

FASP – Feb 24.

Attendees:

Provost Larson, Kathleen Kaiser, Julie Monet, Adam Irish, Tim Sistrunk, Marianne Palva, Todd Gibson, Ella Snyder, Tom Rosenow, Nicholas Burke, Brian Oppy, Dennis O'Connor, Patrick Newell, Miriam Walter, Jeff Trailer, Rebecca Ormond, Danielle Hidalgo, Betsy Boyd, Ennies Musvosvi, Rachel McBride, Jennifer Underwood, Jen McKee, Nicole Sherman, (missing names of 2 people)

Meeting called to order at 2:33 PM

1. Minutes from February 17, 2022, approved.
2. Approve Agenda - [Tim Sistrunk] proposes the addition of a document on changes to SFOT 8.1.4. The committee wants to bring this forward as a substitute document. [Kathy Kaiser] moves to approve, [Patrick Newell] 2nds.
3. Action Items:
  - Proposed Changes to [FPPP Non Discrimination 2.3](#)

[Provost Larson] Reference to proposed changes in FPPP section 2.3. as currently written is not in sync with the equal opportunity statement that HR puts out, or the non-discrimination statement that has been recently revised in the CBA. Concern is for a slightly independent statement may possibly challenge us if we have a grievance. Proposes the language syncs with either HR or the CBA statement.

[Provost Larson] reports the CBA statement does include CASTE, does not include pregnancy, breastfeeding, pumping, family care, medical leave. Recommends if we want to keep the notion of pregnancy, to sync up with the HR statement. Introducing items that have not been vetted in either source is problematic

[Brian Oppy] EOE statements are talking about legal requirements and recommends to first seek legal advice specifically about the implications of this language and the implications of changing it.

[Brian Oppy] references 2.3., line that states, *breastfeeding or pumping at work*. The transition is essentially from how we look at recruiting and then change into essentially activities at work and that include things that people are already legally entitled. Recommendation is if we want to try and change the language, first vet through campus legal.

[Kathy Kaiser] does not want us to lose the critical nature of these additions. Agrees with the confusion that people may think those things are only limited to working on campus and not to recruiting, not sure if this is a crystal-clear segregation and maybe more legal oversight is needed language wise.

[Provost Larson] appreciates interest in keeping the information about breast feeding and pumping at work and eligible for family care and medical leave. However, this is a statement about equal opportunity employer and needs to be in syn with what is defensible through a legal review.

[Tim Sistrunk] The committee can take it to HR to review the language that is not a problem. At action we can bring it back.

[Adam Irish] motions to table the action item so it can be reviewed by HR. [Kathy Kaiser] 2nds the motion. [Provost Larson] makes a motion to amend the motion so it not only includes a review by HR but includes the campus legal representative to review as well.

[Tim Sistrunk] No objections to amend the motion, we will come back to this at another meeting.

- Proposed Change to [FPPP Appendix V](#)

[Miriam Walter] inquires if there is an existing list of abbreviations which can be used as a link it in their department document. [Miriam] moves to add a link to the definitions. [Kathy Kaiser] 2nds.

[Tim Sistrunk] Action item passes and will find a link before sending it on to Senate for introduction.

- Proposed Changes to [FPPP Chairs on Personnel Committees 4.1.10.c, 4.1.10.d, and 10.1.12](#)

[Betsy Boyd] moves to remove the word “Chair” because it creates confusion with a separate Chair’s report. [Kathy Kaiser] 2nds the motion.

[Betsy Boyd]) moves to motion that anywhere the *Department/Unit* is mentioned and uses clauses that it maintains the *Department/Unit* language, so it is consistent. [Kathy Kaiser] 2nds the motion. [Miriam Walter] questions whether (*or Department/Chair*) needs to be included in 4.1.10.c, line 3. [Tim Sistrunk] changes the language in line 3 to read *Department/Unit report*, for consistency throughout the document.

[Tim Sistrunk] No objections to either motion. Passed as action item that will be moved to Senate as an introduction item.

- Proposed Changes to [FPPP 8.1.4 \(SFOT Online\)](#)

[Todd Gibson] Summarizes proposed changes:

The original version was to move SFOT completely online, followed by the frequency in which the online instrument is currently filled out low and needs to be rectified. The original version of the rewrite was to have this model as closely as possible to the paper administration which has a higher rate of return. The second version shows highlighted text where needed to differentiate between electronic and paper and to resolve the issue of not administering the SFOTs totally online.

