



## Faculty and Student Policies Committee Minutes

---

TO: Faculty and Student Policies Committee  
FROM: Elizabeth (Betsy) Boyd, Secretary *du jour*  
DATE: April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020  
SUBJECT: FASP Minutes – April 9<sup>th</sup> 2:30  
VITRUAL MEETING: [Zoom Link](#)  
Meeting ID: 396 728 863  
Password: 463321

---

Attendance: Underwood (chair, FASP), Boyd, Block, Day, Guthrie, Herman, Hidalgo, Irish, Kaiser (@3:30), Keyawa, Livingston, O'Donnell, Ormond, Perez (@3:07), Peart, Sistrunk, Sparks, Trailer, Vela (@3:07), Westbay, Wright, Zartman

Guests: McCarthy, Kitchell, Allen, Polsan

*\*Disclaimer – Please keep in mind that the FASP committee will do their best to keep all agenda items on task and honor all time certain commitments to the best of their ability. As a reminder, this is the last opportunity for items to come to FASP at introduction. This is no guarantee that items will be approved and moved successfully through the full senate process this semester. FASP will appropriately facilitate discussion on all proposals in the most well vetted process possible regardless of the currently impending timeline.*

1. Approve minutes of [03.26.20](#)  
Motion to approve JL/TS – approved w/out dissent
2. Approve today's agenda
3. Student Conduct Rights and Responsibilities [Grade Appeal policy](#) (2:30) – Introduction

Emily Peart provided an introduction to this proposed policy

Up to student to demonstrate grade discrepancy. This policy would shorten the length of the appeal process from months to XXX by removing several layers of prior processes.

Irish – How did the sub-committee deal with the issue of the length of the hearings?

XXXXX

Sistrunk – section 6, formal grade appeal line 4 from bottom, mentioned twice

O'Donnell – is this is this new document? Is there a track changes doc to see what was changed or is this a new doc? A: this is a new policy that separates it from different types of student grievances

Livingston – How many grade appeals are there, typically, in a semester or school year? A: estimate is around 100 grade appeals. This gives strength to academic side of house to close out these appeals, particularly those that are frivolous

Follow-up – what is expected this semester? Not sure, possibly many more.

Day – commented that this document is a continuation of previous discussion on this.

Sparks suggested the following editorial changes:

IV b. "The" in the phrase "which initiates The Formal Grade Appeal Process" should be lower case (this is at the bottom of page 2)

V b 3. "Hearing" should not be capitalized here (it's lower case elsewhere)

V c. delete extra period in par. 1 after "facilitator"

Suggest removing inconsistent "The" in headings/subheadings (spec., section V heading, V b. subheading, VI subheading "The Formal...")

Peart mentioned there is not a suggested addition (sentence) – will add sentence/paragraph as suggested – need to check notes for sentence

Irish – commented that tying this committee to Senate would be beneficial because it would incentivize junior tenure track faculty to participate more readily

Boyd suggested checking previous minutes for suggested sentence.

Approved without dissent

4. Student Conduct Rights and Responsibilities [Student Complaint policy](#) – Introduction

Emily Peart provided an introduction to this proposed policy. This matches previous policy, but allows Director to determine if complaint should go forward based on criteria.

Sparks had the following editorial suggestions

III b 3. "Hearing" should not be capitalized here (it's lower case elsewhere)

V c. last par. - be consistent about capitalization of "committee" when referring to spec. committees

V d. Referencing "The Grading Policy" - I wouldn't recommend capitalizing "the"

Suggest removing inconsistent "The" in headings/subheadings (spec., section III heading, III b. subheading, IV a. subheading)

Sparks also had one style suggestion for first sentence

O'Donnell requested track changes doc for this grievance process

Approved without dissent

5. [FPPP 8.0.2.a and 8.0.2.b](#) (3:00) – Introduction item

Removed reference to "census date"

Irish Q: Does this give more or less time to faculty going up for review? A: same amount of time

Underwood: Suggestion to add clarifying language on timeline start (the first day of instruction).

Vela – reference to the suggested addition –

Sparks and Perez suggested altering the parenthetical – "from the first day of instruction" instead

Approved without dissent

6. [FPPP 13.1.2.e.6](#) – Introduction item

Discussed after CFAC & Grading Policy due to time certain appointments

Change increases review period of Provost by two weeks.

Have done this last two years in less formal basis.

Approved without dissent

Motion to consider as Action seconded and approved

Approved without dissent

7. [Campus Fee Advisory Committee](#) (Kate McCarthy & Jeni Kitchell time certain: 3:15)–  
Introduction item

McCarthy & Kitchell provided a summary of the changes to this EM.

Role as CFAC Chair (mccarthy) EO 1102 – confusion about our various fee EMs, since EO 1102 covered IRA

Senate directed FASP/CFAC to revise CFAC EM and eliminated IRA as separate committee

Committee is much larger to accommodate workload, with maintenance of student majority

Meeting guidelines were organized from pre-existing committee guidelines

Authority and responsibilities clarification instead of Fees and CFAC ....

Addition of IRA subcommittee

Student learning fees

IRA EM stemmed from an older EO from the 1970s

Irish – 4 faculty, 4 students on current IRA committee – goals in place- revise budget; new policy would reduce to a smaller subcommittee and concern having enough people to cover workload A: faculty membership may not have been considered

Sistrunk – suggested to Irish to think of amendment to policy to address membership concerns. He also offered some editorial advice on the EM.

Boyd – offered checking in with Brooke Banks on use of template.

