



---

**M E M O R A N D U M**

---

TO: ACADEMIC SENATORS

FROM: Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary

SUBJ: **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

DATE: Thursday, March 3, 2022, 2:30 p.m.  
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/81231074627?pwd=ZWFzZVpKVENOY2pEb0drdC8vaE43dz09>  
Meeting ID: 812 3107 4627 Passcode: 761594

---

PRESENT: Adamian, Allen, Bailey, Boyd, Boura, Burk, Cline, Ferrari, Ford, Gray, Hidalgo (Sparks), Jenkins, Kaiser, Kralj, Larson, Lawrence, McBride-Praetorius, McKee, Medic, Millard, Miller M., Monet, Musvosvi, Newell, O'Conner, Ormond, Paiva (Chair), Peterson, Rios, Seipel, Sherman N., Sistrunk, Snyder, Son, Trailer, Walter, and Young.

ABSENT: Buffardi, Geier, Hutchinson, Irish, Miller A., and Sherman A..

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 2:34 pm. Announced item #9 was changed from pdf file to Word document with available comments.

1. Approve Minutes of [February 10, 2022](#)  
Minutes from February 10<sup>th</sup> approved.

2. Approve Agenda

Motion made to amend agenda and add resolution Call for Assessment of Title IX Practices as an introduction item under new item 18. Second. This is a statewide issue and response to resignation of a Chancellor, Title IX. Four other campuses passed resolutions calling on legislature to examine Title IX practices and processes.

Support was shared for this resolution.

Question: what processes were done? Did this item go through FASP or EPPC before coming to the Senate? Answer: Resolutions do not require full Senate approval to be introduced here. In the past campus passed support for Palestinians, students, many social justice changes. This is a legitimate process. Resolutions do not have to come from a Standing Committee, it can come directly to the Academic Senate.

Concern was shared that with long agenda, this item may not have enough time to properly discuss it and respond to it adequately.

Motion was made to amend the amendment and place resolution as an item 4. Second. This would prioritize the item as highly as this resolution was intended to be prioritized.

Senators voted, 32 in favor, no opposition, motion passed. Resolution will be added as a new item 4. No other changes. Agenda approved.

### 3. Announcements

- a. FDEV shared a new podcast on supporting faculty of research. The Friday forum on March, 25<sup>th</sup> will be about interdisciplinary research opportunities.
- b. Department of Music and Theater will be presenting live theatre on campus. At Wismer Theater exciting new production of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet will be played now through next Friday.
- c. Student research competition will be held virtually via zoom at 5 pm. Participants across the campus, multiple colleges, many departments sharing their research projects and results of those projects.
- d. The College Senator election will be happening in March. Colleges should be sending out emails for election and nominations. Reach out to your dean if you're interested in serving starting in fall as an Academic Senator.
- e. UBC meeting will be held tomorrow at 8 am via zoom.
- f. Board meeting of Chico Unified will held a meeting to discuss the choice of the mapping for elections for the school board on March 9<sup>th</sup>. Masking requirement in the State of California will end on March 11<sup>th</sup> at midnight. However, any student, teacher or staff member that wants to continue wearing a mask can do so on any of school district sites.

Question: did the campus made any similar statements about when masking will be or at least become optional during public presentations? Answer: president addressed this during the State of the University address. Provost Larson shared President Hutchinson's message that campus will continue with face covering policy and will evaluate the data, assess situation after the spring break and will update campus community on any changes. The CDC site does indicate Butte County is the high risk county, expectation is this risk level will change. Butte County Health Department is updating data twice a week, on Mondays and Thursdays.

### 4. Resolution [Call for Assessment of Title IX Practices](#) – Introduction item

Resolution the CSU Chico Academic Senate call for assessment of practices and subsequent institutional culture and policy change surrounding sexual harassment and discrimination will be presented. Chair Paiva emailed resolution yesterday to all senators.

Item introduction:

- a. Chancellor's resignation impacted CSU system, his mismanagement of the Title IX and additional problems at the University of Fresno can be found in news links within resolution.
- b. There is a culture among administrators across the CSU that fail to take Title IX matters seriously.

