Faculty and Student Policies Committee Minutes

Faculty and Student Policies Committee
Meeting of September 19, 2013
2:30 p.m., Kendall 209

Present: Gray, Mace, McCabe (Chair), Meadows, Mills, Postma (Mills), Rehg, Rowberg, Seipel, Sistrunk, Smith (Traver), Traver, Kotar, Shkoda, Acosta, Pereda, Blakeslee, Aird, Kirchhoff, Lee (Karen vonBargen)

Absent: Pereda, Root

Error! Reference source not found.

1. Approve minutes of September 12, 2013 meeting
   Approved by affirmation.
2. Approve today’s agenda
   Approved by affirmation.
3. Announcements
   a. We have a potential new FASP non-Senator: Jodi Shepherd no other names were suggested.
   b. Secretary for today’s meeting is Russ Mills
   c. McCabe elaborated on what she sees as her role as chair of FASP
4. Items for Discussion
   a. Lashzone. Recap: Opinions were divided last week about whether our campus policies adequately address the issue of a student selling his or her own work to a (non-student) third party. Issue: Should FASP look into our academic honesty policies in relation to this matter?
      Kotar noted faculty are restricted from selling materials by FPPP 1.3.a.1. Refer this issue to the Academic Integrity Committee.
   b. Title IX (Sexual Harassment & Assault). Recap: Our campus Sexual Assault Policy (EM 91-001) is out of compliance with Title IX and the Chancellor’s Office directives. Issue: Should FASP initiate a revision or dissolution of this policy?
      This issue is already being discussed by administrators and staff, according to Root. Some faculty and student participation at this early stage would be very helpful. FASP suggests that McCabe and Meadows participate. McCabe will try to identify one or two AS representatives. General discussion followed of the difficulty of locating information associated with university committees. This side issue will be discussed by EC with possible future action.
   c. IRA Policy. Recap: We have no official “policy” regarding alcohol consumption during “Instructionally Related Activities”, yet we use an authorization form that purports to express one. Issue: Should FASP work on developing an alcohol policy or on revising the form, or both?
      Mills will follow-up with Wei and Rethans regarding the continued use of the IRA Code of Student Conduct form and possible modifications to the
Campus Alcohol Policy. This could be a possible work item for FASP – adding a section to the current on-campus policy that would also address off-campus alcohol consumption at university-related activities.

d. **FPPP 8.1.b on SET Policy.** Recap: Our current SET policy requiring review of “all” classes is based on an emergency stop-gap measure put in place last spring by the Executive Committee, without full Senate review and approval. It became the default to which we reverted after the President rejected Senate’s proposal to keep our former practice of reviewing two classes. **Issue:** Should FASP revisit the SET policy, and if so, how?

The recommendation from senate last year has not been implemented. The president has concerns and would like to seek greater consultation – including deans, chairs, and students. It is important to emphasize that the recommendation was not just to conduct SETs in two classes, but in a minimum of two classes. For many faculty, particularly junior faculty, SETs have historically been administered in many more than two classes. Doing SETs in all classes for all faculty will result in increased workload and added expense. FASP discussed possibly undertaking this task again, but since the president did not approve the first iteration it might be wasted effort. In the short term FASP recommends that EC continue to work with the president to see if there might be a future agreement. Another alternative would be for FASP to consider an intermediate approach, something more comprehensive than a minimum of two classes but possibly less than all classes. FASP will pursue a future joint meeting with the SET committee to discuss this issue, the standard university instrument, and confidentiality, especially as it relates to electronic SETs.

e. **2013-14 FPPP changes.** **Issue:** Should FASP develop a standard practice of reviewing the published FPPP changes at the beginning of each year to make sure they match our understanding of the work Senate performed the previous year?

There is a continuing concern that adopted policy does not always match the policy passed by senate, especially in the FPPP. The most serious concern is that this may be the result of errors or omissions. FASP recommends that Faculty Affairs implement a new protocol for FPPP changes, such that EC be provided with the list of all changes for its review prior to release of the new FPPP at the beginning of each academic year.

f. **FPPP 8.2 & 8.3 on evaluation of Temporary faculty.** Carryover from last year. **Issue:** Why are there two sections on evaluation of Temporary faculty, one about all of them (8.2) and the other about only “full-time” ones (8.3)? Should this difference be eliminated (because it’s apparently not in the CBA) or clarified?

The portions of the FPPP addressing temporary faculty need comprehensive revision. But so does the entire FPPP. Consider consulting with Siegall, with advance buy in from Lee and Wei, to undertake a comprehensive reworking of the FPPP. This reworking could be primarily editorial but could also include selected substantive changes, like this one.

g. **FPPP 8.5 on life cycle of department RTP documents.** Carryover from last year. **Issue:** Should the FPPP and department personnel documents used in RTP processes be the ones in effect at time of hire or at time of review? Department practices differ. We discussed this last year, but some FASP members think the FPPP language is still not clear.

Same issue as (f) above.

h. **Speech and Advocacy Policy.** Before working on this draft policy, FASP would need to know the nature of the problems that caused the Chancellor’s Office to reject it. A request for more details has been made to the President’s office (Karla
Zimmerlee), but no new information has been provided.
East Bay has a very good policy addressing particularly time, place, and manner of restrictions. FASP should develop a subcommittee to research existing policies at other campuses and develop a draft policy that conforms to the environment at Chico.

5. Other
There was no other.

6. Adjourn
Adjourned at 4:08 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Russell Mills
Secretary pro tem