

TO: Faculty and Student Policies Committee
FROM: Tim Sistrunk, Chair
SUBJECT: FASP Minutes – October 13, 2022 at 2:30 PM
VIRTUAL MEETING

Secretary for this meeting is Janell Bauer and Marianne Paiva (Senate chair, attending as guest)

In attendance:

Timothy Sistrunk (FASP Chair)
Mahalley Allen
Janell Bauer
Michael Coons
Aaron Draper
Danielle Hidalgo
Michelle Holmes
Kathy Kaiser
Seth Klobodu
Terence Lau
Rachel McBride-Praetorius
Ana Medic
Ennies Musvosvi
Patrick Newell
Dennis O'Connor
Nicole Sherman
Jeff Trailer
Teresa Traver
Miriam Walter
Athena Zhang

Proxy:

Ana Medic is holding Betsy Boyd's proxy.
Patrick Newell is holding Nicholas Burk's proxy.

1. Approve Minutes of FASP meeting [September 1, 2022](#) and [September 14, 2022](#)
 - There was not a record taken of the minutes on September 1, 2022. If you were in attendance but do not see your name on the attendee list, please let Chair Sistrunk know.
 - Amendment: September 14th should be the 15th. Correct in minutes for that day.
 - On September 15th minutes, in the discussion for ESAT, item b and c, there are references to "I". Discussion regarding use of I, and request to clean up the minutes was made.
 - A motion was made to table both sets of minutes to clean up both sets of minutes. Guidance was provided to send recommend changes to the Secretary for each set of minutes.
 - No objection to tabling the minutes. Minutes not approved.
2. Approve Agenda
3. Introduction Items

1. Proposed revision of [EM 06-034: Student Privacy Rights and Student Records Administration Policies and Procedures Document \(Time certain 2:40\) Revised Version](#)

Michael Dills-Allen (Registrar) provided a summary of the proposed changes which include:

- 1) Most proposed revisions are updating language to reflect new names and offices, etc.
- 2) Two substantive changes in the document:
 - a. Definition of a student. Dills-Allen: I propose to remove “However, the university accords applicants for admissions who never attend privileges accorded to students under FERPA as rights.”

Question: Does this mean that I can talk to parents before students sit in my class? Answer: it basically gives you the opportunity to, not the obligation to talk to them.

- b. Last page (page 12): Update “Responsibility” section. Difference between “minor” and “major” change.

Question: My concern is charging students for copies for their own records. Basic needs are an issue. Do we not have any sense of financial ability to pay for students in determining those costs? Students might look at this and think they have to pay just for their records.

Answer from Dills-Allen: In 3.5 years of working here, we’ve never charged for records. For transcripts we do need to charge to cover the cost of staff and expenses for copying transcripts.

Question: I’m concerned about the extended time period to fill a records request from 15-30 days.

Answer from Dills-Allen: The federal government actually says 45 days, but the reality is that we use a lot of different systems to store old records. If I have to find it on microfiche and then copy it, that will take longer than 2 weeks.

Question received: I’d like to understand how this privacy topic came up.

Answer from Dills-Allen: Circling back to the 30 days, that is usually when a court issue comes up. Sometimes it takes a long time to respond to court requests for documents.

Vote: All those in favor of passing this as an introduction item, please press the green button. All opposed, press red.

Approved. (16 in favor)

2. Proposed revision of FPPP [substitute word “Evaluatee” for “Reviewee” throughout](#)

Sistrunk: This was a recommended change from the provost’s office.

Comment from Senator #1: “Evaluatee” links directly to evaluation and is more clear.

Senator #1 looked up the definition of Evaluatee. “If you are under evaluation you are the evaluatee” - based on definitions. Same senator would strongly object to the change, and added “I don’t think there’s a reason to change.”

Senator #2: There’s a difference between being reviewed and evaluated. The term should match.

Senator #3: Evaluatee is not an actual word in the Oxford dictionary, but reviewee is.

Senator #4: I think “evaluatee” is already in the FPPP. But this is a weird word.

Sistrunk: I would like to suggest that instead of voting today, we withdraw this item and review the FPPP.

Senator #5: I don't think we can withdraw. We can postpone.

Senator #6: I make a motion to table this until the next meeting.