- c. We have national, institutional, and systemic changes that need to occur. This provides an opportunity to speak up for many victims in many different places, not just the CSU.
- d. This resolution is about trying to construct something that helps the CSU become a leader out of this incident, to potentially flip the mindset from protecting against lawsuits or abusers and try to protect those that have been abused or are victims and survivors.
- e. Another reason for this resolution is to be able to represent campus at the statewide level as well where these resolutions will be shared.
- f. Chico State is behind in responding to the title IX controversy, which also provides time to make a measured response.

Discussion and comments:

- a. Example shared: At the University of Michigan both administrators and coaches are aware of physical and sexual abuses, and violence against students, however, these are not publicly shared. Support shared toward this resolution as a positive was to be a leader and not a reactor to sexual harassment, especially the one involving students.
- b. Important to have a response from Title IX administrators.
- c. Support, acknowledgement, and appreciation for working on this resolution was shared.
- d. Report was written as a response to news reporting on Chancellor. It has been suggested to consider using preventative versus active measures after something occurred. To provide more facts and evidence for some broad and general statements. Resolution can be more strengthened.

Questions: What does it mean “the resolution on the Senate support staffing of the Title IX office with professional personnel that are independent of labor”? How does Title IX works? Answer: senators that worked on this resolution are in no way trying to say anything about current staffing here at Chico State. There is an awareness that across the system there is no adequate support for Title IX officers to do their work.

- e. The resolution included the resolve that said “the Academic Senate calls on the legislature and the governor to conduct an independent investigation and audit all tightened with Title IX governance enforcement investigation, and other activities in the CSU.” Concern was made this may slow the work on already widely understaffed and underfunded Title IX offices, and ability to appropriately respond.
- f. Support was shared for us to be leaders in these changes. Rewriting some statements can strengthen resolution.
- g. Quote shared “the system works as designed; it is designed as intended”.
- h. Disagreement shared about the notion that accountability through audits will slow down a system that by the measurable and available evidence is not designed to support those complainants.
- i. The second statement “recognizing that institutional structures, prioritize risk management over the protection of those who they protect”. Historically institutions use policy documents

and other documents such as these resolutions as evidence to support that their systems are in fact working, even if the evidence suggests otherwise. It has been suggested to add resolve clause indicating that the faculty do not support the use of this resolution as a tool for silencing survivors.

- j. It was asked that if anyone has suggestion on practices about Title IX without calling for an audit, these can be shared.
- k. In our system, restrictions are placed by CBA, article 11 that states that we are not allowed to take any action against faculty, unless it is in the PAF.
  - i. In context of Title IX, if a student complains about faculty member, student has to be identified, this has to be in the PAF before any action can be taken against that faculty member to protect the faculty member's due process rights.
  - ii. Third resolution says, "the Senate calls to prioritize accountability for the acts of sexual harassment and gender discrimination, and the protection of faculty, staff and students from sexual harassment and gender harassment, over risk management and the protection of the reputation of perpetrators."
  - iii. If audit was done and it is determined that Title IX proceedings are not allowed unless named witness and signed statement is present, would Senate accept this or consider as too protective towards perpetrators?
- l. Due process is important, that is the law and this need to be respected. Statement above (k.) does not apply as third resolve does specify victims (students, faculty) over risk management and protection of perpetrators.
- m. Admiration and appreciation towards the resolution, its intent, and preventative methods was shared, and that it supports students.
- n. Sixth resolve mentions "victim as whole" and that section can be part of those previously mentioned preventative measures by referring to it as restorative type of justice.
- o. Resolution covers systemic problems. Title IX covers systemic problem of gender, sexual violence that has gone for a long time. Comment was shared that perhaps Title IX doesn't have a power to fix these problems.
- p. Suggestion made to include preventative measures like supporting safe place and victim advocates, their role within the system.
- q. It has been stated that the systemic change should include what happens at early stage, and not necessarily only at the end.
- r. Suggestion not to use word "citizen" in sixth whereas, and to substitute it with people or faculty, staff, students.
- s. Second resolve ask Senate to examine staffing and financial support. It is suggested to clarify if this examination should be done at Chico State, or the CSU system, and to specify to whom recommendation should be made after the examination.
- t. Suggestion to break sixth resolve into two separate clauses for clarity of that statement. In addition, to consider another word other than sweetheart deals to clarify if these are secret deals, illicit deals, official deals.

