



Faculty and Student Policies Committee Agenda – Meeting Minutes

Date: March 29, 2018

Members in Attendance: Carl Pittman (Proxy for Danielle Hidalgo), Evanne O'Donnell, Chuck Zartman, David Scholz, Jeff Livingston (Proxy for Ann Schulte), Tim Sistrunk, Barbara Sudick, Jennifer Underwood, Bryan Gentles, Rick Ford, Jeff Trailer, Jonathan Day, Ricardo Jacques

1. Minutes of March 8, 2018 were approved unanimously without changes
2. The meeting agenda was approved unanimously without changes
3. Announcements
 - a. Tim Sistrunk and others discussed the CFA day of action on April 4 in Sacramento to lobby for more funding for the CSU, in hopes of avoiding tuition increases.
4. Policy on Policies – Action item
 - a. In the “Policy Details” section of the document, the committee moved and approved language to emphasize the necessity for policy to comply with collective bargaining agreements and other negotiated union contracts.
 - b. The committee also discussed whether language should be included in Appendix B regarding revising v. superceding policies, as sometimes past drafts of policies are lost when revisions take place. Rather than putting this in writing in the document, we discussed ways of keeping track of policies that might be used to reference prior versions (for example, including “version day/month/year” in the document title).
 - c. The document passed unanimously.
5. FPPP Early Tenure – Introduction Item
 - a. In 10.5.4, the draft policy stipulates that faculty members must request early tenure in writing and “delineate how they meet criteria.” A committee member expressed concern regarding the redundancy of a faculty member having to prepare justifications in their file for their rankings, and then repeating or re-justifying this in writing to request early tenure. The committee recommends that this section be amended at action item to address this concern of redundancy.
 - b. The committee discussed at length the appropriate standard for a person to receive early tenure. The discussion:
 - i. Highlighted that there is a wide range of approaches used across campus
 - ii. Reognized that the standards range from individuals meeting the department standards early, and thus receiving early tenure to candidates being required to exceed rankings of superior in one or more categories of evaluation.
 - iii. Also considered the financial ramifications of the different standards under consideration. Setting the standard at exceeding the expectation of superior in all three categories would raise the bar for most departments

and thus reduce the number of candidates for early tenure. Setting the standard at being ranked superior in all three categories would raise the bar for many departments, but would lower the bar for select departments. The impact of the changes on the eligible number of candidates for early tenure was discussed.

- iv. Included awareness that, given the teaching load on campus, requiring candidates to exceed superior in all categories of evaluation may be an excessively high standard. Some members of the committee were concerned that setting the standard at this level may remove several exceptional candidate from consideration for early tenure, and could result in low morale or exceptional faculty members seeking employment elsewhere.
 - c. The committee recommended that at action, the language in the proposed document be amended to require that candidates for early tenure be ranked superior in all categories of evaluation.
 - d. Additionally, the committee recommended that the policy authors review whether the language in 10.5.5 is consistent with the language in the CBA, and necessary motions at action to insure the language is consistent.
 - e. The document passed unanimously.
6. Proposed changes to EM 03-010 – Introduction item
- a. At action, the language in section II. a. iii. 2. Regarding term limits will be moved to the next section so that term limits will not apply to members, but rather to the Chair of EMEDC.
 - b. At action, the language in section II. a. v. should be clarified to refer to the calendar of reviews. At present, there was concern that the language gave the president all of the power to determine who should be reviewed and when, when in practice, executives are reviewed approximately every 5 years.
 - i. Specifically, the committee suggested the following sentence be added to under 1. Of section v. “Normally the executives reviewed under this policy should come up for review every 5 years.”
 - ii. Under sub-section 2. Of the same section, we recommend language to stipulate that in consultation with EMEDC, the president will determine reviews.
 - c. The committee had an extensive discussion about II.a.vi.2.e regarding appropriate and accurate language regarding the rigor of the instruments and method used to evaluate executives. The surveys and other methods are specific to Chico, and thus “validated” instruments are not available or appropriate to the purpose. If we are interested in validating some of the measures, there are departments on campus that could assist with this process.
 - d. The policy passed at introduction.
7. Proposed Revisions to EM 04-043
- a. Main revisions were to clarify management from dean selection committees.
 - b. At action, add an EMEDC member to the list of members to be on dean selection committees.
8. Other
- a. The committee working on the Chair appointment and evaluation document needs a FASP member. Jonathan Day volunteered for this committee assignment.

9. Adjourn

- a. Meeting was adjourned at 4:15.

Links to:

[Academic Senate](#)

[Current Executive Memoranda](#)

[The FPPP](#)

[The CBA](#)

[The Constitution of the Faculty](#)

[Student Judicial Affairs, Campus Policies](#)