

March 2, 2023

Attendants: Tim Sistrunk, Kathleen Kaiser, Patrick Newell, Emily Bruns, Mahalley Allan, Rachel McBride-Praetorious, Miriam Walter, Jeff Trailer, Chris Nichols, Marianne Paiva, Ennis Musvosvi, Margie Keyawa-Boyd, Ana Medic, Dennis O'Connor, Elizabeth Boyd, Troy Jollimore, Nicole Sherman, Michael Coons, Nicholas Burk

Guests: Patricia Stock, Terence Lau, Taylor Hinchcliff, Holly Ferguson, Athena Zhang, Jennifer Brundige, Maleta Wilson, Janell Bauer,

Meeting called to order at 2:34.

1. Approve Minutes of FASP meeting

* Kathleen Kaiser notes that "Boyd" is misspelled as "Boys." It was corrected.

a. Minutes of February 16, 2023

2. Approve Agenda

* Elizabeth Boyd noted that she had forwarded a status update on the university budget committee

* Agenda Approved

3. Introduction Items

a. Proposed changes to FPPP Introduction

* Miriam Walter called attention to the fact that "published within 14 days" part has not always been observed

* Elizabeth Boyd asks if we can have the deadline earlier, in August

* Mahalley agrees that we could have the deadline earlier, in August. Last year changes were not received by Office of Academic Personnel until classes started and there was criticism of the office.

* Miriam clarifies that OPAL has to wait until the document comes from the President's office

* Elizabeth B. suggests it was "a Senate issue" and that Senate needs to look at the process internally.

* Patrick Newell asks for clarification about how this would be done.

* A charge to "go talk to people" (aka senate officers)

* Miriam asks for clarification: "What is going to happen and who is going to do it by when?"

* Elizabeth: Chair of FASP takes care of things at the introduction item level. Chair of FASP could delegate this or otherwise make sure that this gets done.

b. Proposed Changes to FPPP 5.1.3

* Miriam asks Mahalley to clarify. Mahalley explains that the three years in the document is not in compliance; it has been changed to four years. We need to at least change three to four if we do not do this proposed change.

* Elizabeth asks Chair Sistrunk to ask for any objections, to make it clear whether the committee has passed it as an introduction item.

* Elizabeth has a motion on this item: moves that we suspend the rules and consider it as an action item. Motion seconded.

- * Elizabeth speaks to it: the change is very uncontroversial; she has a recommendation if it goes to action.
 - * Seeing no objections, item becomes an action item.
 - * Elizabeth suggests an editorial change, adding a hyperlink to the executive order before it goes to Senate.
 - * Patrick asks for a formal vote using buttons. Elizabeth clarifies that she did not make a motion, so we can't yet vote on it.
 - * Rachel clarifies that is only voting for faculty (since it is an FPPP item)
 - * Miriam makes a motion to add the hyperlink. Motion is seconded.
- Vote: 15 yes. Item passes as an action item.

c. Proposed Changes to FPPP 8.1.3

- * Miriam explains changes are instigated by dossiers being electronic now; most changes relate to that.
- * Mahalley agrees with Miriam, clarifying that faculty no longer have to retrieve their dossiers and keep the binders on their shelf. The dossier can be returned to an assigned folder. The other change is because not all faculty are reviewed annually. Tenured faculty may be reviewed every 5 years rather than yearly.
- * Elizabeth asks about electronic dossiers. Has every item in old files been scanned? Did faculty have a chance to audit their paper file versus their electronic file? Who is able to see the box files? Administrator of Box files often does not have access rights to see the files.
- * Mahalley responds. Are we talking about the dossiers or the PAFS (sp)? Entire PAFs are supposed to have been scanned in. Faculty can always look at their personnel files.
- * Elizabeth clarifies she WAS referring to the PAFs. Can faculty compare the scanned version to the paper version? With regard to access issue, the Dean's office is responsible for storage of the personnel files. Typically only college AAS and Dean have access to personnel files. But in some cases, the administrator of the box is falling to a different staff member than the AAS. Scanning of the PAFs may have been designated to staff who were not the official designee and thus not supposed to have access to the files. Also, there is an account administrator within IT and it would be good for us to have a sense of what security faculty have against someone in IT as global administrator from viewing the files. That might be an HR question. Concern is about whether we're following the CBA.
- * Miriam adds that her understanding is that the move has taken place and the files are fully electronic now.
- * Jennifer Brundidge points out that people given access have REGULAR access to see it at any time in the review cycle. It's unnerving to have it available for almost the whole semester rather than only seen for brief periods of time in the office.
- * Elizabeth clarifies that the PAF file is not returned to the faculty member and that's what she's concerned about. Her concern is whether faculty have a chance to audit that. Clarifies that files are not moved to new folders; rather, access is granted to view the files.
- * Patrick reminds us that the flawed UTECH (sp?) document granted administrator right to see any file at any time, and that's something we should pay attention to.
- * Miriam: The dossier IS returned to faculty members. She notes that the personnel committee only has access to the dossier for a little over a month.
- * Elizabeth clarifies that her issue is with the word "returned." That's not what happens to the file.

