

Faculty and Student Policies Committee Meeting

March 9, 2017

2:30 pm ARTS 228

Present:

Meadows, Wilking, Hennessey, Pittman, Zartman, Livingston, Janos, Thompson
Sudick, Elamad, Sistrunk, Peart, Harrington, Elamad, Scholz, McLemore, Schulte (Kirckhoff proxy), Rehg,
Schierenbeck (guest)

Absent: Blakeslee, Kirckhoff, Parsons, Stapleton, Pratt

Meeting started at 2:30 with Jennifer Meadows presiding

1. **Minutes** of 2/23/17 meeting approved with no amendments
2. **Agenda** for 3/09/17 meeting approved
3. **Announcements**
 - other
 - a. Schulte wants to revisit FRAS criteria
 - b. Today's secretary is Barbara Sudick
 - c. Meadows participating in MS walk in Bidwell Park 4/30, invited all to join her
 - c. Executive Director of housing, Abeer Mustafa, invited to talk about RA situation (not confirmed)
4. **Proposed EM: Adjunct Appointments at California State University, Chico–Action Item (Supersedes EM 86-005)**
 - a. CSU Channel Islands wording for adjunct description added
 - d. Minor editorial changes made
 - c. Pass as an Action Item
5. **Proposed EM: Campus Vegetation and Arboretum Committee – Introduction Item**
 - a. Kristina Schierenbeck, botanist from Biological Sciences Dept, was invited to speak
 - b. Provided background and committee overview
 - c. Greater collaboration with campus architect and facilities management needed to improve committee's effectiveness
 - d. FMS wants to manage grounds
 1. FMS is discussing hiring a replacement for Kevin Doyle
 2. We might want to bring up Arboretum Committee during the hiring process
 - e. Broader representation on committee recommended (suggestions to consider adding AS sustainability, Geography, AG, Natural Sciences, Park and Rec,)
 - f. Possible areas of focus for committee include:
 1. native plants - 30% of CA native plants threatened
 2. Pollination crisis
 3. Resoration of creek
 4. Tree removal policy

- g. Some informal proposals to date for additions to campus gardens include: herb garden, orchard, vegetable garden, native vegetation, lysimeters (to measure groundwater content)
- h. Concern raised about long term management of possible vegetable gardens (particularly over summer)
- i. Possibility raised of finding local partners (corporate and/or community partners)
- j. Passed as an Introduction Item

6. Proposed EM: Chair Appointment - Discussion

- a. Meadows provided some background
 - 1. This sat on Zingg's desk for a while
 - 2. Last PAC meeting there were some suggested changes (Meadows read her notes from PAC meeting)
 - 3. Some concern that there be a way to recall nonfunctioning chairs
 - a. Dean should be able to say "no" to dept recommendation
 - b. Faculty may not be able to question chair because of chair's power position
 - c. Subcommittee formed (Wilking, Livingston, Hennessey)

7. Subcommittee Reports

a. Internship committee

- 1. Sudick and Hennessey reported it's about done
- 2. Sistruck suggested getting in touch with Loeker

8. Other

a. FRAS (faculty recognition awards)

- 1. Schulte- there is a need for clear long-term award criteria (none exists)
- 2. Other possible kinds of teaching acknowledgements or roles were discussed (helping with pass rates, first generation students, master teachers, research mentoring, etc.)
- 3. Perhaps offering more than one award per year or more than one per college
- 4. Subcommittee formed (Thompson, Sudick, Schulte, Pittman, Elamad)

b. RA issue

- 1. Mustafa did not show
- 2. Meadows provided background of incident in which 20 RAs were fired last week
- 3. Discussion followed regarding concerns about the incident and its impact
 - a. How did University Housing approach the incident?
 - 1. Would an investigation have been more appropriate than firing?
 - a. This may have been too draconian
 - b. Was response evenly applied?
 - b. Could this be a teaching moment rather than a condemning one?
 - 2. Concern about asking students to name names
 - b. If you represent the campus Alcohol and Drug Center is it a conflict of interest to be drinking with students?
 - 1. Are expectations for RAs different than other campus workers in this regard?
 - 2. Do we really know what RAs do?
 - c. Concern that this is more of a cultural issue and that perhaps these students were scapegoats
 - d. Did the RAs have a clear contract or just a job description?
 - 1. The wording of the contract may have been changed last year (to *refrain* from drinking)
 - 2. Was expectation changed after they were hired?

3. Could this be considered wrongful termination?
 4. Do we need to craft a better job description?
 5. Sami will send job description for RAs to Meadows who will distribute it to committee members
- e. Impact on RAs
1. Homeless- and no money to find another place
 2. Food insecurity
 3. Emotional impact- loss of identity
 4. Ability to continue as student-will they need to leave the University?
- f. Impact on students living in dorms-
1. Are they without RAs?
- g. Urgency in addressing this matter
- h. Concern that information circulated is not accurate (need to understand context)
- i. Is it appropriate for Senate to address this?
1. A forum rather than a Senate discussion was recommended

Adjourned at 4:15 pm

Respectfully submitted:
Barbara Sudick