



Faculty and Student Policies Committee Agenda

TO: Faculty and Student Policies Committee
FROM: Jennifer Underwood, Chair
DATE: September 26, 2019
SUBJECT: FASP Minutes – September 26th 2:30, ARTS 228

1. Approve minutes of [09-12-19](#) -approved
2. Approve today's agenda – approved
3. Campus Sustainability Committee (CSC) – [EM](#) - Introduction item
 - a. Cheri Chastain time certain – 2:45

Cheri Chastain, Sustainability Programs Manager, FMS, introduced herself and explained that the Campus Sustainability Committee would like to update the EMs that impact the committee's work, and especially 11-017. The new EM:

- Updates committee membership including 11 areas of subcommittees
- Each full committee member is subcommittee member and may have subcommittee chair responsibilities
- Subcommittees each create actionable goals and a work plan and execute it within an established timeframe
- They Report out to the full committee which will create an annual report

Questions were asked::

- KK: Why are there only 5 students to spread out over 11 subcommittees
CC: any appropriate and interested people will be invited to serve on the subcommittees, but leadership of subcommittee would be assigned to CSC member –the committees might be larger or smaller
12-15 month work plans are expected from subcommittee
- Bre: Would there be specialized members for each subcommittee (ex would Ag have an Ag member?)
CC: Yes, for example in case of Ag, Cindy Daley would be chair
- EV: multiple subcommittees specifically listed makes the EM weak
CC: These are supposed to create flexibility in subcommittees
BB: using appendices to list the subcommittees could be a solution to allow flexibility in the future
TS: reason to solidify subcommittees list, was to designate a commitment, with action and accountability

- JL: impressed with thoughtfulness of EM, asked how designees are approved
-should there be some explanation?
TS said that it was normal to have University officers charged with specific responsibilities listed as permanent members of a committee whose functions are important enough that they can designate a suitable replacement if they cannot attend. This was approved by the Chairs of the CSC, the Provost and Vice President of Business and Finance
- TS: 19 members, but 20 are listed, CC said a student was added
- KK: Asked about appropriate expertise on the committee. Her example was complex groundwater regulations – these have legal implications – where is reference to meeting requirements of the law
CC: Campus policies are referenced, but it was a given that we will follow state law
KK: might be good to include someone with legal background, even if ex officio member
- Laura Sparks: Didn't read policy as 11 separate subcommittees. There should be more explanation to specify these are separate. It looks like there would be quite a lot of overlap between the subcommittees
CC: There is definitely some overlap in work between subcommittees. For example, the Built Environment subcommittee will need to communicate with the Energy subcommittee. These are separate and important but interrelated.
- Al: how many people will serve on each subcommittee
CC: 5-10 people will be identified for their interest and expertise

Moved and seconded as an introduction item

Introduction item passed

4. Oversight of Complimentary Units – [EM](#) – Introduction item

Jeff Livingston gave a brief overview of this EM. Beginning in 2014 the Chancellor's Office asked all campuses to develop a policy. Because of changing leadership there were various attempts. Finally, in July 2018 an interim policy was written under the guidance of Daniel Grassian, Vice Provost for Research and passed by the Senate EC.

It was worked on by a FASP subcommittee and the earlier version was renewed in Jan 2019 as a second interim EM.

JL, CZ, DG, SB worked courageously on a revised policy, but the Camp Fire happened. A draft was finally achieved.

EC got third new version and determined that a substantial portion was process and needed to be in appendices

Early in summer, JL worked on the redraft early July there were additional meetings by EC, and then the continuously refashioned EM was adopted as another interim policy

This is now the policy you're seeing

Comments and Questions followed:

- KK: asked section 4: Membership if the member from the Risk Management Unit was supposed to be involved in process or after fact?
TS:said Ann Sherman offered services of Risk Mgt to help with group when needed

- EV relayed a suggestions from Dean Lau, College of Business– consider adding “the CU directors report to the Dean and serve at the pleasure of the Dean” (no specific location in the policy was offered)
GThompson: this might be put under the qualifications addressed on page 5, Director/Leadership Board “The qualifications of the proposed Director...”
It was noted that some centers are multi-college – so this specific language might not work

EVO: suggested that might use of “appropriate administrator(s)” to substitute for “dean”

It was asked if CUs have “professional directors” and if so how referenced?

- EV: made a second suggestion from Dean Lau: add something like “notwithstanding intent of restricted sources of funds, the colleges exercise responsibility and oversight over CU funds as they do for all other funds”
Unclear where exactly.
LS: asked – is this about CU independence? are these points to express the implicit authority of the deans in the CU structures? Is about making it explicit what the deans already do?
EV: said this is true since Deans must have oversight of funds

- P: – how many CUs do we have? JL – said 20 something
- JL – asked that Dean Lau sentences to be sent to FASP before next meeting

Introduction Item Passed

5. Subcommittee Updates – Discussion items

a. Campus Climate Survey Committee EM

Guest presenter: Matt Thomas time certain – 3:30

Matt Thompson gave a brief Powerpoint presentation with some of the highlights of the history of the Campus Climate Surveys before now.

Early verions began in Fall 2014 under President Zing and were always administered by the Senate Chair and the President’s Office working together. The last one was undertaken in Spring 2018.

Early surveys were quite extensive with 23 open ended Questions that were finally reduced to 4. Each comment was individually de-identified, Matt Thomas did the initial de-identification on the first two surveys, than round two was undertaken by a committee of other sets of eyes. The whole group did coaxial coding – and ended with select representative quotes. The final year in 2018, Jennifer Meadows and Matt Thomas did almost everything.

Problems with the undertaking:

- no official charge for group,
- no institutionalized process
- No EM
- no guiding principles

Matt Thomas outlined some critical issues:

- Composition of the committee,
- Frequency of survey
- Instrument to use,
- Tech Support required,
- Confidentiality (distracted responses, climate of fear in past)
- Analysis/Report Writing (who's in charge?)

Comments and Questions followed:

- KK: it is a good idea to keep ahead of trouble or highlight good things happening – We need a specific needs to have a charge
- Alrish: what is sense of other campuses doing with this kind of info
MT: looked at sample of universities using some sort of survey years ago – I don't know, other CSUs weren't doing it
- Al: what do you see as being potential uses of data?
MT: present data without interpretation of it
BB: must be complete, timely release of results
- JW: should be staff unions on the committee
- MT – having HR director was disquieting, probably shouldn't be a member of the committee
EO'Donnell – I could go off the group too
- TS: what about deidentification work in the future
MT – said it is soul crushing and mind numbing to read trauma – de-identification can't really be farmed out in his opinion.

Formation of subcommittee: Adam Irish volunteered, Emily Pert, Jessica Westbay will look for suitable staff, Betsy Boyd and Eddie Vela

b. FPPP RTP – Update

Subcommittee from last year reconvened

TS reported that Michelle Morris published best practices for faculty of color – maybe include that kind of language in appendices of FPPP

EOD – best practices – on doc that Morris put together – best practices for department standards, made recommendations for retention, how to add to reviews, and language in department standards – might be good for FASP to read it (can see on OAPL website)

EOD said the committee began to consider ideas presented in Provost's letter

She suggested that Senate add recommendations about how her office can implement new ideas when the FPPP is changed

KK: pointed out concerns probationary faculty were having about FPPP changes of areas of evaluation from 4 to 3 in the latest changes to the FPPP

EV said changes to FPPP are emblematic of larger issue, implementation – might be useful to add staff on the ground during policy writing to get their feedback

LS had similar reaction of being concerned about FPPP changes – suggests looking at timeline that we disseminate – everyone liked the changes, but timeline and implementation would be helpful

EOD – grace year of implementation discussed by the Deans – Aug 21 is when changes are published. We might think of ways we could change practice

Mentioned that lookback period change is only for new faculty

TS – said that Provost had thought we could let people be reasonable about the accommodating how people interpreted the original 4 areas of review into three

EOD pointed out that meetings with the personnel committee can help

AI – people working up to deadline – consultation has to happen earlier

LS – reported that she felt she was the first to know about the changes in her department, so communication must be improved

JL – pointed out that being asked to make significant changes quickly is unworkable – need more time to change things like this in the future

JDay – the coming contract changes could influence FPPP – the Provost's changes aren't really a part of that process. We should consider what needs to be changed in this light

GThompson – willing to serve on FPPP/RTP subcommittee

ROrmond – also interested in serving

c. EMEDC

Trevor Guthrie and Tim Sistrunk (will call first meeting) (Jeff Trailer offered if needed, he will serve)

d. Student Conduct Rights & Responsibilities

Emily Peart noted that the current grievance processes are messy. She is working on revising the student grievance procedures and said she is separating grade appeals from different grievance appeals. This will give power back to faculty side of house. She hoped to have a draft EM ready by mid-October.

6. Announcements

Trevor Guthrie mentioned that the issues students felt about Boarder Patrol at career fair yesterday had concerned many students. His office had already issued statement and the AS Government Affairs committee will be meeting tonight at 5 pm BMU 205 to hear student and community voices.

7. Other

BB said there is a link to the Ethnic Studies resolution on the ASCSU website if senators want to examine it to give more feedback..

8. Adjourn 4:30

Links to:

[Academic Senate](#)

[Current Executive Memoranda](#)

[The FPPP](#)

[The CBA](#)

[The Constitution of the Faculty](#)

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