- * Mahalley agrees with Elizabeth that that part could be phrased better.
- * Chair Sistrunk asks what we want to do with this: pass it as an introduction item?
- * Jennifer suggests that policies may be uneven across different colleges. Sometimes people are given access files for months.
- * Call for a vote: item passes.

d. Proposed Changes to FPPP 10.5.3

- * Miriam introduces it.
 - * Mahalley clarifies that when faculty start with 2 years of reduced teaching load. They must work at least 1 year of the department's typical full time assignment and service years should not count toward that.
 - * Jeff confirms Mahalley's interpretation.
 - * Michael Coons: What about buyout time? Are we talking about needing to teach the full load or merely working the full load? Should it be clarified that it means full time allotment rather than specifically teaching?
 - * Mahalley: What's typical in YOUR department is different from other departments. You can make a case that your buyout is typical for your department.
 - * Jennifer: it just means "full time." Also, there's a big general problem with service credit. Departments have a hard time evaluating what someone did previously at another university. This policy may penalize those who come in ready for promotion. Can someone defer course releases so they can go up earlier?
 - * Mahalley: there IS a possibility to defer the taking of your new faculty released time. Someone with two years' service could apply for tenure in their second September on campus.
 - * Elizabeth: If someone comes in with service credit, why/how do they get a deferred teaching load? Also, disagrees that we view someone with a reduced teaching load as not full time. The two year reduction is because of the need for course prep. Shouldn't it be considered full time?
 - * Mahalley clarifies that people with service credit still do receive reduced teaching during first two years of probationary period. Might be useful to go back and look at minutes from when this originally came through senate.
 - * Jeff Trailer says there's an argument that the level of productivity will continue, despite full time assignment.
 - * Jennifer likes Elizabeth's point about course release maybe actually being "typical." Clarifies that there was a push from Provost Larson to make it harder to go up for early tenure. That's where this is coming from. Do we as faculty want to discourage early tenure?
 - * Elizabeth suggests that this policy practically means that someone has to work a minimum of three years at the university before they are up for accelerated tenure. Maybe the subcommittee should talk about this.
 - * Michael Coons points out that the FPPP is really directed at Assistant Professors. What about folks who were already tenured elsewhere? Just saying "you have to be here three years" would be more straightforward.
 - * Elizabeth says that with this language currently, a brand-new faculty member could come in, defer their release time, work one full-time year and go up for accelerated promotion/tenure. It's important to define what we really want.
- Passes with 15 yeses.

e. Proposed changes to FPPP on Lecturer Issues - Definitions

- * Jeff Trailer introduces it. No discussion.
- * 13 yes. It passes.

f. Proposed changes to FPPP on Lecturer Issues – Section 1

- * Jeff Trailer introduces item.
- * Elizabeth wonders if we have a companion document that moved the language from 1.1.4 to 5.2.1.c.
- * Jeff says we are still working on 5.2.1.c; we don't yet have that document as an active item.
- * Elizabeth suggests that at action we might postpone this until the companion document is ready.
- * 17 yes. It passes.

g. Proposed changes to FPPP on Lecturer Issues – Section 5p1

- * Jeff introduces the item 5.1.1.e. Concern is about whether to repeat language from CBA.
- * Elizabeth asks “Do we know if we have endorsement from the lecturer council on these items?”
- * Sistrunk points out that two of the members of the subcommittee are on that council, but the council did not formally endorse this.
- * Miriam asks whether the black language is staying in, since it looks repetitive. Suggests language could be shortened.
- * Elizabeth points out that the two members of the committee may or may not speak for the lecturer council. Suggests that it's good practice to reach out to the Chair of the lecturer council when we discuss items related to lecturers.
- * Kathleen Kaiser agrees with E.'s point about getting input from lecturer council. Also agrees with Miriam that language could be simplified. Committee is encouraged to look at that.
- * Vote. 15 yeses. Item passes.