- u. Last resolve includes The Press Enterprise which is in the Riverside County. Suggestion to use more specific name or location.
- v. It was suggested that name CSU, Chico should be replaced with official name Chico State, and that title uses the complete name “California State University Chico”.

Question: considering that this was not a committee work, who will work on suggested revisions?

Answer: Senators that prepared this resolution were Senator Boyd, Senator Ford, Senator Sistrunk, and Senator Medic. If this passes, they confirmed they will work on revisions and invited others interested to collaborate.

Senators voted. 30 votes yes, 1 no. Resolution as an introduction item passes and will be presented at the next Senate meeting as an action item on March 24<sup>th</sup>. Senators were encouraged to email comments to above mentioned senators. Invited others to join them if interested in working on this resolution and its revisions.

#### 5. University Reports – Hutchinson/Larson/Sherman/Boura/Rios

##### Provost Larson:

- a. Provost Larson will include President Hutchinson’s report.
- b. President’s State of the Union Address was shared today with campus community.
  - i. Included messages from student being back in person, president’s budget information (Governor’s proposal, Chico State budget), student enrollment, and equity gap progress.
- c. New Vice President of Information Technology and CIO Dr. Monique Sendze starts her role on March 7<sup>th</sup>.
- d. EMEDC started the Vice President for the Student Affairs search, expect finalists in April and position to start in Fall 2022.
- e. There were 10 reported COVID cases. Booster clinic was successful.
- f. 90 % (around 11,000 students) submitted booster information by the CSUC February 28 deadline. 75 % of employees submitted proof of booster shot information. Others will do weekly testing.
- g. PMT is working with booster non-eligible students and those that have not submitted information yet.
- h. Require masking policy will continue on campus; evaluate situation after the spring break.
- i. The Glenn Kendall Public Service Award has requested nominations for outstanding graduating students. Deadline by March 11<sup>th</sup>.
- j. All campus majors Career Fair is scheduled for March 8<sup>th</sup>.
- k. The Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice organized the panel on the discussion around Ukraine and Russia.

##### VP Rios:

- a. Chico State was recognized as a military friendly school by GI Jobs (13 consecutive years).

- b. Larry Langwell, coordinator of Vet Center and veteran of the United States Air Force who served from 1980 to 1985, shared veterans were awarded credits for military service. It is a federal law for all higher education institutions to examine veterans military service with the intention of providing academic credit.
- c. Veterans have priority class registration, extension admission deadlines for active-duty personnel, not requiring veterans to provide immunization records, and to recognize their unique culture by organizing veteran day events and veteran graduation.
- d. Chico State serves 150 veteran students and 550 dependents. Campus process \$8 million of educational benefits annually.
- e. Campus is working with ARC, the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA hospitals or health providers to provide health and other help to student veterans.
- f. ARC processed around 1,300 student disabilities out of which 9 % are veterans (number doubled since 2020). Disabilities reported are psychological, attention deficit disability, broad category of learning disabilities, chronic health conditions and students on the autism spectrum.
- g. HEERF funds provided to ARC to develop and implement a coaching program for students on the autism spectrum to help them transition from educational area to employment.

Praises shared regarding VP Rios' work on campus and true change he had done. VP Rios will be leaving his position at the end of a year.

#### VP Boura:

- a. Giving Day finished yesterday with over 100 programs participating in this event together with students, alumni, faculty, and staff.
- b. Support given to Chico State Fund, athletic programs, anything related to equity, diversity, and inclusion groups.
- c. Raised over \$337,000 from 2,200 donors from eight different countries. Expectation campus swill pass \$400,000, which will be updated tomorrow morning at the UBC meeting.
- d. Campus fundraising effort this morning is at over \$10.2 million.
- e. Webinar with a topic on cryptocurrency was today. Previous one was on diversity, equity, and inclusion. All webinars are posted online. The various experts in different subjects shared their impact on Chico State students.

