the policy on digital learning would try to present language that would give people a sense of control over their materials. This should be ready in the Fall.

- Faculty Recognition and Support Committee (Jinsong Zhang) [25:49-27:04]
Jinsong Zhang, Chemistry Department, Chair of FRAS, reported that the presentations of the various Outstanding Faculty awards by the President and Provost and other cabinet and faculty in the classrooms was a great success. The posters commemorating the awards were wonderful.

She reminded senators that two new awards will be offered next year (these will be in an action item today).

She offered to answer questions.

- [Service Learning Committee](#) (Susan Roll) [27:08-27:27]
Susan Roll, School of Social Work, Director of Civic Engagement, offered to answer questions about the report.

5. [Proposed Revisions to EM 18-005: General Education Program](#) – EPPC – Action Item [27:28-2:11:57]

- [Proposed Substitute Document](#)
- [Summary of Changes of the Proposed Substitute](#)
- [Additional Amendments Proposed Substitute](#)

Wyrick explained that this EM had already been discussed as an Action item and so he opened the floor to discussion. The Chair experimented with having Traci Stumbaugh edit the documents being considered on the overhead screens while they are being discussed.

It was moved that the substitute document be considered and not the document from last week. Paiva described the changes made in the substitute document:

1. Editorial changes on pp. 3-4
2. Clarification: addition of “GE Curriculum” to lower- and upper-division section titles on pp. 4-5
3. Clarification: description of Interdisciplinary GE minors added on p. 6
4. Clarification: explanation of status of courses that are not part of the GE Minor on p. 6
5. Clarification: statement that significant changes to GE Minors will go through normal curriculum process of EPPC and Senate approval on p. 6
6. Clarification: process of recommendation for new GE course proposals (under Curriculum Oversight) on p. 10
 - a. Academic Advising added to consultation
 - b. College deans have a more explicit and proactive role
 - c. “Programmatic needs” (e.g. USD) added to “historical and projected student demand”
 - d. The calls for new courses and changes will be maintained on the GE website
7. Clarification: maintenance of status of current courses in GE confirmed on p. 11

Substitute document accepted.

Sistrunk noted that our students have led efforts to recognize that we are in a period of climate emergency, and they have called for university courses to articulate this through a widely supported student referendum. He hoped we could add a sixth GE [Program Learning Outcome](#) on page 2 to promote this kind of awareness, since unlike values, PLOs are supposed to be marked by concrete demonstrations of knowledge and activity:

“Sustainability” – Demonstrate the capacity to recognize the imperative of maintaining the long term viability and stability of the natural world while embracing a systems approach to human efforts to balance environmental responsibility, social justice, economic feasibility, and cultural diversity.”

Objections to this included:

- We want our PLO's to correspond to the five WASC PLO's
- We had some problems reconciling our complex learning outcomes in the older EM with the WASC outcomes
- It seems impossible to assess this PLO
- This should remain a value not a PLO
- You can't measure the skill of diversity every three but you can make exposure intentional and active so that students get it
- The list of values have much broader and more significant goals than the PLOs
- If this is added to the graduation requirements it will add units
- CAB received instructions from the Provost not to add additional graduation requirements at this time
- We do have Green leaf courses on this campus and we already accommodate sustainability across our curriculum

Counter arguments included:

- Programs are not prohibited from adding to the five WASC PLOs
- We are not limited to five WASC PLOs, but these are supposed to be regularly assessed, measurable and streamlined with curriculum so that every single student is supposed to take a class to meet these learning objectives
- Our students should be coming out of our classes with a sense of social justice, cultural diversity and sustainability so that are students are practicing these in a way that we can assess their learning, or we are not walking the talk
- This is a response to the urgency of our circumstances
- It seems tragic that we can measure how much oil is coming out of the ground and how much money it is worth, but we can't see the systems in front of us that are causing our emergency
- This does not denigrate the value of the other values
- Why not treat sustainability like we treat the *Diversity Graduation Requirement* on page 7
- Is there currently a place that requires all students to take sustainability courses?
- 84% of the students just voted that sustainability should be imbedded in classes at Chico State, not necessarily by creating new classes

This motion did not pass.

