



Faculty and Student Policies Committee Minutes

TO: Faculty and Student Policies Committee
FROM: Adam Irish (Secretary)
DATE: October 13, 2019
SUBJECT: FASP Minutes – October 10th 2:30, ARTS 228

Member Present: Patti Perez; Jeff Livingston/ proxy for Danielle Hidalgo; Adam Irish/ proxy for Laura Sparks; Rebecca Ormond; Jonathan Day; Tim Sistrunk; Paul Herman; Breanna Holbert; Jeff Trailer; Trevor Guthrie; Kendall Block; Jenna Wright/ proxy for Emily Peart; Jessica Westbay; Betsy Boyd/ proxy for Kathy Kaiser; Jennifer Underwood; Eddie Vela; Chuck Zartman; George Thompson.

Guests: Terence Lau, Daniel Grassian, Stephanie Bianco, Cheri Chastain

1. Approve minutes of 09-26-19 – approved
2. Approval of today’s agenda – approved
3. Campus Sustainability Committee – EM – Action Item
 - a. TS – motion to offer substitute document w/ changes made based on discussion during 10/7/19 meeting; BB Second motion
 - b. DISCUSSION
Cheri Chastain – Have changed/added local, state, federal regulations language; moved subcommittee language to appendix; revised membership to be 20; and language on approval by co-chairs added
JL: Shift list in “scope” section to regularize usage of commas and semi-colons. After some discussion, PP recommended using semi-colons between items because some items contained lists.
PH – Do any other committees use CSC as acronym? Is there a possibility of confusion?
TS: CSC is only used a reference within document.
JL: Further corrections to CSC expectations – revision of “includes” to “include” and moved “to” from end of the sentence to precede “whom”.
TS: Notes that subcommittees have already begun their work on increasing campus sustainability. FASP should be proud to support this EM as a further contribution to campus sustainability.
 - c. VOTE ON CSC EM – approved unanimously
4. Oversight of Complementary Units – EM – Action Item
 - a. DISCUSSION (no substitute document offered)
JU: Previously discussed changed (offered by EV courtesy of Dean Terrance Lau (TL)), not yet included but can be discussed here and added during discussion. Discussion began regarding Section 3 “Oversight” – considering the suggested language to include colleges/college deans as exercising control over CU funds similar to other university funds.
JL: Stephanie Bianco (SB) is here and did a lot of work on this proposal last year
SB: Delegated entity (w/ authority over funds) might not be a dean.

Daniel Grassian (DG): Policy is now campus wide rather than just Academic Affairs (as suggestion of Provost during prior EC meeting on this EM), so would include Student Affairs.

CZ: Noes that there was initial a rep from Student Affairs during subcommittee meetings last year, but once it was designated as applying to Academic Affairs that rep no longer attended meetings. Policy was originally designed to address Academic Affairs.

SB: Stems from EO, current language doesn't fully address others on the list and formation did not include rep from Student Affairs. How did this evolve away from solely Academic Affairs?

DG: Subcommittee did submit updated info but it has yet to be updated online (Chancellor's office). When it came to EC, Provost brought up that it could be campus wide policy to address CUs. There were concerns about whether all Student Affairs CUs were being overseen. In seeking out a list of CUs, DG is still waiting on emails to develop a full list of CUs on campus.

TS: Remembers that there was deference to Provost in expanding the policy to be campus wide.

TL: Suggests the language change to Deans due to Chico State Enterprises (CSE) – wants to be clear that deans oversee spending of money. Concerns over not going through certain processes and potential for inappropriate expenditures.

SB: Asked for clarification.

TL: Some CU projects that exist don't have specific controls.

CZ: Many centers have a number of requirements that deans wouldn't want to have to sign off on.

EV: Even with grant guidelines, deans do play a role to make sure that funds are spent appropriately. Deans to be able to defend what the CUs spend money on.

SB: Additionally, there is a large delay between any potential inappropriate purchase and review by money granting source.

TL: Noted that it could be something like a conflict of interest purchase.

PP: would EM apply to CSE? Is this a loophole problem?

BB: Inserting language such as “the appropriate administrator” to Section 3 “Oversight” would give direction to oversee funds expended.

EV: could begin sentence with “the appropriate administrator”.

CZ: PIs should be referenced in there potentially.

BB: Grants are already contracts. These issues should be dealt with in grant language already. The concern seems to be that when things go sideways, the administrator are left to clean up any investigation or inappropriate expenditure. Noted that it is problematic to make rules based on those who break rules if other rules exist to be used. Additional rules might unduly restrict good actors.

PP: Could add appropriate administrator “exercise oversight to ensure the following of appropriate procedures/policies.”

TL: From managers perspective “trust but verify” there are PIs who do not follow the rules and then Deans are left to deal with investigators/investigations.

EV: No matter language PI will have responsibility for managing the grant. Make implicit authority of the deans explicit (e.g. signatures made to spend funds).

JT: Built in safeguards vary across types of grants. Grant sources are often not sufficient monitors (e.g. corporate grants) – some are (e.g. NSF, NIH). Grant holder have power via grant and may face temptation to misuse it.

