# California State University, Chico

Academic Senate, Zip 020
530.898-6201

---

## Faculty and Student Policies Committee Agenda

TO:　　　　Faculty and Student Policies Committee

FROM:　　Jennifer Underwood, Chair

DATE:　　 March 8, 2021

SUBJECT:　FASP AGENDA – March 11, 2021 at 2:30 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING:　　Zoom Link

　　　　　　　　　　　Meeting ID: 985 9539 4337

　　　　　　　　　　　Password: **752886**


Attendees:　Jennifer Underwood (JU), Jeff Trailer (JT), Adam Irish (AI – also proxy for Nick Burk), Alexander Smith (AS), Callie Norton (CN), Danielle Hidalgo (DH), Duncan Young (DY), Kathy Kaiser (KS – also Proxy for Betsy Boyd{BD}, until she arrived – Betsy Boyd Proxy for Marianne Paiva {MP} after she left) Jennifer Brundidge (JB), Jonathan Day (JD),  Kendall Leon(KL), Laura Sparks (LS), Nicole Sherman (NS), Patrick Newell (PN), Paul Herman (PH), Rachel McBride-Praetorius (RM), Tim Sistrunk (TS), Rebecca Ormond (RO), Andy Miller (AM), Brian Oppy (BO), Tiffany Anderson (TO)

---

Meeting called to order at 2:34 pm 03/11/21

1. Approve minutes of 02/25/21

2. *(\* JU noted attendee's on minutes missing that will be added & discussion of Digital learning policy  and University Diversity council – plus reminder in order for items in chat to be included in record please raise your hand )*

    - Minutes approved

3. Approve Agenda –

    - KK (as Proxy for BB) request change for identification 6 – FPPP #17 as a discussion item at time certain 3:15)

    - JU so this [agenda item #6] would become a discussion item & at a time certain  (no objections & seconded & approved )- so can you speak to it

    - KK  the chair council does not meet until again until April 2nd,  if this (item#6)remains introduction status  it would come back to us April 1st & we wouldn't have opportunity for chairs council to discuss/give input – we have someone coming at 3:15 to provide framework- the status of discussion allows to accommodate chairs council to discuss and come back to us at appropriate time

    - JU  I would like to add if we move this to switch item 5 and 6 – might fall more in line coming after our DUO presentation as well

    - no objections – Agenda Approved with changes

    JU – Agenda Approved

4.  Proposed changes to [FPPP definitions](#) (pg. 14) – Introduction item

    - TS: the subcommittee worked to clarify the definitions of things- to make our definitions fit the definitions of the CBA – 1st change, department unit is a basic admin entity – it just defines what a department is – then department unit standards, we wanted to clarify "department standards, policies and procedures…(reads full) … that's the old language, then folks have bylaws and constitutions, those are not approved by the provost, those are faculty created… so we wanted to add that language for how shared governance is supposed to be working… then faculty unit employee – this is strong out of the CBA  - we are all unit 3, there's 11 units on campus, per CBA article 12-13 definition of faculty includes all part time, probationary, temporary … like for tenure track, FERP and others as defined by CBA and are assigned to a unit and goes back to the department definition, So the administrative unit, you know, goes back to that department definition. That defines, older language in the faculty Constitution- it implies that departments can decide who auxiliary members of their department are - some people have used that to say our lecturers are not really members of our department. And that's not really CBA definitions. And so, we're cleaning that up  It's a way to go at this very old document- it has great ideas in it – but it's kind of passé now - we added FERP faculty, those are that are mentioned in the other parts of FPPP but they're never defined. So, we added that …

    JU:  Thank you Tim this is an introduction item.  Comments?  Objections to this passing at action during the next FASP meeting? (none) We consider this approved – our DUO presentation nor ready yet – lets jump to Item #5 and begin discussing

    [note:  we jumped around agenda -jumps are highlighted- RO]

5.  Full implementation of DUO – (time certain: 3:00 PM – Andy Miller) Information item

    [jumped  here at 3:00 – start of #5]

    JU (cont.) Andy Millier is here to give us a presentation on DUO for the full campus (presentation share in meeting and via box)

    AM:  Most of you already enrolled… our project is to enroll an enforce remaining ... DUO is a multi-factor authentication system (when you log in you get a  prompt to use either a smart phone app or SMS text (handed out tokens for those who do not wish to use phone – freely)  passwords easily compromised – 2020 significant hack to sister CSU (months to fix)  but this project started ack in 2018 – roughly 90% of faculty and staff are enrolled on state side – 40% on Auxiliary side of staff.  April 6, we flip the switch for remainder of faculty, staff including on Auxiliary side, the following week Tue thruTh enroll enrolling half the student's same day each week – and the next week Tue thru Th April 20, 21 and 22  we'll do the same thing.  we looked at critical campus dates in developing the timeline – including registration on the 26th to limited students – at the moment Blackboard is not one the systems enforced with DUO that will change later in the summer.  We're working closely with student affairs and University Communications, to make sure that our communications and support plan is really sound. - a list here of different media and communications and trainings that we'll be doing over the course of the next four to six weeks. I'm making stops at a number of groups like … we will also be doing presentations and trainings to various Student Services, departments and areas on campus that are in close contact with the students so that they really understand what's coming… original manual enrollment (ITSS had to get involved) is no longer the case – we've figured out self-enrollment.   That's no longer the case, we've actually figured out a way to allow self-enrollment, which takes out the ITSS intervention. - So right now, there's what we call a nag screen. - a screen that says - click here to enroll now, or wait later- In the future, though, what will happen is that nag screen will no longer be there, you'll automatically get the now you must enroll…1-2 minutes to self-enroll … In terms of exceptions, we do recognize that that we may have some students who do not they either don't have a smartphone or they're you know, they don't want to receive text messages or phone calls may have an accessibility issue. For those

students we can grant the temporary exception while we ship them a token (most students due not want tokens we have a surplus). … to show you what's happening across the CSU (showed graph) 58% of the campuses have between 96 to 100% of their staff enrolled already in duo. (multiple references to graphs in PPT)… by April 1, we can see that most of the campuses are going to have most, if not all, of their of their students, faculty and staff enrolled.