Second version of proposed changes to SFOT will be administered the last 2 weeks of class, the duration depends on the mode of instruction:

- Synchronous mode - 20 minutes during a class period, administered at the beginning of the class whether administered electronic or paper
- Other modes - under the discretion of the instructor but caps out at one week. Example is an asynchronous course.
- In-person mode of instruction - The faculty will announce the intent to administer the SFOT in a future class. If the delivery will be electronic remind students to bring a phone or laptop.
- Regardless of paper or electronic the instructor leaves the room for the 20-minute duration
- Only students currently registered in the course can complete the SFOT
- Only students who complete the SFOT online need to authenticate before they can fill the form out.
- Student would still put the paper instrument into an envelope and sign

[Tim Sistrunk] introduces Tom Rosenow from Data Services who will provide a summary of numbers over the years and costs:

- Fall 2019-38% of the evaluations were done on paper, Spring 2020 back online due to Covid. That year almost 70 thousand pieces of paper were printed ~ \$5,000. These were thrown away because we went back online.
- Normal cost is ~\$2,000 per semester on labor to process the paper, and another \$5,000 per year in scanner maintenance.
- Generally running between \$7K-10K per semester to process the paper, about \$15K-20K a year
- Fall 2021, 8% of faculty requested paper, Spring 2022 about the same. Paper costs will be about \$1500. other costs will remain the same.
- In the future the question is whether to stay with the Scantron company. It would not be easy to switch over to Qualtrics for a paper and electronic version.
- BBL interface allows the instructor to turn on and off the SFOT as they feel. The Scantron site has a dashboard that shows all the classes students are supposed to do. If needed the subcommittee group and the vendor can talk to see if that function could be better controlled so you would only see the ones that are open.

[Tim Sistrunk] New contract language in the CBA admits instruments can be biased so faculty unit employees can submit written rebuttals.

[Adam Irish] Pleased written option is being provided. In the future the ask is to consult faculty on these types of changes that is an important part of the RTP process.

[Adam Irish] summarizes the memo sent out for those who did not have time to read: Sent 2 emails to faculty in BSS, and 90% responded, that is 52 of the 235 that teach in BSS. Of the 52 responses, 37 tenure line which account for 35% of the tenure line faculty in BSS. Of those 93% were opposed to getting rid of the paper survey.

[Ella Snyder] shares her concern that SFOTs have a significant impact on faculty and their ability to get promoted. Concerned it has reached this point with significant proposals being made about the process and how it is administered without significant consultation with faculty.

[Jennifer Underwood] speaks to Ella's comment regarding a common misconception about the SFOTs, they are not actually supposed to weigh that significant, but in some units, they do. Acknowledges the importance of Adam sending out survey and recommends all Senators to engage in reaching out to their college.

[Jeff Trailer] Appreciates the work that Adam Irish is doing.

[Provost Larson] Refers to the survey that was sent out to BSS faculty, asks if it is clearly stated that even though the survey is electronic it would be administered during class?

[Adam Irish] responds yes. Faculty were given the original proposed policy change which included that language, and the two questions are listed in the memo.

[Tom Rosenow] clarifies they cannot control the time period of the online process, currently it is open for 2 weeks. In the future, will ask the vendor to see if this can be changed.

[Jennifer Underwood] asks if there is currently other CSU campuses that offer fully online of the student survey? [Tom Rosenow] believes there are currently 5 CSU's left with the paper option process and CSU, Chico is one of them.

[Brian Oppy] Appreciates Adam reached out to faculty, but not sure faculty really understood there was a distinction between how they are administered. Reported on their experience administering electronic surveys was about the same as paper, main difference was much more verbal responses on the student side, seemingly more willing to type an answer than to write one on a piece of paper.

[Marianne Palva] shares perspective from the state level that most of the online administration allows faculty to control when the tool is opened. Hopefully CSU, Chico can get the same so faculty can have control over when the digital is administered.

[Betsy Boyd] points to a larger issue that it would be helpful if before these issues are brought to FASP if the committee could conduct surveys more robustly, emphasizes we need more information if we are going to work into one category of delivery.

[Adam Irish] The survey question is about the fundamental choice which we should take seriously in shared governance. The removal of an option as one way to get feedback should be on the people who are asking to remove the option from faculty.

[Ella Snyder] refers to research being conducted when they were previously on a U-SET committee that included many of the questions being asked today, suggests finding out if this information still exists.

[Provost Larson] Asks to call this to question; this topic has been debated thoroughly.

[Todd Gibson] Makes a motion to call a vote.

[Tim Sistrunk] To call the question we need a 2/3rds of the faculty vote.

[Danielle Hidalgo] The count is 12.

[Tim Sistrunk] Question can be called. All in favor of passing this to Senate as an action item vote.

[Danielle Hidalgo] The count is 13

[Tim Sistrunk] 13 is the majority. Item passes to Senate as an action item.

[Betsy Boyd] asks to take out the file name because it's editorial at this point, suggests using the actual SFOT update or the actual FPPP number.

#### 4. Introduction Item:

- [Proposed Changes to FPPP Union Service](#)

[Tim Sistrunk] This proposed change to the FPPP Union Service is a response to the Statewide Academic Senate resolution to include language about the California Faculty Association and to fill out our local policies with references to it. A review of the proposed changes to the language ensued.

[Provost Larson] references the section on Reprimand, specifically the new section 14.1.2.1 relative to a detailed list of due process that the ASCSU has put forward. The language in this section is superseding what is in the CBA. Willing to entertain the conversation about if there is an intent around this that might be finessed to not supersede the CBA.