4. Discussion Item

a. Student Complaint Process Discussion (Maleta Wilson) Complaint Process pdf

<https://csuchico.app.box.com/file/1150462870239> See University Policy :

<https://catalog.csuchico.edu/academic-standardspolicies/university-policies/> (see esp. #2 and #3 Complaint/Grievance Procedures) Discussion about “when unchanged behavior becomes problematic”

* Dr. Wilson (Director of SCCR) introduced this discussion item. Gave a presentation on what the student complaint process currently looks like. Student Conduct Administrators don't WANT to expel people. They are mediators, facilitators, etc. Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities is from 2008; students who don't follow student code of conduct come to see SCRR. If students have complaints, they come to SCRR to fill out a student complaint form. Dr. Wilson's question: What about behavior that doesn't meet the threshold of discrimination, labor relation, or student complaint processes? Could include microaggressions. Could this be an opportunity to create some restorative justice language to help the faculty, staff, or administrator to understand how these are microaggressions? NOT discipline.

- * Emily: Found a couple of things confusing about EM. What if a student has to take a class with the professor in the future and thus is reluctant to report? The statute of limitations seems really short, being only 10 days into the next semester. Can students understand this language?
- * Jennifer: really liked the idea of addressing problematic behavior. But what does Dr. Wilson mean by restorative justice if it's not a penalty? Suggestion: if every complaint is meant with a restorative justice process, that would be a lot of work. Maybe the complaint has to fit a pattern, for example multiple problematic instances?
- * Dr. Wilson: Agrees that we are looking at multiple incidents. Restorative justice means "having a sit down"—maybe a restorative circle where complainants have a conversation with the faculty/staff/administrator. Victim gets a chance to say what they need to say.
- * Elizabeth: WRT how we move forward, does Dr. Wilson have specific ideas about each of these Ems to work with the FASP chair or Senate chair to get the word version of the files so start suggestions that could be brought forward in a formal charge. Office of Faculty Development might be interested in coordinating restorative justice sessions.
- * Wilson clarified that being new, she wasn't sure if rewriting the policy is the way to go.
- * Sistrunk suggests that trauma informed policy language might fit together.
- * Traver asked about current processes and whether faculty know when there are complaints. Dr. Wilson clarifies that right now the office is supposed to reach out to the professor to get a response from the professor.
- * Emily wonders about putting a student in the room. Does that exploit students? Put too much labor on them?
- * Elizabeth points out that we used to have a university Ombudsperson who was available to the students for this reason. How much might this overlap with having an ombudsperson? (University currently does not have an Ombudsperson.)

5. Subcommittee Reports/Conversation

a. Overview FASP Policies and EM subcommittees 2022-23

- * Elizabeth provided an update on the University Budget Committee subcommittee. Subcommittee met. Shared current document. It will be revisited. We might want to consider long-term budget planning processes used at other CSU campuses. Might outline why these specific members are there, so committee members understand what voice they are expected to bring. The document formalizes an agenda setting subcommittee similar to what is informally used now.
- * Sistrunk clarified that none of the Research committee policies are likely to go forward this semester.

6. Announcements

- * Kathleen Kaiser: faculty embezzlement case has been in the news. Campus is being hit with lots of negative news on extreme behavior on the part of a few faculty. Hoping for a statement back from administration about changes have been made. Is there any chance to recover any of the million dollars?
- * Patrick. Library faculty has contacted an outside group to do an evaluation of the library budget. Library want to know what a proper budget should be for the library. Currently, library collections may not support some new programs. Resources in computer science are not available for students or faculty. Subject liaisons have way too many departments! Library

faculty do not think the provost or admin understand the role of the library or its budget, and thus want an outside review.

* Sistrunk. We will not look at the withdrawals question; it will go to EPPC.

7. Other

* none

8. Meeting adjourned at 4:55.