JU:  questions?  (none) our program got signed up last fall ... been working fine.  If anyone has questions get in touch with Andy.  We are moving on to the time certain 3:15 – we have a discussion item for proposed changes FPPP 17.0 . Jonathan Day is here to discuss

6.  Proposed changes to FPPP Rating (pg. 14) and 10.3.3 – Introduction item

JU: (continued from item #3 above...) this is FPPP item the subcommittee is bringing – this is going to be a more lengthy conversation that we'll start and then jump back to our time certain ...Jeff I'm going to call upon you.

JT: subcommittee challenged with revising rating system to meet concerns raised by provost (towards bottom we have an appendix that talks about problems this in intended to solve) – The new rating system is intended to solve 3 problems (reads- summarized) more appropriate align the title of the summary evaluations to the actual RTP decision outcome,  more appropriately establish & communicate the requirements and timing for accelerated tenure (especially important to provost), and eliminate the incentive to assign a low summary evaluation in early years of a career in order to show progress over time – so basically, what's being proposed is that we go from the current system which is inadequate, adequate, effective and superior – and simplify it – to meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or exceeds expectations.  This would be a change in the definitions if this is approved…(looking at) FPPP 10.3.3 most language is preserved except toward the end...(reads) "and supersede discipline-specific nomenclature as outline in the Units department standards.  Here, except expectations are defined by the criteria specified in the Units department standards."  And then 10. 3.3. goes on to define the general pre-evaluation categories – and this is more specifically how it would change.  Superior would relabel as Exceeds Expectations -the language is the same except at the end where it (reads) "Exceeds expectations shall be concluded only for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure."  Effective would relabel as Meets Expectations most of the wording is preserved except we are suggesting to strike the word Impressive but adding (reads) "meets expectations shall be concluded only for those whose performance in the specific area of evaluation appears to afford them a reasonable possibility of obtaining tenure in due course - i.e. given the number of probationary years remaining.)"  hopefully this is more clear - that this is normally expected until  you have worked here long enough to exceed whatever the expectation is  and if that happens then it would move up here.  Inadequate would relabel as Does not meet Expectations  again most of the wording is preserved (reads new wording not strikethroughs) "evidentiary record does not demonstrate that the candidate is making the minimum contributions with regard to department criteria in area being evaluated. The significant deficiencies identified require immediate attention and correction." Mostly the same but a bit of wordsmithing to make it more straightforward.   We tried to make this as minimal a change as possible but still be impactful.   Adequate then just goes away.  The point of the RTP process is yes or no, so more than two summary conclusions becomes a problem.  So why do we have 3 conclusions?  That's because we allow accelerated Tenure – and so we need a third one to address – we need a third category to justify breaking the normal pattern.   Then moving further down, still 10.3.3. =

what it does is more specifically applies each of these to the different categories. Modifications are relatively minor.  Just replacing <u>Superior with Exceeds Expectations,</u> <u>Effective with Meets Expectations,</u> removing <u>adequate</u> (it's just redundancy)  replacing <u>Inadequate with Does not meet Expectations.</u>   The wording is basically identical, the same with PG& A and service.    Then we get to 10.5.3 and here is one of the issues the provost specifically mentioned – we want to do a better job of identifying  appropriately accelerated tenure and promotion – so 10. 5. 3 (reads) "To qualify for accelerated tenure and promotion the candidate must: (1) have been rated (instead of superior) Exceeds Expectations in a *Performance Review"* - so the idea here is you would have had to have had a review and been evaluated at this level before you could announce yourself as going for accelerated tenure, so this is a specific hurdle  (reads) *"*as defined in 10.3.3 and (2) demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue; and (3) have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full time assignment."  Issue is people get by outs and things earlier in their career and so the point is to perform better and so this is saying that you would need to demonstrate that you can maintain your level of performance under a normal workload type of assignment.  Then – I know you will probably have questions I'll just read and then  you can redirect me to 11.1.3(reads)  To qualify for accelerated promotion to full professor"  so then this is another area the Provost was concerned about  so "(1) be ranked"  – so I got some feedback that ranked is not probably the wrong word -want to wordsmith that-  rated maybe – (reads) " exceeds expectations in all three categories)?  2 is being eliminated as it no longer applies, 2 then becomes (reads) "demonstrate the likelihood that their exceptional performance will continue and (3) clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and beyond the University itself."  This is the current language reduced 4 issues to 3 issues (reads)  "Inasmuch as consideration of accelerated promotion to full professor is not the normal pattern, a recommendation for accelerated promotion must be accompanied by its justification as an exceptional record at each level of review."   This is why we need 3<sup>rd</sup> category – a summary level conclusion facilitating and defining of accelerated decisions.   Then it was suggested we have an appendix for guidance in transition, when we have changed the FPPP in the past it would have been helpful to have gotten in front of some of  the questions and provide some guidance – Appendix A was put together with this in mind – it is suggested to transition to the new format in the following manner  You know, superior would translate into exceeds expectations. And then effective and adequate, you know, could translate into meets expectations and inadequate shall translate into does not meet expectations, because we have to have a no answer, right. However, the unit's department standards are the appropriate authority for defining expectations. So, it's really up to the units as to how they specify their criteria, and then how they want to translate their criteria into these standards. So, the units are still completely free to specify whatever high or low standard they want, and then define how that translates into the overall summary. So that freedom still exists. And then for example, if the unit's department standards for a specific area define that summary, evaluation of effective as the minimum rating for awarding tenure, and this is what my department does, so this is very dysfunctional, then effective could translate as meets expectations, and inadequate could translate into does not meet expectations, right, that would have to be true. And then inadequate, of course, shall translate into does not meet expectations. And so that's the, that's the overview.