Kaiser moved to add the word “social” to the list of perspectives that will create breadth in GE since it is an area “C” topic (page 1)

Motion passed.

Sign Language is recognized as a type of oral communication. Accessibility services can help students with a variety of modes of communication and reasonable accommodation depending on their needs to fulfill this requirement.

Ferrari moved to change page three, sentence 2: "PLOs are assessed within a ~~three~~ five-year period."

She said this will allow CAB to assess these easily on a five-year cycle.

Motion passed.

Ford moved to add a line at the very beginning of page 3: "The mix of approved GE courses shall fully cover these five areas."

He thought this would make sure information literacy is covered as it is not mentioned elsewhere. It also insures that these are all covered in upper and lower division courses

Motion passed.

Gruber moved to add language to the third sentence of the Mission statement, page 1: "the education necessary for success as a civically and globally engaged individual, and as a lifelong learner."

Motion passed.

Ferrari move that the first line on page 6 should read: "Upper-division Pathways should ~~must~~ include all GE learning outcomes, all"

She thought "should" is more flexible than "must" and this might be important later.

Motion passed

Boyd moved that page 9, under the section defining committee membership, bullet two, should read: "Pathway Coordinators, non-voting, receive release time...."

And bullet three should read:

"One member selected by the Academic Senate's Educational Policies and Programs Committee (EPPC), non-voting, who shall...."

She said that as the College of Agriculture representative and an at-Large Senator she wanted to ensure that CAB adequately represents their constituent base. She noted that the largest number of Pathway Coordinators come from one college and the next largest number come from only a second college which dilutes the vote of the students and the faculty representatives from each of the colleges and the Library. Of the 18 Pathway coordinators and college reps. currently voting, 8 come from one college.

The EPPC member is supposed to report back to the Standing committee and does their voting about the curriculum in EPPC itself.

Altfeld explained that the high representation of the college of HFA on CAB is not always the case. She did not understand why Coordinators, who put in an extensive amount of time, should not be allowed to vote. She noted that the two colleges with the highest representation on CAB have the highest stake in GE. The positions are open to everyone and provide needed representation from the faculty who teach the courses of the pathways.

Kaiser moved to divide the questions. Passed

Boyd pointed out that the release time given to Pathway coordinators might be seen to create a conflict of interest in their management of GE. She was also seeking to balance this.

Holly Nevarez, Chair, Public Health and Health Services Administration, reported that teachers in the Pathways have told her they have never been contacted by Coordinators and this undermines why they need to vote since they are not really representing their faculty.

Jason Nice, History Department, Chair of CAB said that Pathway coordinators are elected by the departments teaching in the Pathway and since $\frac{3}{4}$ of the courses come from HFA and BSS, this explains the current composition of CAB. He pointed out that if the Pathways are changed to only upper division courses as this measure proposes, then the composition of CAB will change.

Ferrari noted that there are CAB by-laws that might be changed to make the process broader without taking coordinator voting rights away. It could be that the entire campus could vote on coordinators instead of just the departments, for example.

Ford said that legitimate and acceptable courses coming to CAB are being rejected because of the problematic make-up and one-sided nature of the membership. Promises that CAB will not be one-sided in the future are less sure than passing this provision now. He has specific cases to prove this assertion.

Question one: define Pathway coordinator as non-voting did not pass.

Question two: define the EPPC representative as non-voting passed.

Sistrunk proffered some suggested language to replace the definition of the GE Value of *Sustainability* on page 1:

“Being an engaged member of society informed by a systems approach to balancing environmental responsibility, social justice, economic feasibility and cultural diversity.”

Sistrunk explained that “a systematic approach” to these issues is a description of thinking or acting about them and not a focus on the systems themselves that impact and create them.

Motion passed.

Ford pointed out that there are still questions about whether this new EM sustains the structure of

D1 and D2 in GE defined in the old EM. The new EM will allow students to take two D1's or two D2's to get their D requirements met. The language does not require them to take one course from one area and one from the other.