PH: Appropriate administrator works for honest actors and allows deans to regulate and bad actors.

SB: Creating list of activities for oversight is problematic. There could be an infinite list.

BB: This is more a process, which should be put into an appendix. Policy documents should not list processes to achieve policy those processes should be in appendix for easier future revision.

JL: What do people running CUs think?

CZ: Language could create constraints on PIs and projects.

BB: Reminds that the appropriate administrators are still responsible for oversight.

EV: could add term “ensuring oversight”.

SB: Notes that previous appendices contain old language that names CUs and request that these appendices be replaced with generic templates.

DG: Info on SB’s CU should be removed. It is unclear who will house this information. CSE may house it contingent on discussion with the new CEO of CSE. Will have to determine appropriate timing/action for centers to take. Some CUs may not have Ems – these CUs are going to be prioritized to follow up with.

JU: Updated appendices are now attached (as they were emailed from DG). There is also language suggestion on Directors/Leadership boards that CUs “shall” form these boards.

TL: Change “shall” to “may” because shall implies requirement of action. There may not be a need to have a leadership board for each CU.

BB: asked for clarification.

TL: Many not have a grant with funding that would require an external board.

BB: Does application to setup CU require a board?

DG: It does seem to, would need to change CU establishment application.

BB: offering historical perspective, EPPC takes on establishment of CUs, typically they always need a board. The “may” could possibly apply to the external board member.

EV: Does the application require a board? Or is it informational – i.e. if it has a board that they should inform campus. Notes that some CUs do not have boards and that advancement might not need to be involved.

DG: it is implicit that the board is required, but could change it to “may” and add “if applicable” to the sentence.

BB: In consultation with advancement was a request from Ahmed.

SB: Understand how this might be useful to university advancement fundraising.

JL: perhaps “if applicable to university advancement.”

TL: This could be one of the things to come out of annual CU reviews. Consider whether a CU would want/need to establish a board.

JU: Also language on CU director report to Dean and serve at pleasure of Dean.

SB: “Delegated authority” is language used in EO and EM – we should use similar language here.

After some discussion, there was consensus that “delegated authority” should be used throughout the EM to match with existing EM’s and EO.

JL: Recommended consideration of implications for Student Affairs before sending EM onto Senate.

DG: Provost’s concern was that the same/similar issues in Academic Affairs could also be an issue in Student Affairs.

CZ: This work was done focused on Academic Affairs w/o input from Student Affairs at the request of Student Affairs.

SB: What Student Affairs CUs are receiving external funding? What would count as CU?

DG: Pg 2. Of EM has language defining CU.

TS: Did this inclusivity come from Chancellor’s office?

DG: not where this is coming from.

JL: We will not likely be able to vote on this today. We should be able to provide a clean copy to Student Affairs to consider before we pass this to Senate.

JW: Concerned about which Student Affairs groups would fall under the definition of CU

DG: Second bullet point of definition should control

PH: Regardless, we should know whether or not we are addressing Student Affairs as well as Academic Affairs.

TL: Question about #6 in the "Reviewing/Reporting" They submit an annual report to CRCU, but does that also require a presentation? If so, there is a concern about how busy this would make CRCU.

SB: They do have to submit a report.

TL: Additional concern – bullet #2 requires budget for personnel, including salaries. Is it okay to disclose salaries to the public?

SB: Have run into issues with comparable salaries which has stopped some merit increases. Approves of transparency to resolve these issues via public reporting.

BB: We should be as transparent as possible.

TL: Additionally, what if the CRCU deadlocks (currently has 8 members)?

DG: Might not need to specify in policy, leave it to CRCU to design its process.

BB motioned to accept current edits. CZ second. Approved unanimously.

BB motioned to definitely postpone approval until next FASP meeting. TS second. Approved unanimously.

Jenna Wright will receive cleaned up draft to discuss and consider with Student Affairs.

CZ: Notes that we should acknowledge Stephanie Bianco's contributions to this current policy.

5. Subcommittee Updates

- a. Campus Climate Survey: Has not met yet, but plans to do so soon.
- b. FPPP/RTP: See included notes from TS.
- c. EMEDC: President Hutchinson suggested Anne Sherman be included on this committee. Chuck Zartman will be added to the committee.
- d. Policy on Digital Learning: JU is still working on policy context and will bring up at next meeting. JL notes that it would important to get input from a student rep.
- e. FASP representation on EPPC for Syllabus Policy: Laura Sparks will serve as FASP rep.

6. Announcements

- a. TS: Bargaining talk on 10/16/19 and CFA's Honoring Ancestors event upcoming
- b. BB: Entomological film will be presented end of Oct. Additionally, response was sent to students regarding the Quantitative Reasoning requirement. Should help student senate by providing links to sources, resolutions, and board of trustee's videos.
- c. JL: The Dodgers lost last night!

7. Other

- a. None

8. Adjourn

- a. Adjourned at 4:27 PM.

Links to:

[Academic Senate](#)

[Current Executive Memoranda](#)

[The FPPP](#)

[The CBA](#)

[The Constitution of the Faculty](#)

[Student Conduct Rights and Responsibilities, Campus Policies](#)