JU:  Jeff you ended that perfect for our time certain – Kathy I'm going  to hold your question until we can come back – we need to move on to our DUO presentation

==[paused to return to time certain at 3:00 – then continued on through FPPP 17 #6 before returning – its typed continuously here but there is a time gap to other items]==

JU:  –Kathy you had your hand up do you still have a question

KK:  Yes – greatly appreciate move away from "superior" but am concerned It doesn't always say how a specific performance is being assessed. …here it says, the candidate has achieved less than satisfactory levels of performance with regard to the department's criteria's, but then you go up to academic community and it's not clear who's making that assessment or how, and then you go up to a model of academic and professional contribution and the area being achieved? And again, it's a little bit vague… what's being used as the ruler... Department only shows up at 'does not meet"

JT:  I think I can answer that. That is, in general, always referring to department standards. So, if it would be more clear, to put DEP standards at every single one of the definitions - we could do that, but that was the intent.

KK: I think it's important- sometimes a candidate's professional expertise is assessed differently than other areas of the college that they might be in. -social  work has an application standard that you need to be able to meet- another area of the university, only looks at publications. We need to allow the profession itself, recognition of how they're assessing things - we've had this discussion around the performing arts, sometimes around other areas

JT:  yeah,  in 10.3.3. The initial paragraph outlines the intent of the section. And there is a line here that's at least intended to address your concern -it says expectations are defined by the criteria specified in the unit department standards.

KK: my experience on the assessment committee of a college when a department's professional standards were different it was a very protagonist sticky situation where they had to defend themselves- they had to clarify how their profession looked at that performance when other departments in a college didn't have the exact same limbs.

JT:  hopefully this will help... what this is saying is that if you're doing a written performance review, that you're not allowed to do that, that you're only allowed to define it by the criteria specified in the unit's department standards.

JU:  Thank you … Jennifer

JB:  I think this will greatly simplify the RTP process.  I'm wondering if we couldn't reduce it to two categories, meets expectations or doesn't meet expectations, with the caveat that if somebody is going up early, they, exceeds expectation …one of the agonies of the RTP process is just trying to decide whether somebody is effective or superior. … people end up going up for tenure and feeling like crap about themselves because they got effective and not superior. - it should be a moment of celebration, because they've met all the expectations… you only need to be exceeding expectations when you're going up early.

JT:  I couldn't agree with you more- I got lots of feedback- All of it was supportive. But I did have a group that wanted lots more categories- 16 different levels. ... but in my experience -as   you have said, if you don't give them the top level of Uber magnificent awesomeness, then it's like ripping their heart out, right? - I too struggled  - 2 is really all that's need for the report and if you want to put that somebody is super mega awesome. You can put that in the report, right- create that category in your department standard and say Super Mega awesome, equals this. And if you become super mega awesome- you are going to meet expectations.

JB:  In the qualitative –

JT:  excellent point…pragmatically, we could do it that way. But even if we left it at just two, we would still have to define the third one for accelerated tenure anyway. And so, we would still have to define it because we need it or we need something for that. I'm agreeing you raise a good point….this is the most simple system that we could agree on.

JU: Thank you . Paul…

PH: like you're super mega, mega awesome... my question ... The descriptions that you're proposing ... exceeds or meets, are just replacing superior, effective and adequate. They're not messing with the DEP standards at all?  …My department standards are pretty rigorous, rigorous- there has to be two Super Mega awesome in there to even get considered. And so, I'm wondering, I'm wondering, for those of us that are on that track that are up for tenure, will this affect that? And how, how would we go about blending the transition?

JT:    once you have gone beyond the definition of the unit standard whether it's a little bit or a lot, however it's defined, once you exceed it, then then you're up here. …The intent here is that this is a completely honorable position, to be in that meeting expectations, is a demonstrated good achievement, that typically the department standards are high, you have met these high standards.  However, you've defined it, you would be running here, and the department needs to itself decide how it wants their criteria to fit into here. So, there is a step that has to occur. Where the department says what it takes to meet expectations. … then beyond this point, we're going to place it here. Both of these are tenure decisions, so really, the thing in terms of getting tenure or not getting tenure would have been inadequate … Now it's called does not meet expectations. This is the one that would have changed the professional career. So down here -The only issue is that you have to identify significant deficiencies for correction. And of course, we've always expected that anyway. Right. I mean, that's always been understood, but we're just saying it now. Then we're also just saying that you have to draw this conclusion in terms of the department's criteria -you can't just make up new stuff. So I think that there is zero risk, I think, because the department is completely free to define how their standards fit into each of these three categories. So it should simplify the process.. I don't think anybody should be concerned that they were on track and now there is a risk of being off track just  because of the classification system. But let me pause in case there's other committee members see it differently.