Charlene Armitage, Assistant Registrar, said that was true but that it included both upper and lower division courses in Area D. The Provost said that this language does not prohibit us from implementing a system of requiring D1 and D2, it just does not require it. We will need to work through the details next semester and will need to trust what CAB will come up with. She thought the intentions of this campus are to preserve the D1 and D2 distinctions.

Ford pointed out that the specific language that requires one separate class from Humanities (Individual and Society) and one from the Social Sciences (Societal Institutions) (on page 5, 3rd paragraph) has been deleted and there is no substitute in place right now. This is not his personal concern, but we should be clear about what we are doing.

Larson asked Jason Nice why that particular phrase about (Individual and Society) and (Societal Institutions) was taken out and if there were some compromise that can be made here? Jason Nice deferred to Kate McCarthy, Dean of Undergraduate Education, who reported that according to the Chancellor's Office our local implementation of area D by subdividing it, is out of compliance. There has been resistance to that reading of the EO 1100, but when CAB was considering this passage the effort was to create a document that was silent on "sub-areas." This also happened with area C, the mandated subdivisions are not there either.

Boyd noted that in the future it could be that if we are more restrictive than our EM allows, we could be out of compliance with it.

She also pointed out that there is great debate ongoing across the CSUs about the implementation of EO 1100 and especially about the interpretations of this particular AVC about it. Although we need to recognize that our President must follow Chancellor's Office directives, the language of this current EM does not guarantee any separation of course requirements. If the motivation is because of one person's interpretation at the CO, then that is concerning because our changes here should be based on our faculties' desires. Faculty manage the curriculum.

Larson did not agree that if we are more restrictive in practice than our EM provides, we can do that as long as we are not out of compliance with the EO. She thought this gave us a pathway forward.

Ford said that it is the position of the CO that we cannot be more restrictive than their language in the EO. This is what is causing this conversation. Ford thought we should decide right now whether we want D1 and D2 to be part of our GE design.

Sistrunk said "yes" for D1 and D2. He agreed with Ford that there has been confusing reporting from CAB about what this new EM requires since he had asked whether these particular sub-areas were disappearing and received different answers. It needs to be said now that we will constitute these sub-categories again.

Jason Nice reported that an intense compromise had been worked out with BSS about these sub-categories a few months ago. He said he had much work to do to get his colleagues to trust in the process. His intention was not to pick a fight with BSS that had strong views about maintaining the categories of D1 and D2 unless directed by the Chancellor's Office and agreed to by all the layers of administration. Jason Nice said he did not want to bring this back to senate to fix this one issue.

McConkey asked if the paragraph on pages 4-5 listing the lower division categories for all the GE areas under EO1100 would serve since they all have area 1,2 and 3, etc. Wyrick clarified that EO 1100 does not recognize our local subareas D1 and D2.

Charlene Armitage, Assistant Registrar, offered some data about our transfer student population that Ferrari asked her to share. She said that in any given year about 45-47% of our students on this campus were admitted as upper division transfer students. Students taking courses at a Community College to transfer are not held to subareas D1 and D2. We do not require them to take such specific courses (only anything in area D).

Ford asked since EO 1100 requires student select two different courses from area D, what would the Registrar's office have to do to implement the change to still only allow one discipline area? Charlene Armitage answered that there is a "limit line" in the degree progress report that does not allow a student to satisfy their requirements by taking all political science for area courses. They could reconstitute this service if we decided to take away the sub-area. This is true only for the lower division classes.

Sistrunk moved to add language to the last paragraph on page six that ends on page 7 under section: Management of Upper Division Pathways and GE Minors (seconded):

"Pathway faculty ~~will~~ should be supported ~~financially~~ as they consult with Pathway coordinators, CAB, and each other to create Pathway integrity, determine coherent course learning objectives and their measurement, promote intellectual development and communicate to strengthen interdisciplinary innovation."

Sistrunk hoped this would direct our interests to concrete faculty support beyond the money spent in the past to evaluate GE goals so generally (like Writing, etc.) outside specific context. This is answering the question "how to maintain pathway integrity?"

Hutchinson wanted to object that this could tell us where to spend faculty development money. Larson did not think every faculty member in the Pathways should be getting additional compensation for teaching a class they are already getting paid for.