Seconded.

Sistrunk: Are there objections?

Senator #5: What does table mean? Don't we want to send it back to subcommittee?

Senator #6: I withdraw the motion. I have a new motion to return this to the committee.

Seconded.

Vote called (Sistrunk): Mark green if you approve to send it back to committee.

Red if you are not in favor. 10 in favor. 4 against.

Approved to send the item back to subcommittee.

3. Proposed Revision of [EM 15-001](https://www.csuchico.edu/awards/esat.shtml): Exceptional Service Assigned Time (ESAT) <https://www.csuchico.edu/awards/esat.shtml>
[Revised Version](#)

Sistrunk: Reviewed the changes: Membership of the committee. Discussion last time about the involvement of students, they are now left in. The Provost has a voice in the final review so the role was removed from committee review.

Removed an item under eligibility and restrictions related to mention of a required report required for future application.

Question: Why wouldn't we have a final report?

Comment: There should be accountability for this funded time via a report. It's appropriate to do so here because we are giving funding. We should make sure the work has been done.

Comment: Brought up that the awards are based on work that has been done.

Comment: Indicated that with assigned time the work will continue. So it could make sense for a report to go to the Provost's office, or the chair of the committee, or other appropriate reviewer to ensure that the funds are being used appropriately.

Comment: Described a similar process for accounting for work done on assigned time, that provides another layer of accountability. It would be good to know what the report needs to contain and where it needs to go.

Sistrunk: What do people think about the need for a report. Remember why these awards are being assigned - it is for exceptional work and service. Could the report be very simple? What does everyone think?

Motion: Motion that a final report is submitted by the recipient with a concise summary of what they regard as their achievements based on the award they received.

Comment: I don't know that it's fair or appropriate to categorize these awards as always being for work that is already done. The language of the award leaves room for people to apply for the awards for future work. I do think it's appropriate for there to be accountability when state funds are awarded.

Comment: I agree that a report should be required.

Comment: To clarify, we don't vote on a motion to make a change right now. That would only happen once this becomes an action item.

Comment: Move to make this an introduction item

Comment: Object.

Sistrunk: Open the floor for discussion.

Comment: I don't think we need a motion to move to introduction. I would like to have an actual vote.

Sistrunk: Let's move to vote. All in favor of passing this as an introduction item and moving it forward as an action item next time. Green button in favor. Red against.

12 in favor. 7 against.

4. Discussion Item

a. Workload Efficiency Project, Best Practice ideas -discussion of the 3-3 load
Sistrunk: Discussion of the college of business and how they have moved to a 3-3 load vs. other departments who are on a 4-4 load. POLS has a 3-3 load.
Senator: Shared his experiences with the college of business about how they manage the 3-3 load. Information about classroom space and combining classes. College saves money in the sense that sections are combined and there are fewer faculty needed for different classes. But the faculty/student ratio is changed - so faculty have more students in each section. This change followed their desire to meet accreditation requirements. There aren't any CSU COB programs that have tenure track faculty teaching at a 4-4 and so that would impact faculty recruitment. TT apply for this - in the request they outline their research project and additional funding information. They also do a follow up on how they have used the AWTU. The AWTU is only research based.

*SFR = student/faculty ratio

Comment: Space could be an issue if we were trying to increase class sizes.

Many are designed for 30 students. / Trailer affirmed that could be an issue.

Comment: There was a lot of work on a space audit and the use of large classrooms with proposed teaching schedules.

Question about if larger class sizes support quality pedagogy and student success.

Comment: the UC system is very successful with larger rooms. There are different ways to look at the data. It can also depend on the ratio between very large and very small classes. Sometimes larger classes also allow you to have small classes - because the number is based on the average.

Sistrunk: Note from comments the President had made about how space could be utilized differently on a year round basis; if there were more summer programs.

Discussion concluded.

5. Subcommittee Reports/Conversation

a. Overview [FASP Policies and EM subcommittees 2022-23](#)

Sistrunk: Review and update on committees

6. Announcements

a. The Almond Bowl is Friday night.

b. The Parade of Lights is Saturday night.

c. The Butte County Public Library Literacy Services is having their Trivia night be on Friday at 7 pm at Sierra Nevada.

7. Other

8. Adjourn 4:23