TO: Faculty and Student Policies Committee  
FROM: Nicole Sherman Rotating Secretary; Tim Sistrunk, Chair  
DATE: November 3, 2022  
SUBJECT: FASP Minutes – November 3, 2022 at 2:30 PM  

VIRTUAL MEETING Via Zoom: Zoom Link Zoom ID: 215-434-9094 Password: 279547  
https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/2154349094?pwd=aTY1SlVNVzBmMzZuQVVdMEV0UFJxQT09


Meeting begins at 2:32pm

1. Approve Minutes of FASP meeting September 1, 2022 and September 15, 2022 and October 13, 2022 and October 20, 2022  
   a. None approved. Moved to next meeting.

2. Approve Agenda  
   a. Add agenda item of nominating/deciding Vice Chair  
      i  Nomination of Patrick Newell by Kathy Kaiser; accepted nomination; no other nominations  
      ii  Patrick Newell elected Vice Chair for Spring 2023

3. Discussion Item  
   a. Proposed revision of FPPP 5.1.2: Equivalency  
      i  Link provided in chat. Tim Sistrunk explained the reasoning behind the equivalency revision to create standards if a department adopts equivalency in their processes. Proposed changes happen at the
department level to determine what equivalency will be. The recommendation is then sent to Dean and Provost to recognize the standards. Kathy Kaiser brings up the weight of responsibility on the Provost to make the decision and asks what the process is in other campuses and also the length of time for feedback in the process. Mahalley Allen brings up use of the “application” versus a different word like “submission” that may more accurately reflect process. Mahalley also brings up the 14 day turnaround from the Provost as not enough time. Patrick Newell asks what a sufficient amount of time might be. Mahalley also responds that the Provost is appropriate to make these decisions since the Provost makes RTP decisions as well. Ana Medic asks why 14 days was stated. Tim Sistrunk responds that it was just what was suggested. Tim notes that this will be coming back to FASP at some point.

4. Introduction Items
   a. Proposed revision of FPPP Lecturer Issues: Definitions, Sections 1 and 5
      i Tim Sistrunk explains the purpose of the revision regarding unclear provisions in hiring of lecturers. Kathy Kaiser raises that she is alarmed by the number of lecturers who could qualify for tenure track positions and that it was not a previous requirement of the FPPP in hiring. Kathy wants it noted that there are many amongst FASP that this would positively affect. Mahalley mentions it was part of the CBA. Tim goes through the other changes regarding salary range and other topics. Kathy asks about 5.2.6.b and Mahalley clarifies that it comes from the CBA. Kathy moves to move it to action. Voting on whether to introduce and passed as introduction item. Ana Medic wants it to be noted that we did not have time for discussion and that further discussion may happen at Action the next meeting.
   b. Proposed new EM: University Committee Review Committee
      i Jeff Trailer discusses purpose of the Review Committee to give oversight and structure to committees on campus. The size of the committees matters in terms of workload and staffing. Also specifically points out the role of secretary has been a common issue in committees and explains structure for permanent secretary. No objections on introduction item, it passes as introduction item to be taken back up at next meeting.
   c. Proposed new EM: University Committee Nominating Committee
      i Tim Sistrunk explains the similar proposal/structure for this as the previous item. This essentially separates the Committee on Committees into two parts: governing structure, duties, and purpose of committees and this item which would seek volunteers and people to sit on Committees. No objections, so passes as an Introduction Item.
   d. Proposed revision to FPPP 9.1.2 and 10.5.2
      i This is about faculty instruction in RTP and FPPP. Miriam Walter goes over the proposed changes which include adding examples of aspects of the FPPP and links to support/explain categories. Mahalley Allen
asks what Academic Peer Review Course Module is, and notes that some of this that is deleted is not the current FPPP. Miriam clarifies that it meant for evaluation of online asynchronous. Mahalley suggests adding language to clarify that in the document and the if there is a difference between Academic Peer Review and Peer Review. Kathy Kaiser asks what happens if you’re the only one who teaches a course if someone else is able to do a peer assessment if they don’t have the expertise. Ana Medic suggests inviting Jennifer Underwood for her expertise on some of these items to help answer questions FASP may have moving forward. Passes Introduction.

e. Proposed revision to FPPP Range Elevation Process
   i Kendall Leon suggests a 5 min. break which is taken. Ana Medic explain the language of this FPPP which clarifies the process and timeline for range elevation. Passes as introduction item.

f. Proposed revision to FPPP “evaluatee” to “reviewee”
   i Miriam explains the use of “evaluatee” and decision to keep it in the FPPP and make it more consistent in the document. Mahalley suggests moving the item to be voted on. To vote it down with “no” would be the choice to keep the FPPP as is in this regard (based on the recommendation of the committee). Item does not pass introduction.

5. Subcommittee Reports/Conversation
   a. Overview FASP Policies and EM subcommittees 2022-23
      i Subcommittees meeting but nothing further.

6. Announcements
   a. No announcements

7. Other
   a. No other

8. Adjourn
   a. Adjourned at 4:16 pm.
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