Ford offered an amendment to change "~~will~~" to "should" and strike the word "~~financially~~".
Seconded.

Zartman spoke in support of the amended measure because we have moved so far from the coherence of the pathways originally envisioned when they were created. The value-added of this model was the cohesion within the minors. This is additional support though it is not really

constant, but initial to get the pathway underway and into coherence. Even if it is not financial support, this is a way to get back to the intent of this aspect of the model.

Amended amendment. Passed.

Ann wanted to add language to explain who will consult. Boyd suggested adding after the word consult “with Pathway coordinators, CAB and each other” to promote consultation. Passed.

Sistrunk asked if the line saying that every department that has a course in the pathway should vote for Pathway coordinators should be struck because departments don’t really understand what the Pathway SLO’s are. No one seconded this.

The complete amended motion passed.

Zartman wanted to comment for the record that this EM was passed on trust. This is so important going forward because we have a balance in the academy here within GE. Going forward, this balance should be honored and respected and listened to as this document is actualized. If not, there will be wounds that will last. The implementation and consultation must be collaborative.

Action Item passed.

Jason Nice was recognized for all of his effort in bringing the EM forward.

14. University Report (Larson) [2:11:58-2:45:03]

Wyrick reported that he had received a request to move part of item 14. The University Report earlier because of a time conflict.

- **Research Foundation/Research & Sponsored Programs Organization (Larson)**
[Link to power point](#)

Larson thanked the senate for moving her report forward on the agenda.

[Slide 1] She presented some slides with ideas around sponsored opportunities which we typically associate with the RF and RESP.

[Slide 2] The RESP helps with program development, contracts and grant development and RF that helps with accounts receivable and accounts payable, etc. to help those who receive grants. We have a support organization that we have outgrown because we have greater needs and greater interests in the goals of this organization.

[Slides 3 and 4] A classic way to demonstrate this is by viewing the two organizational charts of these entities that show that we do not have an organization that fits our needs today. [Slide 3] shows the organizational structure of the older RESP whose logic is hard to understand. [Slide 4] shows the organizational structure of the RF.

These two organizations are intimately involved in a continuum of work that starts with the

development and identification of proposals through implementation and the close-out of a project. Yet, they are distinctly different with distinctly different missions with organizational charts that one would be unable to place together.

[Slide 5] shows the basic process (without all the details) of developing grants, submitting grants and negotiating and accepting them. This is called the Pre-award phase. The second phase of implementation billing and invoicing is called the Post Award phase. Mixed into this Post-Award phase the RF provides HR and other services. This is actually a fairly simple process. We have evolved and grown a process over time that demands a reengineering because we don't know what we are doing.

[Slide 6] The Provost said she has been working on this problem for a very long time. She has long heard concerns and issues and hopes that we have for this research environment, and the desire to support entrepreneurial activity that we can participate in.

Much has already been accomplished by the staff working in these organizations. [Slide 7] There have been many assessments of the program over the years. The first she knew about was in 2009. Some were related to RESP and others to RF. No assessments were done over the entire process putting them together although both organizations are part of a single continuum. The personnel are hardworking and dedicated, but it is time for us to do something different.

[Slide 8] We need a common vision and common goals. We need a lean process and development. We need to attend to the personnel needs and help people have role definition so people understand where they are within the process. They need visible connection to the campus and better information and education about being a grant maker and everything that means for responsibilities and opportunities.

Our current process is driven by compliance, accounting and administration rather than an organization that needs to be focused on development. We need to focus on the front end. It is important for us to be compliant and attentive to risk, but the tail is wagging the dog. We need a common vision.

[Slide 10] Our RF is a separate a 501(c)3. It is where we hold all of our non-state activity and our entrepreneurial activity. She proposed that we change the RF name to Chico State Enterprise and merge everything into one organization. The folks formally part of the RESP and those part of the RF become part of CSE. She hopes the current employees will be interested in filling out the grey box and help to design what is happening inside that box.