#### 6. Associated Students [Report](#) – Young/Lawrence

Lawrence shared AS report:

- a. Discussion on working towards offering a unit to students that are participating in university councils and committees.
- b. On March 4<sup>th</sup> Rick Ford, Statewide Academic Senator, will present information on AB 928 at the Academic Student Senate.
- c. Intent file packages were due on March 4<sup>th</sup> for all students interested to serve on campus. Election will take place on April 6<sup>th</sup>.

7. [Staff Council Report](#) – Peterson

Senator Peterson shared Staff Council report (full report attached to the agenda):

- a. Staff and Faculty Art exhibit is open now to accept items through March 11<sup>th</sup>. Art will be displayed for sale in Kendall Hall from March 18<sup>th</sup> through 29<sup>th</sup> with reception on March 30<sup>th</sup> 3 – 4:30 pm.
- b. Planning other art shows e.g. veteran’s art show, diversity art group.
- c. Tammy Bassi from FMS received Cat’s Caught Being Awesome award for the month of February.

8. Standing Committees Reports

- [Educational Policies and Programs Committee](#) – Kralj
- [Faculty and Student Policies Committee](#) – Sistrunk
- [Committee on Committees](#) – Allen
- [Executive Committee](#) – Medic

Reports attached. No questions.

9. Statewide Academic Senate Report – Ford/Boyd [CSU Academic Senate](#)

- ASCSU [Agendas](#), [Minutes](#), [Resolutions](#), & [Summaries](#)

Statewide Senators Boyd and Ford shared the following:

- a. The Fiscal and Government Affairs committee (Chaired by Boyd) is going into legislative advocacy period. Reach out to Statewide Senator Boyd if you see any new legislation or have any specific position on any legislation.
- b. Both Statewide Senators will have plenary during the spring break in March.
- c. Expectation that there will be a response to Title IX issues seen in the press.
- d. Expectation there will be a discussion on legislative positions, including AB 928 status.
- e. Discussion on implementation of the AB 130 (admissions to the teacher preparation programs).

10. Proposed Amendments to Academic Senate [Constitution](#) – EC Action

Chair Paiva will be presenting this item. Vice Chair Allen will take over the meeting during items 10&11.

- a. Motion made to suspend this item indefinitely to have more time to process the information shared at the last Academic Senate meeting. Email sent to the Executive Committee. Second. Comment made the same motion will be made for item 11 Academic Senate Bylaws.
- b. Chair Paiva shared email with Academic Senators. Senator Ferrari’s email shared below:

“Dear Chair Paiva,

In reading the Senate agenda for March 3 that was sent yesterday, a number of ideas and potential concerns came to mind that I would like to share.

My concerns refer primarily to the feeling that the proposed amendments to the Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws are somehow rushed, or at least feel rushed. Considering that these items come from the Executive Committee, the campus community did not have a chance to discuss them first in the Standing Committees, and were only presented the proposed changes on February 10 as introduction items. Certainly, the Senate Constitution and Bylaws are complex and long documents

that inevitably require Senators to take some time to digest them, fully understand the implications of such changes, and consider the potential need for additional amendments. I am asking to consider moving the approval of amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws later this semester or potentially postpone it until next semester/year, and I am ready to make a motion on Thursday.