PH: I ask because in our department meets expectations is not a consideration for tenure – that has be superior range.


JT:  Yes. great point. So There's this guide for transition. And that issue is relevant to me as well - we require effective rating as a minimum for granting tenure rather than adequate So the trick here, is that the departments have to get together and state that this standard equates to meets expectations- to say that it meets expectations as a summary level conclusion for RTP - so meets expectations, not general use of the word meets expectations. Does that help answer the question?

JU: Thank you – Laura…

LS: Thanks, support two...But I understand why three would make sense … I wanted to suggest continued thinking about language where these different sets of categories get broken down in professional growth and in service. In particular, in professional growth, the meets expectations, it talks about substantial, significant scholarly achievement, which we all want to have, but I also don't know if that's the same as competence, given that we're at a teaching institution. I wasn't sure about the inclusion of both the word substantial and the word significant.  I wondered if, if there could be some consideration of tempering that language, maybe one or the other, or a different word, I mean, adequate sounds sad but something that suggests you have met it but doesn't mean you're at an R1 And then in the service part, also in that meets expectations I was thinking about the difference between exceeding and meeting…it mentions taking on key roles on significant committees … and I'm wondering if there are enough to go around

for everybody who is pre tenure. - given that that's pretty much the same as exceeds - maybe there's more roles or more significant committees. Maybe something like participation in membership on significant committees, or something like that would suffice for someone who's an assistant professor. I don't know that we're distinguishing here between associate and full but I would expect more of those key roles to happen before that promotion. So I could see a tempering of the language in the meets expectations to straddle the effective and adequate, a little bit more, and also to make clearer hopefully, whether someone is truly exceeding expectations, or meeting where we would expect someone say in their 30 years to be…maybe or future discussion. Thank you.

JT: excellent points. And this is the existing wording. And I think that over the years, it has been neglected, right, because it's such a big deal to change this. And so I think now's the time

JU: Thank you … Brian

BO: I will advocate once again for three categories. And this is primarily because I've seen enough department standards. And you will be hamstringing some of your colleagues, if you cut it down to two. - the rest of the phrasing - you guys are doing great work with making these adjustments. But I will say that the four has been problematic in so many ways. So good work.

JU: thank you .. Adam

AI: - on the research end of things- words like substantial ..significant in this way expects us to have all this time to be doing research when we're also teaching a ton. - from a junior faculty perspective, that'd be a very welcome change to have it just say, Look, you're doing scholarship, like we would expect the junior faculty to - you're meeting our expectations. You know, the idea that we're changing our field? - they should probably pay us more than that. The second thing is, which raised a big, red flag within my own department and with people my college that I've talked to, is the question of significant committees. - what that actually means? I know, for example, just like everyone else here, serving on FASP whether or not a chair, - the amount of time that is put in, in terms of service, the amount that we process for university policy is so disproportionate to what other junior faculty are doing. What's a key role on FASP? I've kind of feel like anybody that's here is in a key role, given the just raw time. So I would strongly encourage the committee to either to define what is the significant committee that you can be on, or to maybe get rid of this idea of a key role that you can get, because that that also makes it very difficult - when we start thinking about, - the actual participation of service, the time that goes into it – like my advising Honor Society, the Honor Society takes a lot of time to, but I doubt that anybody would consider that a significant committee. So I think the way this is classified now is really problematic, especially for junior faculty.

JT: we probably don't need to put metrics in here because the departments are going to do that. Better. .. so that the departments can then step down and define what's meaningful to them. So Yes.

JU: Thank you … Tim..

TS: Yes, that's what we are addressing, we left all those parts because they are so you know, tangled. -you're all talking about things that everybody pretty much agrees with. If people want to join Jeff and I, to rewrite these little pieces, or send your recommendations for things to cut - that's exactly why we left those aside so that people could think about them.

JU: Thank you.. Kendall

KL: an issue here is the word committee - I wonder if we could say something like scholarly .. service activities, that support rather than identifying committee work, because honestly, until I received tenure, I tried to focus on service activities, that kind of connected to who I was as a researcher and teacher rather than seek out committees,

because I just felt like I didn't have time to do all of that in the tenure process. So I wonder if that would work to kind of broaden that category. I do want to go back to professional growth and achievement, we have to remind ourselves in the language when it says, maybe it's the use of the scholarly, This, to me seems a space to recognize being maybe a leader in the field, - might be some impact being made on a national level that somebody might be doing. It might not be publishing articles. I don't know, maybe if it's the term scholarly, suggesting research articles or research publications. I feel like national service, national impact on a field, doesn't necessarily have to be scholarship. Maybe our time is limited in terms of getting peer reviewed articles out. But that doesn't necessarily mean we can't be contributing on a larger scale. You know, that in a field, which to me is this, this is what this category is about. So I don't know – if it the word scholarly, or if that's been reduced to look a certain way. So I think that this is that space for that kind of national work, or field related work. I'm just hearing what people are saying about we don't have time to do research, but I don't really see that been said here - if we're reading this category, broadly.