She would like to have a CEO, if you will, of the Enterprise that is supervising all of this. She wants to be able to draw everybody into one org. chart. She hopes teams of staff members support the column on the left. This will give a clear idea of the opportunity maker as it relates to the work of the service organization. This column illustrates opportunities, but also the many responsibilities of someone who gets a grant and is a PI. The provost is supposed to support this work so we can continue to do the great work.

She wants to create the head of this organization who would be an enterprise employee. This person is currently called a Vice Provost for Research but could be called the CEO. She proposes to start working on these changes as soon as possible. This will start with a search for a CEO that would report to the Provost as the President of the 501(c) 3. She has the primary responsibility for this organization. As head of Academic Affairs, she is vested in having a process that works for everyone. The CEO will report to the VP of Business and Finance and the Board.

[Slide 11] articulates the goals of the organization:

The PIs are the customers served by teams

She wants to reduce administrative costs and increase sponsored work to drive more F & A back to the campus. She hopes by generating more indirect for our campus we can start generating more for our equipment, laboratories and travel which is what everyone else does in the modern university. This is how the work of a faculty and equipment is moving in higher education as we build this important infrastructure.

This will result in the employees working in 2535 Main becoming happier, confident, knowledgeable, and empowered because they are working together on a common mission and vision.

Kaiser thought our current organization was awkward. In the past it was said that you can't get a grant if you don't give the foundation a cut. There are grants that are system based that don't allow this. There have also been issues in the past where the Board was not being open and transparent. She hoped this would be a critical consideration. Larson said all those things are happening, the public is invited to the Board. We have strengthened the communications and the Board has a much greater knowledge about what their job is.

The question about F&A is a perennial question for any research organization in the United States, they need to support the very important grants that bring in support for the grants that do not make enough to support themselves. There are creative things we could do to support those grants (like write staff support into them).

Zartman said it appeared to him that there are fewer personnel working now with \$30M than there were when RF had \$10M. Fewer people are working harder, which brings up the question, what does it mean that the organization become lean. Larson said "lean" does not mean that the organization becomes smaller but it is terminology that refers to process design, systems design where we have mapped the process and every step in the process adds value.

Our staff at 2535 have been compromised by a lack of investment in technology and we must struggle with implementation of new software. We are on the verge of purchasing a Pre-Approve software that will replace the paperwork, triplicates and carbon that confound our processes now.

Boyd asked if we could link the slides to the agenda? She asked if instead of having an AVP as a stateside position we will have a CEO of a 501(c)3 but the board retains many members of cabinet. She asked if she had missed the timeline on this?

Larson said she would love to be able to start a search for a CEO soon. She said we are working right now to develop a job description. She might be able to find an interim to serve in this role. They may also hire a consultant to help finish the merge and help to define the process and the software. The CEO could help reimagine the organization is the milestone to accomplish to actually start the timeline.

Boyd asked if Larson was collecting feedback on this as she went forward, how can faculty give feedback? Larson said that how however we would like to give feedback we could. Boyd asked if there were menus or any sites, and Larson said time is getting too short for this towards the end of the semester. She said she will publish the power point but that there are a few slides that she wants hidden and moved from the version that is here right now.

Boyd asked if there will be a RF Board meeting that faculty can attend soon and give comments and Larson said there will be in June, but she does not know the exact date.

Stephanie Bianco, Director for Healthy Communities noted that the PIs of a great deal of funding have a vested interest in what happens and asked to have an avenue to give feedback before any decisions are made because they had a lot of insight about the day to day activity of RESP. She noted how significant her center was to support staff and the university and the necessity that the F&A rates remain stable. She wanted to be included in the conversations.

Larson said that we had the ability to develop our opportunities which will build opportunities for the larger University. The current organizational structure is not set up to nurture momentum for development. She did not feel ready to reveal all her designs yet, but she wanted to move ahead and maybe recruit faculty who are already here to help search for a CEO.

Zartman noted that there are a number of constituencies who have not had input into the processes going on. There are many who were, but many who were not. Larson thought she had heard the basic points. She had not presented all of her information because it was not all pleasant. But we have an organization of people working very hard. It is better to focus on the reframing the organization to change it. She did not want to do a public laundry of all the findings since many of them were not flattering.

