Faculty and Student Policies Committee Minutes

Faculty and Student Policies Committee
Meeting from April 17, 2014
2:30 p.m., Kendall 209

Present: Blakeslee, Gray, Kotar, Lee, Mace, McCabe, Meadows, Mills, Postma (Mills), Rehg, Root, Rowberg, Shepherd, Shkoda, Seipel, Sistrunk, Smith, Traver,

Absent: Herren (Barrett), Rowberg, Kirchoff, Shkoda, Aird, Pereda

Guest(s): Karen von Bargen, Dean Judith Hennessey

Call to Order: 2:31 pm– Senator McCabe presiding

1) Approve minutes of April 10, 2014 meeting; Minutes approved.
2) Approve today’s agenda; Agenda approved.
3) Announcements
   a) Secretary for today’s meeting is Ben Seipel.
   b) McCabe: Senate office is beginning to organize committees for next year.
   c) Rehg acknowledged visitor: Judith Hennessey- College of Business
   d) Tentatively this is the last meeting of semester, Deb McCabe stepping down as chair of FASP for next year.

4) Decision Items
   a) Proposed EM: Intellectual Property Policy. Action item. This item was postponed definitely at the last meeting, to be brought back today having addressed concerns raised in last week’s meeting.
      i) Root moved that amendments be approved as presented in the minutes form the last meeting:
         • Student Creations, Section II.B.3.f. (p. 12): Unresolved questions of ownership or other intellectual property rights may be directed to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs, under the designated authority of the Vice President for Student Affairs, to initiate an inquiry in accordance with the Student Grievance Procedures (See Appendix, Section II.B.1.). [Replaces references to VPSA and Associated Students]
         • Student Inventions, Section II.C.5.f. (p. 16): Unresolved questions of ownership or other intellectual property rights may be directed to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs, under the designated authority of the Vice President for Student Affairs, to initiate an inquiry in accordance with the Student Grievance Procedures (See Appendix, Section II.B.1.) [Replaces references to VPSA and Associated Students]
• Intellectual Property Issues, Section III.A.2. (p. 18): Such matters as ownership… and the Vice President for Student Affairs (or designee) for issues involving students.

• Add to Appendix, Section I.C.4 (p. 22): EM 08-40: http://www.csuchico.edu/prs/EMs/2008/08-040.shtml; and Student Code of Conduct (Title 5): http://www.csuchico.edu/sjd/_assets/docs/policies/Title%20Five.

• Add to Appendix (New Section #): Section II.B.1.: EM 05-010 [Student Grievance Procedures]: http://www.csuchico.edu/prs/EMs/2005/05-010.shtml

ii) Concerns were about parallel language for faculty and staff as there is for students, and about whether student affairs was the appropriate place for such grievances. Root clarified the grievance procedures move through student affairs and the Vice Provost’s office, and that the policy is designed to direct students to that procedure. It was pointed out that the third of Root’s proposed changes was already approved and that the fourth and fifth don’t need approval (because they are merely mentions to appendices). A concern was raised that this new policy may be in conflict with CFA grievance procedures given that CFA represents faculty and staff when there is a dispute. Von Bargen mentioned that Page 18, section 2, last paragraph of the proposed document there is a reference to the CFA for such grievances.

iii) McCabe called the question. Action item passed as amended.

b) Proposal for Reorganization of the FPPP. Action item. The attached document includes the changes suggested at introduction regarding additional guidance to help readers compare the proposed reorganized FPPP to the existing FPPP.

i) Mills moved and Meadows seconded a mention to introduce a substitute document (attached to the agenda) to make it easier to read and understand by changing the formatting (text wrapping, italics, column, indentation) based on the feedback from the previous meeting. He also noted he had updated URLs that were embedded and hyperlinked in the document. He did not update the numbering. Motion passed.

1) Sistrunk asked for feedback from the other subcommittee members on the substitute document. Subcommittee members reported support for the substitute document based on the comparison and organization, increased readability due to the removal of strikeouts, the organization “looks” like a FPPP. Some subcommittee members reported that the comparison chart was useful, while others found it either cumbersome or of limited use. Subcommittee members reported that they engaged in healthy conversation (conflict) during their work, and that the conversation focused on preserving the language of the original language in FPPP.

2) Clarification was requested regarding references to the CBA in the substitute document.

