1. Minutes of the October 24, 2013 meeting were approved with corrections.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. Announcements:
   a. Jennifer Meadows asked members to review and provide feedback on the draft technology policy produced by the Technology and the Professions Committee. The policy can be accessed at the Academic Senate website http://www.csuchico.edu/fs/tpc/index.shtml. Comments will be accepted through November 15.
   b. The secretary for the November 21 meeting is Mike Rehg.
4. Status Reports
   a. Title IX (Sexual Harassment and Assault): CSU, Chico was chosen by the state agency overseeing Title IX for an audit that is scheduled for November 17 & 18. The audit is expected to look especially at the campus response to the sexual harassment portion of Title IX. Members of FASP commented on confusing procedures for pursuing an action, the need for victims to feel safe in making a report, that deputy reporters will be trained, and that faculty and staff will receive training. Postma reported that the Board of Trustees had received a report in May of 2012 that was a CSU, Chico response to a previous audit. Sistrunk asked what action FASP could take. The decision was made to invite Title IX coordinator, Pedro Douglas, to attend a FASP meeting to report on actions taken to comply with Title IX.
   b. SET Policy: Paula Selvester, Chair of Academic Senate, reported on meetings she attended with department chairs and college deans on the number of SETs to be administered. The majority of chairs would like to have all courses evaluated. Deans were concerned about issues
such as the cost of evaluation, and the effect on faculty wanting to experiment with course designs. Paula reported that she asked them to have conversations with faculty through department chairs. She also said that there is a desire to talk about the response rate of SETs administered online. Patrick Mace asked if the university could make software available to help faculty analyze SET results. Russ Mills commented that one could interpret the chairs’ response as not wanting to talk with faculty about which classes to evaluate if fewer than all courses are evaluated. Other issues mentioned included: that data comparing paper and online show that results are about the same; handling SETs in college offices creates a workload problem for staff; the need for a secure electronic storage system.

c. IRA Policy: No new information was reported.

d. 2012 – 13 FPPP Changes: This issue is about discrepancies in changes to the FPPP following Academic Senate work on it last year based on an analysis by Mike Rehg. Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs Lee requested that Rehg added a column to the discrepancy table to help determine if members on the administration routing list agreed or disagreed with changes. Since changes were related to implementing the new CBA, Mace suggested adding a CBA column as well. There were several comments on the process at this point. Mills offered that real monkeys broke into the Faculty Affairs Office and retyped sections of the FPPP in question. McCabe reported that the Executive Committee is in discussion with the administration on a tighter process for approval of FPPP changes. Consensus of FASP was that the Executive Committee should discuss the resolution of FPPP errors with administration, as well.

e. Mills reported on progress on overhaul of the entire FPPP, reporting that there was a request for a written proposal for this project. Mills has drafted and shared it with Senate Officers. To complete the process by May he commented that it needs to start soon and will require a FASP subcommittee.

f. Speech and Advocacy Policy: Sistrunk reported that he and Kotar had met to review and compare EM 86-12 with the Chancellor’s Office approved CSU, East Bay policy. They recommend that the East Bay policy be used as a model for a revised CSU, Chico policy. They will invite representatives to the subcommittee from Student Affairs and Business and Finance.

5. Discussion Items
   Intellectual Property Policy: The discussion focused on review of the policy by Karla Zimmerlee and when outside legal review of the policy should be
conducted. Postma offered that a new intellectual property policy would replace three current executive memoranda. A FASP subcommittee was formed to work on bringing the policy to FASP. Members are Tim Sistrunk, Jim Postma, and Jeff Bell (to be invited).

**FPPP 8.2 & 8.3:** This item deals with the definitions of temporary faculty at CSU, Chico. Following an explanation, a FASP subcommittee was formed that includes Russ Mills and Karen vonBargen. There was a request to have someone attend a FASP subcommittee meeting to explain the meaning of these two sections. Chair McCabe agreed to try to track down someone with that knowledge and invite them to a meeting.

**FASP work on matters with legal implications:** Several members commented on the desire for shared governance and yet the need for careful review of policies by people who may have an understanding of legal issues than can arise from policy statements. McCabe would like to have the FASP guidelines reflect a process for obtaining legal or outside review. Postma volunteered to draft some language to that effect.

6. **Meeting Adjourned**

Submitted by M. Kotar