## Faculty and Student Policies Committee (FASP)

September 15, 2022

Meeting began at 2:34 pm having established a quorum.

## Present

Coons, Michael
Boyd, Betsy
Burk, Nicholas
Bruns, Emily
Lau, Terence - Dean's Council Rep
Draper, Aaron
Ferguson, Holly
Hidalgo, Danielle
Leon, Kendall
Medic, Ana
Musvosvi, Ennies
Newell, Patrick (by Proxy to Boyd)
O'Connor, Dennis
Paiva, Marianne - Academic Senate Chair
Mahalley Allen - Provost Designee
Shippen, Chris
Sherman, Nicole
Sistrunk, Tim - FASP Chair
Rachel McBride-Praetorius - Staff Council Rep
Trailer, Jeff
Traver, Teresa
Walter, Miriam

1. Approve the minutes of September 1, 2022 and also September 8, 2022
a. Motion: Regarding approval of the minutes of September 1, 2022, postpone definitely to the next FASP meeting.
i. Motion/2nd: Boyd/Medic
ii. Discussion: Not appropriate to approve the minutes without documenting the actual attendance at the meeting. Let's get the attendance documented.
iii. Approved.
b. Motion: Approval of the minutes of September 8, 2022, with amendments.
i. Motion/2nd: Hidalgo/Leon
ii. Discussion: Clarify the holding of proxies; you can put a parentheses, proxy for Boyd after Patrick Newell.
iii. Approved.

## 2. Approve Agenda

a. Motion: To remove Item 3a from the agenda.
i. Motion/2nd: Boyd/Bruns
ii. Discussion: It seems that there's some additional deliberation that the cabinet would like to have outside of the meeting before this comes back as an Introduction so just remove it from this agenda for now.
iii. Approved.
b. Motion: Approval of the Agenda
i. Motion/2nd: Hidalgo/Coons
ii. Discussion: None.
iii. Approved.

## 3. Introduction Items

a. Proposed revision of EM 05-017: University Budget Committee Revised Version
i. (This item was removed from the agenda)
b. Proposed revision of EM 21-028 Interim University Police and Public Safety Advisory Committee (Revised Version).
i. Motion: To send this proposal to UPPSAC and let them review these recommendations and to propose their own recommendations.

1. Motion/2nd: Boyd/Burk
2. Discussion: This is an interim EM so it's supposed to be reconsidered 6 months after we passed it in the Senate. The following are issues for consideration by UPPSAC in revising the EM:
a. The Dean of the Library should have a position because the library is a major public institution that's open all the time.
b. What is the right number/type of students? What is the reason for this number?
c. What is the right number/type of faculty? What is the reason for this number?
d. What is the right number/type of staff? What is the reason for this number?
e. What is the right number/type of police officers? What is the reason for this number?
f. On the next page when it talks about the co-chairs. This co-chair of the committee would be 1 tenured faculty member, or a full time lecturer. But that information was all struck out. One faculty member. but then the co-chair has to be a full time lecturer or tenured, and that information is proposed to be struck out? And then, one student who will each have served on the committee for at least one year. But if we reduce it to just one faculty member when we haven't identified that they're gonna be tenured, or a full
time lecturer, and also we don't know just that one person that they haven't served for at least a year. How can they be the co-chair, and that's a lot of work for one faculty member? Needs to be clear.
g. If we were to have only one student, and you're asking for the student to co-chair and yet the student term is only one year, even if it's renewable and even if they're reappointed; that the chances could be very unlikely. So how would we get a student to Co-chair that has one year already served on their terms?
h. Regarding the voting members. The Dean of Students seems like they would be a pretty important person on this list. It seems that the solution would not be to strike the Dean of Students but maybe to add the Dean of the Library.
i. Regarding the Appendix, it previously had the subcommittees listed, and now it says that these subcommittees will be based on the recommendations of the presidential task force, and while we could certainly understand that some of the subcommittees might want to respond to the task force, it seems like this is really changing the focus of the committee just to respond to the task force. That seems significant.
j. There appears to be overlap between the subcommittees. What are the different functions of the 5 subcommittees, given the 5 areas of focus?
k. We could kind of direct the Associated Students to try to pull from affinity groups to sort of balance out those folks that are in the higher level office positions and other students.
I. The language prevents potentially one of the Associated Students in an officer role from being a chair if they're only there for a year.
m . For the responsibilities on page 2 of this committee there are 9 responsibilities. In the Appendix, the subcommittees are based on the Task Force report, so what are these other 8 responsibilities? How are those reflected in the subcommittees?
n. Also the subcommittees are based on just this 2021 task force report. How are we thinking about this committee long term, at what time is this EM now outdated? And so that just doesn't seem the best way to think of the subcommittee structure and laying that out so explicitly.
o. If those subcommittees are suddenly going to be populated with members from outside the community, then you're gonna have to require them to also undergo some training at an appropriate level as well, and that puts a tremendously large burden on any staff, or administrative individuals that are actually helping with that training.

## 3. Approved.

## c. Proposed Revision of EM 15-001: Exceptional Service Assigned Time (ESAT)

i. Motion:. To postpone introduction of this item; to send this back to the subcommittee so they can respond to the comments and bring it back.

1. Motion/2nd: Boyd/Burk
2. Discussion:
a. We created an EM with such specific date ranges in it, and because it just automatically sort of sets us up for this sort of possibility of it becoming out of compliance you know once It has gone past Kendall. If the group had looked at any possibility of being able to remove the dates altogether? Perhaps just take off the specific day and just put "end of Fall?"
b. Concern about the striking out of the Provost. The Provost Office is the office that sends out this call for proposals and makes the final determination and there is a benefit from involvement in the committee's discussion. It may be appropriate to have that position still as ex officio nonvoting.
c. Also the striking out of the students. The reason for this reassigned time is for exceptional service to students, and the committee would enjoy having the student voice in looking at proposals.
d. So there have been problems with faculty submitting their reports. One of the conditions of the assigned time is that you can't be eligible again, unless you submit your report talking about the activity that you had assigned time to do. This should be addressed.
e. Is the report of the committee sent directly to the Provost for her recommendation? Is it a ranking of all the applicants and here is how we ranked them, and then it's sent to her office, and she does whatever she wants with them? Can we explain the process?
f. Is removing the student representatives and the regional continuing education representatives just because they
haven't shown up in the past a good enough reason to remove them from the membership of this committee?
g. What is the reasoning behind having percentages for the Review Criteria? It seems like it puts people in very narrow criteria to actually have limits on those percentages.

## 3. Approved.

4. Subcommittee Reports/Conversation
a. Overview FASP Policies and EM subcommittees 2022-23

There was a discussion of updates.

## 5. Announcements

Do we want to continue FASP meetings with Zoom or in-person? Let Tim know.
6. Other: None.
7. Adjourn at $4: 18 \mathrm{pm}$.

Secretary: JW Trailer, Ph.D.