JU:  thank you … Adam

AI:  in response to Kendall's point, - a really good point - from personal experience, publications, all that matters My own department, ranked me down- I had everything else, but wasn't getting papers out fast enough -  it didn't matter that I was doing stuff at a national level – I am  smart enough to know if you want to move institutions, papers, are all that matters, but, it's really frustrating because when I got here, people told me this was a teacher-scholar institution- The reality of it is, so far from that - It's much more like we aspire to be a preeminent University in California. And I don't know whether we're beating Stanford, UCLA or USC, but I don't think we're going to be a preeminent university, I think we're going to be a really good regional college that hopefully does right by the North state.  Maybe I should just join FPPP and try and suggest language to try and push people away from the idea that a published thing is the only thing that matters. But that's been my experience. I've been told, like to my face, get things published. Don't worry about all this other stuff.  We don't care about it.


JU:  Thank you.  we've had a lot of feedback for the subcommittee, Jeff and everyone else to consider. So I do encourage, as Tim already said, if you have any language suggestions, go ahead and send it on. Is it okay, if they send it to you, Jeff, as the holder of the document currently

JT: Yes

JU:  that would be great. And we're going to be voting in a second. What would happen then is then, those changes, they could consider how they want to implement them. And they would be considered as this moves to action as a collection of amendments that we would consider prior to discussing the document further. (*Betsy would be so proud of me that I just said collection of amendments.*)  Do we have any objections to passing this document at Introduction and moving this on as an Action item at the next FASP meeting? And I'm not seeing any. **So we will consider this document passed at introduction.** And we'll be discussing this as an introduction item at the next meeting. Be prepared at action, we will actually put additional changes in place. So if you happen to leave this document and see anything else of interest, go ahead and just be prepared to either communicate that far ahead of time, or to be prepared for that for the next meeting.  Thank you Jeff.

JT:  Thank  you.

JU: Now we're going to be moving on to our final discussion item (#7), which was regarding FPPP lecture development.

==jumped  ahead to #7  - as item 6 was inserted earlier==]

6. Proposed changes to FPPP 17.0 – Introduction item (forthcoming)

JU:  (cont....)I will go ahead and share my screen (FPPP 17.0) I have Jonathan here to discuss

JD:   This comes from the chairs executive committee via the chairs Council. - I was asked to put together this section 17 ...gives the chair some idea of what's going on, ... how chairs are actually elected,  what that election means and the fact that the dean is a big part of this. ... what that comes from this committee headed by Daniel Grassian, outlines their time base ... how many students, how many majors, how many staff they, how many FTS, they had, so on and so forth. It's this big, long spreadsheet. And we thought this was a good source of data... we asked Daniel, and Holly if this couldn't be converted into a living document, one that would be updated automatically every year. .. so.. any chair who wishes to negotiate with their Dean with respect to their time base, would have access to  this data,,, I believe we've already run it past the chairs Council. But there are some other changes that Betsy wants to relate to you ... Go ahead, Betsy.

JU:  Thank you Jonathan – Betsy are you going to talk about the chair changes before we have questions?

BB:  Yes, Jonathan gave a nice overview.  ... it's really hard as a chair to have any resource available to before your contract is done before your permissions are set to look this stuff up on your own, to go in and actually see what other contracts other chairs are getting. I am an example of a chair who was assigned of the incorrect contract code, and therefore omitted from receiving the CBA contracted stipend, and some other things Jonathan, how long have we been talking about this chair time based thing in the chairs group?

JD:  Ever since we wrote section 17 so many years  So isn't, there really isn't any mechanism for it. Because of the way chairs are chosen. There's a recommendation, which is based on department vote. But then the real the rubber hits the road when you go to the dean's office and he either accepts or rejects that recommendation. And then there's the discussion of time base. And I know from my personal situation Jeff Bell, the chair before me, in biology, was doing three quarter time as a three quarter time chair. And he thought that since the department had expanded so much that it was worthy of 100%. Chair. And so during the transition from him to me, he made that case

BB:  Part of the reason that section 17.0 was developed in the first place is because the Academic Affairs memo 78 dash 84 (very old 80s or 70s), still referenced as a list of chair responsibilities.  At one point the chairs worked to develop EM's -  that very clearly delineated chair responsibilities - they were even all the way approved all the way through Academic Senate, and then the old admin decided they wanted to rewrite them without our consent. ..We ended up coming back to this with our new admin and bringing in a section 17. The time base has been a decades long situation. And unless you have an awesome chair ahead of you that advocates for your time base to be appropriate, it's really uncommon that you'll even have the knowledge to know what your time base should be coming in as a chair. So the FPPP subcommittee has been working in concert with the chairs over the last several years on section 17. And I've usually been a correspondence between because I was a department chair - the subcommittee's also thinking of making a little bit more robust section in the support area. So Jennifer, if you'd scroll down to Section 17. 3.1, there is an idea to expand this section that were stated by Jonathan -FTES-# of faculty, how many majors ... put them in there to say that Dean's and chair should have a discussion about the comparative data. And that there should

be some consideration of 12 month contract, which is also something that may or may not be discussed, or may not be known to the chair or to the dean if the Dean's new. Another thing is the professional development support for many chairs was removed. So chairs are receiving the normal professional development amount for every faculty member. But that's supposed to be for their own professional development as their own discipline permits, and Chair have had the professional development removed. … chairs and Dean should have a conversation about the support mechanisms and the professional development mechanisms for their role as chair, separate from their role as a hired faculty member. … I'd like to have a draft of some of these ideas and make sure it goes back to the chairs and not get ahead on the FASP schedule …the FPPP subcommittee didn't even know that the chairs were proposing this change. And if we had we probably could have worked together … But I think now that we do, we can accelerate the process and get that consultation in. So I just wanted to mention those things. I think there's one other area, Jennifer on the responsibilities section, if you were squirrel up 17.1.1- there's just some redundancies that are in a couple of these bullets. And so wanted to work with the chairs to see if they thought those were also redundancies- thanks for making this a discussion item today.