I personally plan to either abstain or vote against these amendments if the motion does not pass and these are some of my reasons:

The already mentioned need for more time to digest these amendments and their implications;

Since the pandemic, the Academic Senate's operations and the work of the Chair and officers has involved a great deal of technology. As a consequence, the way officers, Senate Chair, and Standing Committee Chairs operate now entails the use of various digital tools, including academic technologies. I feel the urgency to make sure that this new aspect is mentioned in the documents and that the officers' duties and skills reflect this new need, primarily for their own good. As a matter of fact, the bylaws currently do not include any description of the duties that officers must take on and this is an important addition that should be considered, in my opinion, to clarify what the expectations and time commitment for these positions are;

Speaking as a former Senate Chair, I can attest to how multiple constituents brought up to my attention then, and continue to do now, a perceived "over power" and "over reach" of Senate. As a former Senate Chair, sometimes I experience this first hand. Concerns I have heard include the need to diversify the voices on Senate, including those of officers, and expand the array of faculty that serve in officer positions. I believe this would be a great conversation to have to consider how our Constitution and Byways can ensure such diversification;

Directly related to my previous point is a perceived need for additional transparency in the way Senate chooses its representative on various committees, and again this conversation can contribute greatly to amending the Constitutions and the Bylaws. I believe point 3 and 4 can only be fully addressed if constituents outside of the Academic Senate are invited, early on, to participate in these conversations and potentially join the ad-hoc committee charged with making these amendments. CAB's Chair letter included in the AB 928 feedback material seems to support these concerns. For these reasons, I want to encourage EC to discuss the possibility to delay the discussion of the Senate Constitution and Bylaws and expand the conversation to include a wider pool of constituents and address some of the concerns I list above. This is by no means a critique against the people who have worked diligently on these amendments, but I believe these are important changes that can benefit from more time.

Please feel free to share this correspondence with the rest of the Executive Committee.

Respectfully,

Chiara Ferrari

Faculty Development, Director"

- a. Motion should include two aspects:
  - i. first, to suspend the consideration of the proposed amendments to the Academic Senate Constitution until we have time to consider some of these recommendations and potentially others;

- ii. second, to expand the membership of the committee that has worked on these changes to include members outside of the Academic Senate.

Clarification and background information:

- a. Last time AS Constitution was amended under the Chair Jed Wyrick, it was a lot more closed process.
- b. It has been clarified that this time work started in FASP and was publicized throughout the spring semester. FASP Chair Sistrunk did a public outreach at the beginning of spring semester.
- c. Work started in FASP subcommittee and had few Senate Officers join it. It was a lot more open policy then before when Chair Wyrick wrote previous changes to the constitution.
- d. It has been clarified that this came to the Academic Senate as an introduction and then action item because it was part of additional work done in an Ad Hoc Committee of Executive Committee. This is a regular business process.

Discussion:

- a. Participation, work recognition in Senate should be rewarded. Praises shared for work done on this document.
- b. Important to inform senate and campus community of work being done. Recognized that technology has changed the way business is conducted now.
- c. Introduction item received comments, while today an action item receives amendments and suggestions. Comment made that as a part of this process senator was ready to make amendments. Suggestion made to offer these to the Ad Hoc Committee of the EC group and for the others to follow this path.
- d. Senator speaks in favor of continuing with the process as well as not being opposed to provide more time if needed for additional input. Support motion, suggest comments are shared today.
- e. Support for postponement shared. Suggestion shared to include campus community that would like to be represented in conversations and in this process.
- f. Suggestion shared to include internal recommendations for CSUC that can address some of the inequities and institutional practices, not necessarily just Constitution and Bylaws alone.
- g. Concern was shared that this might not be as easy to achieve as this process, although open and accessible, might be considered very intimidating for many.
- h. Comment shared that the Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws documents, although complicated, are very important, they include and affect everyone on the campus.
- i. Suggestion shared to follow the process similar to EPPC work on adding courses when "Intent to add" is shared with campus community via email and allows everyone to comment it for a limited period. This can provide awareness, outreach to campus community and can allow for input on these two documents.
- j. Support shared that feedback and comments should be included today (and later).
- k. Suggestion shared to include a limited postponement to allow inclusion of students' feedback. Suggested not to postpone this item longer than this semester. Rationale shared that all four

student officers are graduating seniors and effective, informed student feedback can be received soon.