Irish – voices from across campus – reducing faculty voice may be a concern here as well

Kaiser – Can't we just change Pg 3 two non-student to faculty? Can potentially represent arts, athletics, and others who recognize those student contributions. "I have served as a varsity coach for women's cross country and track. The variety of activities that students (their \$\$) are concerned with and benefit from. So I am very concerned about Student majority with IRA subcommittee but also the cross over of student activities. So suggesting 4 student members and 3 faculty voting members for IRA subcommittee. I believe that would give enough variance that all the interests could get a voice or at least notice."

Livingston – suggested send amendments ahead of time

Irish – ask CFAC to consider additional faculty representation and consider administrative roles and how those shift with faculty representation on CFAC vs subcommittee. Also, how do we want the faculty representatives to be appointed? By admin, with consult from EC? Or? Reiterated concerns about funding allocations in IRA.

Zartman – asked how long Irish served on committee.

Irish answered that he is in 2<sup>nd</sup> year. Irish suggested 3 year staggered terms to help stabilize knowledge base of committee members. He asked for funding history for last 10 years, was surprised that patterns appeared to be the same for last 10 years.

Kaiser –On the same tone as Adam—Why are we assuming the Student representatives would NOT voice the interests of different areas of Student IRA benefits—athletes, artists, technology specialists, even AG??

Vela – Adam brings up a very good point, and he has a specific example of why it's important, but appropriately doesn't share it. It's the principle that's important. Having faculty voices on these committees is important.

Underwood mentioned we should continue to be mindful and vigilant with upcoming meeting for this policy.

Approved with dissent

8. Alternative Grading Options for Spring 2020 (Michael Allen time certain: 3:45)– Discussion item

- a. for reference – [EM 10-018](#) and [EO 1037](#), [additional information](#)

Underwood provided direction for the discussion by explaining there were three main questions we are trying to answer.

(powerpoint, survey, CO letter)

Allen provided overview of options 1-4. Would need to update 10-018 CR/NC area of EM

Kaiser – interviewed law student – everyone on cr/nc, imitating Ivy League, indicator on transcripts

Superintendent of CUSD – some teachers very resistant to Cr/NC – if passing grade entering course, can go for CR, if A, B then elect for that, if F raised to D, then allowing for some credit.

Boyd – expressed concern over the survey (cant determine if proportional representation) some may not have responded. She also mentioned AG is wanting autonomy because of concern over the long-term impact

Guthrie – 85-100% get an A...using

Day mentioned there is an open drop policy right now

Allen – currently COVID is constituting serious and compelling reason

Underwood commented – I don't see how CSU, Chico can guarantee that a CR/NC grade will not be detrimental in some way at another institution in the future as we do not have authority over those institutions. Of course the expectation is there to be understanding and lenient in this regard but we can't guarantee it.

Sparks comment – I have students who've been without consistent internet access for the last 2 weeks. Esp. for our most vulnerable students, I see a huge benefit in helping them get through, not encouraging a withdrawal. In English we talked about how to weigh students' work in the first half of the semester.

Perez – many students with various issues, some dropping classes. Some dropping with assumption that we are using the current grading system

Allen mentioned considering letting faculty advocate for letting student back into courses if grading policy decision makes a difference for them.

Irish commented – I think we need to be leaders here in offering options and doing advising, but the leadership has to start from the top in terms of grading and adjusting expectations. We faculty retain control on the grades but if we could get some more public and sustained direction that we be very considerate of students circumstances would be very helpful.

Herman – disappointment and frustration. Issue of pre-requisites – how do we determine if someone had prereq needed to move forward. Also concern over nursing students getting hours needed. Concern over date being too late in semester.

Allen clarified that date is the deadline for students, rather than for notifying students of our decision. Deadline for campus to decide what we're doing is April 15<sup>th</sup>.

Irish – need to accommodate students

Vela commented – it certainly would affect MFT students, whose B or better grade testifies to the minimal competency necessary to move the next phase in their training to be a counselor. Seems that grades are especially important for students in professional programs.

Block – concern for CR/NC without knowing impact

XXXXX

Zartman – decision guided by students

Allen – we will have access to original grade data

Perez – some students dropped everything due to family/work; shared course flexibility rules.

Allen explained that Incomplete can accommodate students who finish course requirements late

Boyd commented that preference for #4

May 8 is new deadline for W or designation of CR/NC with current policy (option 1)

Count 3 for Option 1 (May 8 deadline)

Count of 8 for Option 2 (May 8 deadline)

Count of 0 for Option 3 (May 8 deadline)

Count of 3 for Option 4 (no deadline)

9. Subcommittee Status and Feedback (time permitting) – Information item

These items were postponed until next meeting in interest of time.

- a. Campus Climate Survey
- b. Targeted Harassment of Faculty
- c. FPPP
- d. Digital Learning Policy – postponed until Fall 2020
- e. EMEDC – On hold following test implementation of amended procedures during current review processes

10. Announcements

11. Other

Guthrie brought up the issue of zoom “classroom” etiquette – do we have a policy that covers this? Digital learning policy might be first place to check.

Other committee members shared thoughts about zooming, including those that log in and don’t “attend”.

12. Adjourn            5:14 PM

Respectfully submitted

Links to:            [Academic Senate](#)  
[Current Executive Memoranda](#)  
[The FPPP](#)  
[The CBA](#)  
[The Constitution of the Faculty](#)  
[Student Conduct Rights and Responsibilities, Campus Policies](#)