JU: Thank you Bests- Marianne

MP: I have two questions- And thank you for that rationale for bringing this Forward- I have a question about the time in between the review & sit down with the chair, to determine campus data related to chair time base? and I understand that normally these are three year appointments. But it says up here, no fewer than two years- no more than three years unless term is specified in a hiring contract - I'm wondering if it's possible to have a more concrete time to conduct this review, because I'm concerned that the review might not happen frequently enough? let's say someone is appointed or contracted for a five year term and their program doubles in that time- is some way to review this time base before that five years is up? I'd hate to see a halftime chair, all of a sudden be burdened with full time work?

JD: I'm not sure if we actually have anybody who has more than three years here -that language was left because we didn't know of anything more than a 3 year chair- I think there might be some program directors that were on less …But my 17.2- we're trying to get out there this is something that takes place during the election, the initial election of a chair, so it's supposed to happen right away. We could right something – we don't have any provisions for changing timebase midstream – that's something I can bring back to the Chairs council.


MP: I am concerned some people do multiple terms

JD: It's a good point … though if you are elected for a second term you are supposed to go through this process with the dean though we did not say that explicitly and perhaps we should.

MP: That's my first question. My second question … is the voter eligibility for chairs, which is 17.2.1.a. (reads) faculty, including lecturers are eligible to vote for the selection of the chair as provided for in the appropriate department school or unit governing documents. And there are several things wrong with the assumption that that there is a provision for lecturers to vote in some departments, in some elections they are still not eligible to vote to vote. And in many departments, their vote is less than tenure track faculty ... this is something I would like to come back to at some point, even if its after this initial revision has passed.

JD: …been a sore point for some departments, not sure why some departments are dragging their feet.. not sure it belongs in this section but does belong somewhere in FPPP

JU: thank you Marianne.. Kathy..

KK:  Well, mine is back to time base I know an online major that  just exploded -and yet there was no reconsideration of the workload - We end up working some chairs to a frazzle. - The other aspect is, I've seen departments who have sanctioned chairs, - So there's a tension here, between why a chair might get selected, and then how their performance and the role might expand …So I think that's another aspect as well. Thank you.

JU:  Jonathan has to leave so we'll be in touch the FPPP subcommittee

BB:  I just wanted to comment a little bit to faculty definition and rights regarding the vote. And that's why there are definition changes in the FPPP-  there's also a definition of a department chair within the FPPP I think- And it includes things like program coordinators and program directors that are thought to be equivalent to chairs per their constitution of the guidelines per the department- There might be other program coordination efforts in different units that don't quite have the right that name… Tim can speak to this a little bit. But when we looked at the definitions in the FPPP, the definition of faculty didn't even follow our CBA. And even in the CBA, it's a little bit weird, like you have to look at the definition of a department. And then the definition of a department says all faculty, unit employees constitute a department…. And then you look at what a faculty unit employee is, and it includes all faculty unit.

TS:  Betsy – we passed that as an introduction…

BB:  Yes that's partly why … we wanted to be really clear in definitions and language.. there was argument initially about whether or not to put the parenthetical "and lecturers or including lectures' there.  - it was necessary to make sure that folks knew that we're not excluding anyone.  - it is a real big problem that still exist within different departments.

JU:  Thank you Betsy.  Questions.  This is at a discussion item so we are not voting.  We look forward to working with chairs about suggestions – and seeing the document with changes at a later date at FASP.  So we have bounced around on the agenda.. – before we to Lecturer Development  we need to jump back with Jeff Trailer discussing FPPP ranking and 10.3.3 and Kathy ..

[jumped  back to  #5 previously started between time certain(s)]


7. FPPP lecturer development – Discussion item

JU: (cont.)  Tim, would you like to share your screen for that? I wanted to welcome Tiffany Anderson, current chair of the lecture Council, and she's here to offer any additional comments or information in regard to this.

TS:  these individual observations come out of conversation with FPPP's famous subcommittee- thinking about lecturer development at Chico State and general feelings there ought to be reassertion of the professional, the status, but also the possibilities for personal and professional development, as members of the community. In the first one is what we sort of talked about in relationship to the chairs- we could just add that also in a particular lecture section.   There are different places in the FPPP where lectures are discussed, particularly, we could just add it in the very beginning of the FPPP, there's a