- l. Question was asked what course of action to take/how to proceed. It has been clarified that we have a motion on the table and should vote on a motion, which will determine whether or not this will be further discussed as an action item today or at later date.
- m. It has been clarified that more than choosing a date this motion should be focused on resolving issues, collecting campus and student feedback, and widening the constituents present on this committee.

Motion on a table and senators will vote. It requires majority to vote for a postponement.

Motion amendment made to postpone this to a specific date to allow student feedback to be included and not to allow this work to be stopped. Specific date made to be two Senate meetings from today (April 21<sup>st</sup>). Second. These are specific and serious suggestions. Limited time will provide more action driven response and will move forward with this significant and important work instead of pausing it. Senate voted: 25 yes, four no. Amended motion passes.

Motion to postpone the item 10 definitely until April 21<sup>st</sup> and to expand the membership of a committee working on this document. Senate voted: 29 yes, no opposed. Motion passes, item 10 will be postponed until April 21<sup>st</sup>.

#### 11. Proposed Amendments to Academic Senate [Bylaws](#) – EC Action

Motion made to postpone item 11 and proposed amendments to the Academic Senate Bylaws to April 21<sup>st</sup>. Second. Rationale same as for item 10.

FASP Chair commended Senator Ferrari's requests. FASP Chair invited Senator Ferrari to be part of this process and to suggest ways to invite diverse campus community to be part of this process.

Senate voted: 29 yes, no opposed. Motion passes, item 11 will be postponed until April 21<sup>st</sup>.

Vice Chair Allen suggested that any recommendations should be sent to Chair Paiva.

#### 12. Proposed [College of Business Reorganization](#) – EPPC Introduction

EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 12: The proposed reorganization of COB is an EPPC introduction item. Currently college has four departments and would like to change that to three. The Department of Management would remain unchanged. The Department of Marketing would remove finance and add business and communication. Final Department would consist out of Information Systems, Finance and Accounting. At the EPPC this item passed unopposed. It is supported by COB faculty. Dean Lau can address any questions.

No questions, no comments. No objection, item 12 passes and will be an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

#### 13. Proposed Change to [FPPP Chairs on Personnel Committees 4.1.10.c, 4.1.10.d, and 10.2.12](#) - FASP

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 13: proposed change to FPPP 4.1.10.c, 4.1.10.d, and 10.2.12 as an introduction item. This item was brought to the FASP's RTP subcommittee by Brian Oppy. Proposed

language provides clarity on Chairs being part of personnel committee, about the Chairs report, and aligns with CBA.

Questions: based on proposed language it is not clear who determines whether or not it is appropriate to skip the chair nor when this occurs. Is this solely the Chairs' decision when they join the Personnel Committee or is there language that says otherwise? Section A states "department chairs may participate as members department chair", section B "department chairs electing to serve as members...", and section C "if department chair service members". Who makes the determination when it is and isn't appropriate for a chair to serve on the RTP committee? Answer: at the beginning of a semester Department Chair has to make a decision and do that until the end of academic year. That has been a practice and would normally be specified in the department personnel guidelines. It has been suggested to add a language that can more specifically state this.

No objection, item 13 passes and will be an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

14. Proposed Change to [FPPP 8.1.4 \(SFOT Online and Paper\)](#) - FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 14: proposed change to FPPP 8.1.4 SFOT online and paper version as an introduction item. This was a recommendation done by the University Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning Committee who suggested only online feedback. FASP subcommittee responded to this recommendation and added suggestions aligned with new CBA that performance feedback supposed to be about a course. The course instructor will administer the SFOT during the last two weeks of class. SFOT will be done either online or as a paper version no matter what teaching modality course is taught in. There are two weeks to complete SFOTs.

No objection, item 14 passes and will be an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

15. Proposed Change to [FPPP 9.1.2 and 10.2.5 \(Evaluation of Faculty\)](#) – FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 15: proposed change to FPPP 9.1.2 and 10.2.5 evaluation of faculty as an introduction item. This was done by FASP's GI 2025 subcommittee. Evaluation of instruction includes student evaluation and feedback form. Proposing different kinds of alternative student evaluations and peer letters to be included.