[Provost Larson] references 8.1.3, concerned about the call out to service to the CFA. The FPPP is consistent where it does not provide definitions that define activities but leaves those definitions to the department standards. Nowhere in the CBA does it give a list of service except under the exceptional service activities category. The callout to this one specific activity is not appropriate for the FPPP.

[Brian Oppy] agrees with the points made by Provost Larson. Their primary concern is the new section 14.1.2.1. and us creating a document that specifies a different process and one that is not consistent with the CBA.

[Tim Sistrunk] comments on the notion that faculty union service counts for service comes from the CBA and will look up the passage.

[Provost Larson] Ok with CFA being an element of service, not Ok with that being the only service activity identifies in the FPPP when there are many other activities that faculty complete as service.

[Betsy Boyd] Commends the FPPP sub-committee for working so fast on a recommendation that came from the ASCSU. Would like to know what aspects of the 14.1 are not in line with the CBA so they can make sure we are not out of compliance in any way.

[Miriam Walter] understands where faculty brand new or seasoned would not know whether or not they could include service to CFA as service.

[Provost Larson in response to Miriam Waler] The FPPP does not provide lists of activities, yet the departments do. Departments are actively looking to incorporate the changes that were made in the FPPP by directing the department to put better definitions to their expectations.

[Provost Larson] refers to the letter of reprimand information that is written relative to faculty misconduct in research and will be rarely applied. [Tim Sistrunk] asks if it should not be a reprimand to research but a reprimand just in general. [Provost Larson] doesn't think this set of specifications should be appropriate to the CBA, but as currently written it is just related to faculty misconduct in research.

[Provost Larson] Recommends if the intentions are that faculty members are given the opportunity to have a conversation with their Dean about a situation that has developed, to indicate that in the FPPP and to go back and look at article 18 in the CBA.

[Betsy Boyd] 14.1 was originally intended for misbehavior in terms of faculty misconduct in research. Assumes the intended resolution from the ASCSU was a broad and encompassing overview of what the processes on our own campuses and for the faculty member to understand what that process is.

[Tim Sistrunk] Discusses voting options: vote to pass or recommend before it comes back to action, we need to consult OAPL and the Provost's office, or we do not pass it as an introduction item and refer it back to the sub-committee.

[Betsy Boyd] motions to refer this back to the FPPP sub-committee. Motion would also be to suspend this item as an introduction until the sub-committee is able to bring this back a different document. [Kathy Kaiser] 2nds.

[Provost Larson] Encourages sub-committee to seek out consultation with OAPL and or herself to find common ground around the idea that faculty having the opportunity to have a verbal conversation prior to something that is written.

[Betsy Boyd] The FPPP sub-committee does have our academic personnel vice provost on the committee and hopes this will suffice for some of the consultation. [Brian Oppy] will give feedback directly on FASP.

[Tim Sistrunk] asks if people want to vote. No objections. This will be sent back to the sub-committee.

## 5. Subcommittee Reports ([FASP EMs 2021-22](#) and [Policy Subcommittees 2021-22](#))

- Up-coming Ems

[Tim Sistrunk] The curriculum sub-committee on campus sustainability has met and all sub-committee members are currently writing descriptions. Our Senate FASP question has generated great activity and will probably come back next month on the 10<sup>th</sup> maybe as an introduction.

[Tim Sistrunk] EM – writing committee just faculty union people sent to other unions, HR and OAPL to begin the process of talking about campus behavior and violence prevention EM-12.25. Not sure if it will come back in time this year to act on.

- Ongoing Activity: Reports from Subcommittees that have things to say

[Jennifer Underwood] reports the CFAC/IRA sub-committee has met twice, next meeting will be Monday. The committee has been spending time gathering information to guide their proposal moving forward.

## 6. Announcements

[Tim Sistrunk] announces that yesterday CFA had a student feedback summit to suggest ways to address bias on student feedback on teaching. Summary report is forthcoming.

[Adam Irish] announces he will be moderating a panel talking about events in Ukraine. PAC 134 next Wed. 7-8pm

[Betsy Boyd] gives a brief UBC update. Ad hoc committee met this week and 2 weeks ago to look at exemplar policies from other campuses around other systems on the university budget committee. Commends the Committee who met this week on their efforts for continuing the work.

## 7. Other

[Betsy Boyd] voices serious concerns over title IX processes within the system. Contact Betsy if you are interested in working on a resolution from Chico State about title IX. Invites anyone who is interested in such a resolution.

[Betsy Boyd] Assembly Bill 928 that asks for singular admissions to the GE pathway for transfer students. This has been discussed in FASP at prior meetings. Shared link to the ASCSU portal for feedback. Encourages constituents to send feedback or to ask their constituents that serve on either CAB or the Educational Policy of Programs Committee to send feedback from the CSU, Chico campus. Feedback to the ASCSU is due March 1.

## 8. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:10, next meeting March 10<sup>th</sup>.