3) McCabe moved to accept the substitute document. Motion passed.

ii) Mills expressed satisfaction with the FFFP re-organization document, noted that revisions to FFFP are never done, and emphasized that there are no substantive changes to the document. McCabe asked for the opinions of other subcommittee members. Other subcommittee members made the following points: it would be a mistake to continue debate about continuing the re-organization given the looming revision from the upcoming CBA; the reorganization will facilitate upcoming major
revisions; suggestion for a special meeting prior to or as a part of full senate to explain the changes in the organization.

iii) McCabe moved to approve the reorganization of the FPPP document. **Action item passed.**

c) **Proposal for Minor and Emergency Substantive Changes to the FPPP.** **Action item.** It was noted that the numbering is for the reorganized FPPP document. This proposal includes one file ("Proposed Modifications...") that specifies several discrete items, as follows:

i) Change from All Caps to Italics for Definitions as Used in the FPPP. McCabe moved the item. **Action item passed.**

ii) Distribution of the SET Summary Sheet and Instrument (FPPP 4.0.d.1.b). McCabe moved the item. **Action item passed.**

iii) Decisions Based on Information Outside the WPAF (FPPP 3.0.p). It was explained that the original wording is in direct conflict to the CBA. McCabe moved the item. **Action item passed.**

iv) Return of Faculty Dossiers (FPPP 8.1.c.2). There was a request for clarification of "delivered securely." Mills indicated that hand delivery would be in conflict with FPPP which states, "mailed." So, this change allows for other secure methods. McCabe moved the item. **Action item passed.**

d) **Proposed changes to FPPP 8.2 and 8.3 (Evaluation of Temporary Faculty).** **Action item.**

i) A Senator indicated that there has been potential confusion about defining "change of assignment" (old FPPP) vs. "work assignment" (updated, reorganized FPPP). The meaning of "work assignment" was discussed. It was noted that work load changes are handled by Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs, and that the purpose of the language should reflect the needs for updated assignments. A suggestion was made to change the language to: "If the candidates types of work changes "substantially," or "significantly." The CBA does not address this issue about changes in assignment.

(1) Moved and seconded to remove “if the candidates work assignment changes, the review process return to the initial two-year annual ....” **Motion passed.**

ii) A Senator indicated that 8.2.b.3.a may create undo increased workload for yearly observations for all temp faculty as opposed to just in year of review. Discussion revolved around several sub-issues: yearly evaluations vs. evaluations in years of review, reviews in Spring semesters only, "criteria" vs. "categories" of evaluation, and "may" vs. "shall." Discussion covered the following topics: 1) this is a Chico issue, not a CBA driven item and that CFA indicates that it is good to have these records; 2) the yearly reviews help identify temporary faculty that are doing well or are struggling, and that it protects department and temporary faculty members to have more records while also helping to improve instruction; 3) departments only meet minimal observation needs; 4) the yearly review process is contributing to the "drowning under paper"; 5) departments need to have evidence for range elevation; 6) faculty members may request more frequently by request; 7) perhaps departments should also be able to request an additional observation; 7) evaluations are important for professional growth –even for the observer; 8) perhaps there is a need
for a panel/subcommittee to examine peer evaluations in the classroom since the CBA allows for greater flexibility on this issue.

(1) Moved and seconded that 8.2.b.3.a be modified to: “At least one classroom visit resulting in a peer evaluation of the teaching performance shall take place each review year”. Friendly amendment accepted to add “At the discretion of the PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, Department Chair, or upon the candidate's petition, a classroom visit resulting in a peer evaluation of teaching performance shall occur more frequently.” It was noted that this change could lead to adversarial relationships or lead to confusion. Discussion indicated that departments could amend their own FPPP to require yearly reviews or identify potential triggers for problems. **Motion passed.**

iii) A Senator indicated that there is confusion in the language that “evaluations shall be conducted in the Spring semester”. Discussion noted that there is problem for evaluation for faculty who are only employed in Fall semesters and that and not under contract in spring for their final evaluation.

(1) Moved and seconded to strike the second sentence of 8.2.a.2: If a TEMPORARY FACULTY member’s appointment extends only through the Fall semester, the evaluation process shall be concluded on or before the Friday in Fall immediately preceding final exams. **Motion passed.**

iv) Moved and seconded to change 8.2.b “Criteria of Evaluations” to “Categories of Evaluations”. **Motion passed.**

v) Moved and seconded to change to 8.2.c.4 (under “Record of the Evaluation”) to change “may” to “shall.” **Motion passed.**

vi) McCabe called the question for the action item on proposed changes to FPPP 8.2 and 8.3 (Evaluation of Temporary Faculty) with amendments. **Action item passed as amended.**

5) **Status/Subcommittee Reports**

   a) Gathering Input about the FPPP. Blakeslee indicated that there was no change since the last report.

   b) University Clean-Up Committee. Updates provided to project: Academic Integrity Committee is active; IRA has been working on revising their EM; Scholarship committee does have an EM but there is no other information to report.

6) **Other**

   a) Update on the Ad Hoc Committee on Campus Facilities

    i) Lee provided a paper Executive Summary on EM 13-078, which includes background, policies (old, new, interim EMs), and recommendations/proposed policies. Clarification was requested regarding the process for input: the committee reached out to former provosts who would have insight in addition to the information from the outside consultant. The summary will be further disseminated after today’s meeting. The committee is open to additional information regarding “missing information”. An electronic copy will be provided prior to the next full Academic Senate meeting in preparation for a discussion item.

7) Adjourn 5:04 by McCabe.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Seipel