Support was shared as faculty will have a better understand what counts as evidence of teaching excellence, and to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion. Reminder for the RTP committees that an evaluation of teaching in the RTP has to mean more than just student evaluations. Resources must be available to faculty to meet these standards and requirements.

No objection, item 15 passes and will be an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

16. Proposed Change to [FPPP Appendix III \(Faculty Code of Ethics\)](#) - FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 16: proposed change to FPPP Appendix III Faculty Code of Ethics as an introduction item. Ethical statement had the addition of recognition of the ecological unity and interdependence of all species and resolve to act ethically to sustain the long term stability, viability and aesthetic beauty of the natural world. Old statement was removed, new language from EO 1096 added that CSU employees shall not enter into a consensual relationship with a student or employee over whom an employee exercises or have a direct or otherwise significant academic, administrative, supervisory authority.

Discussion:

- a. Comment made this is Appendix II and not III and for this to be adjusted.
- b. It has been suggested to use a different term instead of “consensual relationship”. This can be done as a proposed amendment when this item is discussed as an action item.
- c. Suggestion was made “romantic and sexual”, however, left to the action item to add more appropriate term.

No objection, item 16 passes and will be an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

17. Proposed Change to [FPPP Appendix V](#) - FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 17: proposed change to FPPP Appendix V as an introduction item. Work done by RTP subcommittee and included discussion on RTP standards, department protocols.

No objection, item 17 passes and will be an action item at the next Academic Senate meeting on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

18. [AB 928 Feedback](#) – Information Item

- [Chico State Feedback Folder](#)
- [Responses from other CSU campuses](#)

AB 928 presented as an information item. Background information:

- a. In December, the ASCSU requested feedback on the new law AB 928 that Governor Newsom signed in October 2021.
- b. AB 928 is the directive for the Community Colleges, the UC system and the CSU to create a common General Education Transfer pathway.
- c. ASCSU charged Academic Senate Chairs and ASCSU Senators from each campus to collect feedback (email sent in January to campus community).
- d. Feedback deadline is March 31<sup>st</sup>. Feedback folder is linked to the agenda.

Question: Considering that there will be a Statewide Senate meeting in mid-March, is there any benefit to have feedback delivered to Statewide Senators before that deadline? Answer: any feedback is welcomed. Agenda for the Statewide meeting will be available 1-2 days prior to the meeting.

Therefore, it is not clear if this will be on agenda. If any feedback is shared with ASCSU at plenary, considering the extension of the deadline it will be shared that our overall campus feedback might be forthcoming. Senator Boyd stated that based on responses that are coming from other campuses, it would be good to know if CSUC Senate would like to provide a response. This would be in addition to all other individual responses.

Question: How will feedback be used at the Statewide level? What kinds of criteria are going to guide the decision? What are the proposals that are being considered and how are they being evaluated?

Answer: answer will be provided after the brief overview. Due to a loss of a quorum, answer was not recorded in the minutes.

Senator Ford providing an overview of the AB 928:

- a. Reduction of the number of units in the program from 39 down to 34.
- b. The charge to develop 34-unit singular pathway is levied on the intersegmental committee of the Academic Senate's.
- c. Three groups will have to work on this: Community Colleges, UC, and CSU.
- d. The deadline for implementation is May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023.
- e. Overview was shared with EPPC and will be tomorrow with the Associated Students.
- f. Responses are provided by many groups (see link above).

Comment was made that this is a very difficult task. It is known that many community college students take an excessive amount of GE courses, which influence their financial situation and time period spent at the community college. This led to having a student be accepted at the university, but not meeting special GE requirement. On the other side, nothing prevents individual legislators from creating a special GE related legislation. Expanding a particular area of GE is not looking at the system as a whole, but at a particular agenda item. It would be devastating to see what GE area gets reduced, to have in few years another legislation to mandate GE expansion. It has been suggested to think about competencies and ways to assess those competencies that aren't solely committed to taking a particular class.

Quorum lost at 5:03 pm. No further discussion recorded.

19. Ask the Administrator
20. Other
21. Adjourn at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary