

## Faculty and Student Policies Committee

---

### MINUTES

---

TO: Faculty and Student Policies Committee  
FROM: Barbara Sudick  
SUBJECT: FASP MINUTES – March 9, 2019 2:30, ARTS 228

---

#### **Present:**

Pittman, Kishore, Day, Donze, Hart, Underwood, Sudick, Vela (Kaiser proxy), Peart (Tarabini proxy), Sistrunk (Boyd proxy), Livingston, Sistrunk, Hildalgo, Gruber, Kendell, Brundidge, Livingston (Herman proxy), Trailer

#### **Missing:**

Zartman, Miller

Meeting commenced at 2:30 pm

#### **1. Approve minutes of February 21, 2019**

No editorial changes or corrections—approved without dissent.

#### **2. Approve today's agenda –**

No Announcements added, agenda was approved without dissent.

#### **3. Introduction Item: Classroom Recording Policy**

Livingston provided an overview of the policy.

The policy will be administered thru Accessibility Resource Center (ARC) and the Office of Student Conduct, Rights and Responsibilities.

Donze inquired about the incidents that prompted the “lively discussion” which was mentioned in the minutes of the last meeting.

Pittman answered that the “lively discussion” was not about incidents, but about rights.

Sudick questioned the policy title in regards to consistency of language.

Livingston suggested an editorial change making the name Policy on Electronic and Digital or Video Recording.

Donze asked if a recording agreement is currently in use?

Hart clarified that there is, but only for accessibility of students with documented disabilities.

Vela inquired about the scope of this policy. Can a student record another student? Do we want to make this focused only on classes? What about recording activities?

Sistrunk clarified that recording in public is outside the scope.

Livingston added that the issue last semester, which drove the development of this policy, was students recording other students' conversations.

Hart added that it covers anything that is scheduled during that class time. This is not about broader state law.

Suggestion was made to change “of” to “during” classes (1<sup>st</sup> line under policy)

Underwood questioned if we need to make it so broad?

Tarabini asked for clarification on what would we be preventing potentially? What if someone is not a student? What about things we want to record- will this inhibit that?

Livingston confirmed that it means during classes.

Sudick asked whether we are able to change appendices?

Specifically, can we add "and subject to disciplinary action" after "I further understand that any violation of this guideline will be considered a violation of the student Code of Conduct"?

Sudick shared concern for possible lack of enforcement of the policy.

Tarabini replied that we are only able to change it for ADA students.

Donze said she includes "no recording" language in her syllabus. She asked if students violated that would she not be able to enforce it? The response was that she can fail them, but it's not a campus policy.

O'Donnell questioned if we are thinking of including this appendices in the policy or whether we can just reference it?

Sistrunk replied that he is in support of including it.

Livingston suggested adding "see ARC agreement..."

Tarabini said your syllabus can include if you need an accommodation by ARC here is how you do it.

Vela said a lot of students choose not to identify thru ARC. If language says this is the form you must use, it might be a problem.

Day says if a student asks him if they can record his class he asks, does anyone mind if anyone records today? If one person says no, then it can't happen.

Pittman noted that the appendices have more restrictions than the policy (such as destroying the recording after so many days).

Donze said students have a right to record.

O'Donnell said they need to cease.

Pittman asked if the appendices is a model for an instructor's own form?

O'Donnell asked if this policy says its ok for instructors to say no? (expressly allowed refers to a verbal agreement). What kind of complication are we creating? It needs to be all-inclusive. Can someone suggest language to get rid of syllabus?

Sistrunk suggested affirmative permission of instructor needed.

Livingston suggested striking out "as indicated in the course syllabus"

Tarabini suggested giving instructor some control. "Permission by instructor if it's ok with greater audience"

What if a student asks once, is it always ok?

Response was, if parameters can be laid out in syllabus.

What if the discussion is of a personal nature, like stories about coming out etc.?

Pittman asked, so is the ARC contract then language for all?

Underwood said Instructor may want to be more restrictive than the ARC policy, which is too liberal.

O'Donnell warned if each instructor allows something different, than we may have trouble.

Underwood likes the simplicity of this policy.

Donze said this is about recording or not, it's not about what they do with the recording. If student shared in class a story about being raped, can they share the recording?

This policy does not cover that.

Response was that there are other policies for that.

Day said he puts the recorder on his podium and it only records the instructor.

Gruber asked if an instructor can take permission away if it was already given?

A short discussion followed about not making the policy too restrictive.

Want the freedom to allow

Sistrunk made a motion to pass this as introduction item seconded by Tarabini. It was approved as an introduction item.

Day gave Livingston proposed changes, Livingston will create substitute document with changes.

#### **4. Introduction Item: Lecturer Policy Recommendations**

Committee members: Donze, Sistrunk, Sudick, Tarabini, Underwood

Sistrunk provided some background saying the Provost Larson had embraced the idea of creating a lecturer group after lecturers got together and 38 signed a document of support. The intent is to make this ad hoc committee into a permanent subcommittee of FASP.

A discussion ensued. All agreed the formation of a lecturer's council would be a good way to have lecture voices be heard.

Livingston suggested the group needs a chair to report out.

Sudick suggested adding and "the chair or appropriate representative" report as appropriate to the current document.

Tarabini suggested that we should pass this before we decide whether or not they need a chair.

O'Donnell asked if this title is just for this current working group?

She suggested that no contract issues be discussed by this group.

The argument was made that staff council is not about labor relations, so this should be the same.

Sistrunk asked how do you separate out those issues?

Day said that chair's council also parallels this, but this group would be more inclusive (provost meets just with chairs in chair's council).

Tarabini said that as staff council rep our role is stated in our bylaws etc.

Council restricts confidential bargaining issues.

O'Donnell suggested striking out "as well as to provide a vehicle for highlighting issues of concern to lecturer faculty"

Sistrunk disagrees.

O'Donnell suggested that the workplace abusive conduct policy has examples of issues that they can include.

Sistrunk said this policy language is from CSU SF

Tarabini said she consults staff council on what we do. It does not restrict us from having conversations. They recommend where to take the issue. The purpose here is just to state what the council is made of and to establish a council.

Miller suggested cutting line about “as well as to provide a vehicle for highlighting issues of concern to lecturer faculty”

Pittman called for a vote for this to be considered an introduction item.  
All were in favor. The motion passed.

## **5. Action Item: FPPP changes: Introduction and Section 8.01.**

This is an intro to the FPPP itself.

Sistrunk moved to accept the substitute document.  
O'Donnell seconded it and all agreed.

O'Donnell asked if we want to add something about the collective bargaining agreement in the third paragraph? And take off faculty?

Brundidge said we are high quality then we are superlative. Can it be consistent?  
Just use high quality or damn fine.  
She made motion to change superlative back to high quality (second paragraph line 2).  
Sistrunk seconded. All agreed.

Day made a motion to remove faculty in third paragraph.  
One vote against, all else in favor. Motion passed.

O'Donnell said Provost talked about guarantees of academic freedom last time.

Livingston moved to remove by guarantees from first paragraph.  
Day seconded.

Tarabini asked, what is the purpose of this sentence? There is too much in this sentence.

Tim said by tenets of academic freedom?

Donze moved to change. Day seconded.

O'Donnell asked, can we discuss this sentence rather than keep having motions?  
Underwood said she likes by guarantees.

O'Donnell questioned “we the faculty”?  
Pittman asked who is “we”? the University? or the faculty?  
Tarabini answered, collective we.  
O'Donnell asked can we spell out who “we” is?

Sistrunk asked what does FPPP do? This is an intro, an overview.  
Kishore suggested “by supporting” in place of “guaranteeing”

Vela suggested we consider including due process.

Vela, “Together we are dedicated to further the university’s mission”

Donze withdrew her motion and it was seconded by Livingston

Vela substituted “Together we are dedicated to further the university’s mission by providing for a faculty of high quality, to their professional growth and development, to academic freedom and due process.”

Tarabini, “Together we are dedicated to further the university’s mission by providing for a faculty of high quality, to their professional growth and by support of academic freedom and due process.”

Livingston, “Together we are dedicated to further the university’s mission by providing for a faculty of high quality, to their professional growth and by support of academic freedom and due process.”

Vela's motion is withdrawn.

Livingston suggests "These common goals unite us as we order our relationships with each other to promote systems integrity, transparency, academic freedom, and shared governance at all levels.

passed by all

Tarabini suggests "Together we are dedicated to further the university's mission by providing for a faculty of high quality, committed to professional growth and development, and due process retention, tenure, and promotion, by support of academic freedom."

Sistrunk moves "Together we are dedicated to furthering the university's mission by providing for a faculty of high quality, committing to professional growth and development, due process and retention, tenure, and promotion.

Seconded by Miller.

Corrected draft reads as follows:

Introduction

The people of California have bestowed public trust on the California State University to promote and maintain a system of advanced education dedicated to excellence in instruction and research, creative activity, and public service. These common goals unite us as we order our relationships with each other, to promote systems integrity, transparency, ~~academic freedom~~ and shared governance at all levels. ~~Together We~~ we are dedicated to furthering the university's mission by providing for a faculty of high quality, ~~who are committed~~ committing to professional growth ~~by guarantee~~ and development, due process, ~~and~~ retention, tenure, and promotion.

These policies and procedures below are intended to define processes for the effective and fair hiring, development, evaluation, and retention of ~~superlative high quality~~ faculty, and preserve their cooperation, departmental expertise and subject matter competency, which are the strengths of our institution.

This FPPP is intended to be used with the ~~faculty~~ collective bargaining agreement (CBA), which the reader is urged to consult. Further, personnel decisions may be affected by federal and state laws, CSU System regulations, and other University policies.

If there should be any conflict between the provisions of this document and the CBA, CSU policy or state or federal law, the higher-level regulations shall apply. The FPPP should be considered on par with campus *Executive Memoranda* (Ems).

For current information on other documents and policies that may affect personnel actions, contact the Associate Vice President for the Office of Academic Affairs.

Pittman called for a vote. It passed as an action item.

## **8.0. EVALUATION OF FACULTY**

O'Donnell asked us to add Provost Larson's introduction to the FPPP. After some discussion we made the following changes.

8.01 In order to develop and advance faculty of the highest quality, this system of evaluation is designed to cultivate faculty improvement and growth in furtherance of the mission of the University. These processes are also intended to guide faculty retention, tenure, and promotion in order to maintain and expand

the intellectual skills and understanding required by humanity to meet the challenges of the future **and professionally disseminate these insights to our students, our disciplines and each other.** These needs take precedence over considerations of individual seniority, except in those instances where law, the CBA, or system-wide policy requires consideration of seniority. In other words, except as required elsewhere, promotion is based on individual performance, not on years of seniority.

Pittman called for a vote. It passed as an action item with one dissenting vote.

6. No announcements.

7. No other.

8. Meeting adjourned at 4:56 pm.

*Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara Sudick*