bunch of language about professional responsibilities in general terms. But that's less important, we just wanted to note that this is part of the conversation – wanted people's feedback before we started putting things down (*2 Serve on committees*) then service opportunities, that second point, you know, lectures could serve on all kinds of committees, the CBA really only one limitation- It requires that if faculty are evaluating other faculty about personnel matters, like RTP, they need to have a rank higher than the person they're evaluating. Other than that, - that's the only thing that our contract says. So there are all kinds of other committees on campus departments, colleges and university wide, that aren't really dedicated just to personnel matters and general admonition that there should be an attempt to find some kind of financial support for that (*2 work to find financial support for the professional development.*) The provost is very supportive of that notion. - if you're a university scholar, and you're teaching at a university level, you have to get training, you have to continue to develop yourself, and you can develop your own aspirations through committee work and you should be allowed to do that. So that's kind of what this is capturing. Currency in the field, that's actually a standard in in CBA, but also in the FPPP for lecturers. (*3 currency in the field = professional development*) -You get to maintain your status to be rehired, then finally, after, after six years, you get to three year contracts, and you're supposed to maintain currency in the field. And how do you do that? conferences, travel or whatever... There are lots of different ways …it's not supposed to be prescriptive. It's just to remind people put that in the FPPP that meets expectations, or whatever the basic standard. And then here's this is a more radical idea for that. If you're going to have a position in your unit & going to call on the universe to bring you a poet and a scholar- it's kind of a nice idea to consider the people around you a little bit (*4 automatically evaluate promotion to tenure lines within a unit*) , not just because it's cheaper and makes more sense Is that same kind of weirdness that we were talking about earlier… that R1 weirdness. It isn't requiring people to hire the people in their own departments… And then this point five (5 Evaluate holistically development – beyond SETs) is sort of related to what we already have been doing, we are supposed to be evaluating all the different capacities that we all develop - follow the mission of the university -promote education…


JU: Thank you Tiffany do you have anything to add?


TO: Tim summed it up pretty well. With these five points, I don't necessarily think there's anything more to add- 2.1, in terms of the voting rights, I do know, and I've heard from lectures some they didn't know that lectures still weren't having a vote for chair -I definitely think that that that's important, that they are part of the department, & their vote does mean something- Even if it's not a full vote - And currency in the field. Definitely something that's been talked about quite often amongst the lecture council members - we do a lot of different types of work on campus in different in different respects & how to give them information on how to do that and the financial support that they might need for that service. Yes. Then SETs. Lecturers, when we're coming up for our evaluations - , if there isn't opportunities to perform service work - all they have to really go on is their SETs. - think about a better way. We all know and I've been in FASP meetings before - I've talked to many people - SETs just are the way to go, they're biased and all those things, I don't want to get into all that- But just trying to find a better way for lecturers to express what they've done beyond SETs especially when lecturers who have had to redesign our classes- were doing this all online, we don't see our students, we don't know if they love us or hate us. And, for tenured track faculty you have your other things that you're doing, your service work, your research that you could speak to that on your path for promotion, lecturers don't really have much of anything else except those SETs. So trying to figure out something else or promoting lecturers to do something else – to discuss beyond SETs.

JU:  Thanks – as the FPPP subcommittee continues on with this they will obviously keep the lecturer council in the loop so you can offer any kind of comments and any language that might be helpful…. Laura

LS:  wonderful list. I have heard from constituents in FHA is a strong desire for more teaching support, not just in terms of the kinds of classes you get to teach, but also time to work on your teaching, time to to go to conferences around teaching or receive more training on teaching. I'm assuming that is also coming up in conversations on the lecture Council. But since I didn't see teaching explicitly on the list, I was wondering, to what extent that was something that FASP should be working on as well, in regards to the FPPP and thinking about how to support lecturers teaching, I also from other committees I'm on and stuff here. I've also heard on other committee what seems to be an unfortunate  de-professionalizing or de-skilling of lecturers teaching, so I could certainly see a value there.

JU:  Thank you – I'm sure Tim was vigorously writing that down.

TS:  Yes we can add your suggestions – this is a work in progress – we can even do it next week & have it out next time we come back

AI:  last time we talked about service not being necessarily compensated .. I really like the direction that you're pushing in with the idea of a holistic development. I really, really liked the idea of providing our lecturer colleagues with other vehicles … it's really hard to describe your online class ..I think one of the things that would be nice is if we also provided some guidance in terms of an overtime template or something like -I  know for the three year lectures, one of the lecturers that I work with in my department, - he has really good arguments over time for what's happening in his class beyond SETs. … I could imagine one for like, the evolution of  assignments … class survey feedback from that module or something, - so that when a lecturer comes in, they don't have to reinvent the wheel.

BB:  awesome. And I have a few things I'm wondering about. I wonder what the lecturer council thinks about the information that lecturers get written and where it might be University structure wise? Should there be some kind of a mechanism every year for lecturers to participate in a paid environment before their classes start to understand their valuation criteria… we've started doing some of our sort of lecture orientation, maybe that's the spot to do it…or an appendix as examples. One thing in particular I'm thinking of is a range elevation. So as a, as a department chair, equivalent, in the last couple of years, I've had lecturers who have been eligible for range elevation, and literally frozen, because they are not sure what that application entails. I started looking around, are there any guidelines? I think a lot of tenure track are really dialed in, like, here's your expectations. Here's your department standards, where they sign off on what standards they're getting. Should we do something like that? Should every department chair be sitting down with each individual lecturer to discuss what is expected? I'm curious with the lecturer Council has to say about some of those.

TO:  there are eight of us who sit on the council, all of our experiences are vastly different- some department standards include information about lectures and their teaching evaluations, in the same document that has all of the expectations for the tenure track faculty, some don't, some only have it for the tenure. … we've also broached that idea.. how do we, how do we disseminate this information to  lectures? Is it a page? Is it a website? Or is it a web page within the Chico State website

somewhere? Maybe OPAL, - where can all this information be located? Another aspect is the FPPP, and kind of poking around the Chico State website just for information - lecturers come to me to and say, "Well, I don't know about this, where do I find it? So then I go hunting for it."   There's a lot of things for tenure track, you have to meet this expectation, and you have to do this. Maybe not individually, but maybe the chair gets the lectures together and says, Okay, here's what expectations are - as we are talking to more lectures and participate in more meetings like this, we're just realizing very much the disparity, just that the dissemination of information is so different amongst all of the colleges, and thereby departments. - like, this is how you get your 3 year contract. This is how you apply for a range elevation. This is what your teaching, this is what the evaluation process looks like. I would think that we'd be able to standardize in way.