Larson said that the F&A circumstances on our campus are unhealthy and to address this we need to lower administrative costs. We have many small F&A grants that we sponsor but we need to find a better balance. We are only bringing in 8% grants but our current cost at 2535 is about 13%.

Boyd noted that all of the Senators in the room are representatives of constituent groups and if it is possible to get the link to the power point of whatever you can post, and we could share this with our constituent groups and come back with feedback by the next Senate meeting on the 9th.

3 minute break: [2:45:03-2:52:29]

6. [Proposed Executive Memorandum: Classroom Recording Policy](#) – FASP – Action Item
[2:52:29-2:59:40]

Pittman noted that this policy is a response to unauthorized recording in the classroom. It is recognized that any faculty member could put this in their syllabus, but this policy will serve across the campus and serve to put teeth in the prohibition. This policy pretty closely parallels the policy of ARC to accommodate documented needs.

Kaiser noted this fit in with system efforts to protect intellectual property and it is timely. Paiva said this is repetitive since California state law already prohibits recording without permission.

Livingston did not think this was the case since those who enforce the Code of Student Conduct and Responsibilities do not think this is the case and they support this policy.

Paiva noted that that she teaches in classes where all the students are recorded without prior warning. It seems unfair that we have the right to record them.

Donze said that students should not have the expectation they will not be recorded as this is a public campus. There does not seem to be an expectation of privacy in the classroom.

Ferrari cited California penal code section 632 only mentions that people cannot record private or confidential communications. This policy broadens the scope.

Pittman noted that this prohibits recording across the university and recording is only allowed with the express permission of the instructor. This also limits how long students can keep recording made for personal use and who they can share them with.

Paiva asked if there were plans to make this kind of policy to protect students and staff and was told it is not but that could be proposed.

Action item passed.

7. Proposed Executive Memorandum: Lecturer Council – FASP – Action Item [2:59:41-3:04:15]

Pittman noted that this notion came from our administration that there be some kind of organized mechanism for Lecturer concerns and issues to be brought to the forefront given that the majority of our faculty are Lecturers. This would be a way for there to be more communication and opportunity for professional development among Lecturers.

Sherman wondered if we wanted to reference the goals mentioned in the first paragraph as the same in the second.

In the second paragraph, third line, the language was altered:
“Committee on progress toward achieving ~~these~~ the aforementioned and other....”

Amendment passed.

Action item passed.

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

Action Item [3:04:16-3:14:32]

Ferrari wondered if the policy was written against the homeless. She thought this could create hostile intent. The second bullet under section B defining violations of acceptable use reads:

“Strong pervasive odors, including those caused by perfume or cologne”

Paiva thought this was an anti-homeless policy. Pittman said this is current library policy now. It could be eliminated.

Donze wanted to add an affirmative statement that said we value homeless people and others.

Zartman said the list was a laundry list that would allow the library staff to make a specific determination to call police help.

Paiva moved to strike the second bullet. Seconded.

Hart said that this was up to the library staff to preserve a certain atmosphere.

There are no representatives from the library to explain the rationale behind this.

Motion to postpone passed.

Action item postponed until the next meeting so that Library representation can explain the policy’s provisions.

9. Proposed Changes to FPPP: Date of Appointment and Review Window – FASP –Action Item [3:14:45-3:24:20]

Boyd moved to postpone this proposed change until next week. Seconded.

She wanted to consult with Evanne O’Donnel about her understanding of whether the policy conforms to the CBA.

Evanne O’Donnel reported that her labor management colleagues in the Chancellor’s Office thought this violated the CBA. They thought the period of review begins on the date of employment. This matches what we said. They thought the provisions of the CBA that allow up to two years of service credit were the way time is added to give a candidate a head start to get to tenure more quickly.

They were confused by the way we defined a summer as a date as he start date. We also wanted to define the period of review from the date of the offer letter. We tried to equalize everyone.

The Dean can negotiate a flexible date to recognize the date of hire if an employee has some accomplishment.

Employment start date is from CBA 12.3. Ford wanted to know where the period of review is

clarified.

Sherman thought you cannot review work done before a person is employed, though she had seen service credit negotiated for up to two years.

Policy postponed until next week.