JU:  I think that you raised a really important point about a bit of inconsistency across campus and we might be running into something where one lecturer might be confident about asking those questions versus a lecture that isn't. …If they are not provided that information in a one stop shopping and then know to go there….if our campus isn't doing that then our lecturers don't know to seek it.  … we run into a lot of that. So the lecturer Council is hugely important to campus. So great work … I do know that the lecturer council is working on a survey… I think that will be very valuable to supporting the lecture Council's mission, as well as the mission of this subcommittee…

TS:  thank you lecturer council.  the CFA … a product of negotiation, the CFA went to the California legislature, that guarantees that people have to have an orientation, a union orientation - the stuff you were just talking about.   It's a great idea to have some place where, the lecturer Council is present, we could also put into the FFFP policy to make sure it's all kind of defined… another resource. I think that's great… Great idea. Thank you, Tim.

KK:  How many more outstanding Lecturers are on this critical committee in critical leadership roles and still don't have an avenue to tenure.

AI:  One of the other things they're are people that would write you letters of support, like, and those can be awesome.   We should be doing that I would have absolutely no problem doing that for the lectures that I work with… even if it doesn't change the tenure situation, at least show a little of the appreciation …

BB: So I met with our AS president and AS Director of University affairs a little earlier today. And they shared with me that the CSSA  which is the California State Student Association, it's kind of like the statewide system students. They passed a resolution basically highlighting that we're still allowing for CASTE  discrimination, essentially and bias related to a CASTE. And that their resolution was against that. We are dealing with the same thing right here.

AI:  It was amazing to me to find out that most of the professors who do so much, especially within the political science department, going above and beyond do unpaid work that is- I find it incredibly unfair that they aren't paid adequately for the work that they do.

JU:  thankful for all of the discussion .. I think that's really gonna help form how the subcommittee moves forward with this and chairs Council.. And so with that, we're going to do a little bit of moving on here.  Danielle, does The Targeted Harassment of faculty subcommittee have any updates, or we can wait till the next the next weekend?

8.  Subcommittees – Information item

      a.   Targeted Harassment of Faculty (Faculty Cyberbullying)

DH:  I think we're going to meet after spring break, but I just kind of checked with him (Cory), he was looking for two volunteers to do something to kind of move us along. And I'm not quite sure if he got those volunteers. I'll hopefully have more to report back on next time.

9.  Announcements

JU:  So we're gonna move on to announcements. And I'm going to jump ahead of everybody Callie Norton is now on FASP - thank you for being with us, Cali, we're super excited to have you here, representing Associated Students. do usually have an email that I send out- You will find that a lot of times our meetings go along but we have pretty interesting conversation. So really appreciate you dedicating some time to spend with us., Adam, do you have announcement to share with us today?

AI: anybody is interested on March 24, Clay Stanger, who is a Chico State alumnus who is a US State Department Foreign Service officer- He's the Regional Director of the Office of Foreign Missions is coming to campus virtually through zoom for a webinar, talking about a career in the State Department- So for any of your students that are interested in foreign service, we're excited to offer the webinar, - if you would like me to send you that link, please just give me an email - I'll start a list and we'll send that out. And, and later on in the semester. We're planning to do a couple other things, but I'll make those announcements after the break.

PN:  Starting on Monday, March 22, the library will be opening the study area for no contact reserved study space. The link will be going on our web page on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, and you'll be able to reserve 90 minute study desks. Every 90 minutes the entire facility will be cleaned to maintain a COVID safe and environment. So share that broadly.

BB:  probably at the end of March on the Academic Senate agenda, you'll see an opening call for nominations for senate office. There's a constitution and bylaws you can look at to see who's eligible.  If you know folks who  are interested in an office within Senate encourage them to reach out-  they do need to be a Senator, and some positions are open only to faculty – we also have representative roles within each of the standing committees -  look at the FASP  for EPPC guidelines, you'll know, like where those roles are… officers are 4 year terms for the most part, the only exception there is the statewide Senate seats - three year appointments.  And there is an opening for a statewide senator. My term as statewide senator is expiring. And I think that it's good to have folks who are interested get nominated or self-nominate, and run. And we'll also have some at large positions for faculty -encourage them to think about running for office or consider running for their own college representatives seats. We really encourage leadership across our members.

JU:  Betsy could you share which positions the senator positions are?

BB:  The official executive officers of the senate are typically the Chair, the Vice Chair, and then the secretary of the Senate. Those are kind of the top officer levels. We also have the FASP chair and we have the EPPC chair- they also attend the executive committee meetings on Friday mornings. We also have two statewide senators, and this is based on the allocation of Senate seats we get from the statewide Senate, based on our full time equivalent faculty available. Each seat overlaps with one of our out large senate roles, and each senator role is three years. Faculty that represent their college are non-officer roles, but regular representatives, they usually a three year term - our Constitution is open so that the Associated Students and staff council can do the term length that works for them.

JU:  That's how I became Chair so feel free to shot an email if I can answer anything, moving on to other.

10.  Other

TS:  Your union, your CFA chapter, joining the system across this state of California, voted to try to divest from fossil fuel from our retirement CalPERS account. Maybe our Senate will talk about it, too.

11.  Adjourn @ 4:40 pm

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