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

- **Proposed Additional FRAS Awards – FASP – Action Item** [3:24:23-3:33:513]

Wyrick noted that we are in the middle of discussing an amendment moved at the last meeting.

The proposed amendment eliminated language page two, the last bullet. Ferrari reconsidered her motion from last week and rephrased it to say:

“the immediate past winners of...awards are strongly encouraged to serve on the FRAS committee during the academic year following the reception of the award.”

Motion seconded.

Ferrari wanted to move this language to the end of the bullet points and remove the bullet (since the faculty referred to are no longer members of the committee).

Sharp said that Jinsong Zhang, Chair of FRAS, had wanted to make sure the number of committee members were maintained. The winners also brought expertise to the committee. Ferrari thought that we could increase the membership without forcing winners to do service (since some of them are Lecturers).

Pittman liked the language to “strongly encourage”.

Amendment passed.

Action item passed.

11. Proposed Changes to FPPP: Areas of Evaluation – FASP – Action Item [3:33:13-3:44:24]

Pittman explained that this measure conflated the fourth area of evaluation asking for comment on contributions to the strategic plans and goals of the university and combining that area with the third area about Service. This fourth area was generally ignored or the third area was repeated in people’s RTP files. This combination would allow people to say they performed service for the college and the department and focusing more broadly on the university’s goals.

Boyd explained that this policy found every passage in which contributions to the strategic plans and goals are mentioned and combined them with area three references to service in general. The passages are spread across many ranks that touch on areas of evaluation.

She pointed out that some people thought that all service should in some way reflect on the strategic goals and priorities of the university. The language also widens service to explicitly

include service to the local, national or international community. This recognizes civic engagement and not just committee service.

Evanne O'Donnell said that the Chancellor's office worried that including the recognition of the service of temporary faculty might imply that they are required to do it. The language should be voluntary.

Boyd moved to change the first line at the top of page two to "The report ~~shall~~ should acknowledge other activities...."

Motion passed

Strike word: "result in a-positive"

Action Item passed.

12. Proposed Changes to FPPP 9.1.2.c.2: Service Policy for Lecturers – FASP – Action Item [3:44:24-3:46:26]

Action item passed.

13. Proposed Changes to EM 06-084: Policy on Information Technology Governance – FASP – Introduction Item [3:46:26-3:55:59]

Ferrari explained that the changes to this policy came from a charge from EC to look at issues about software purchases. One of the key changes is the reporting structure. UTAC will now report to ITAC to be consistent with the way Senate committee work.

The process by which UTAC makes recommendations to ITAC about software is described in paragraph two on page two. There was much consultation about this paragraph to verify the references.

The membership titles were updated and corrected throughout the policy.

Wyrick suggested that ITEC should be spelled out the first time it is referred to.

Sistrunk explained how the template should be utilized.

Sherman asked how attempts to standardize purchasing of software across the CSU or regionally in the state are growing. How would these be recognized in this policy? Ferrari said the link to the Integrated Administrative Manual (at the top of page two) is one reference to CSU level considerations. Sherman was unsure if this reference would suffice since it is not always updated. Brooke said that Accessible Technologies were often not referenced in the Integrated Administration Manual. Some of the changes might be refined net time.

Boyd asked if the second paragraph should be redlined.

Introduction item Passed.

14. University Report – Hutchinson

none

15. Associated Students Report – Sharma/Akinwande

none

16. Staff Council Report - Peterson

none

**17. Kathy Kaiser Academic Senate Service Award – nominations close My 10, 2019 –
Information Item**

18. Ask the Administrator [3:56:30-3:58:30]

Wyrick noted that Sherman was available and asked if there were questions.

Paiva wanted to know what was happening with student housing efforts. Sherman said that Dan Herbert's efforts continued

Ford asked if we had enrollment figure yet. Sherman did not have them..

19. Announcements. [3:58:30-4:00:25]

Ferrari invited everyone Tuesday May 7 at 6:00 to Ayres 106 there will be a screening of a documentary "Unsheltered" about local student homelessness.

20. Other.

None

21. Adjourn. [4:00:25]

Meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Sistrunk, Secretary