



---

## Faculty and Student Policies Committee Minutes

---

Faculty and Student Policies Committee  
Meeting from August 25, 2016  
2:30 p.m., Arts 228

Present: Blakesley, Hennessey, Janos, Kirchoff, Livingston, McLemore, Meadows (Chair),  
Nguyen, O'Donnell, Pittman, Pratt, Reh, Scholz, Schulte, Sistrunk, Stapleton,  
Sudick, Thompson (Wilking), Wilking, Zartman

Absent: Heilesen, Parsons

Guest(s): Loker

---

Call to Order: 2:35 pm, Chair Meadows presiding

1) **Approve minutes of 4-28-16**

Approved

2) **Approval of today's agenda**

Approved

3) **Introductions**

Greetings were exchanged around the table.

4) **Respectful Communications – Discussion Item**

Meadows explained how FASP utilizes Robert's Rules of Order when a formal motion is under consideration, but normally proceeds more informally. She pointed out that the efficiency of meetings and the important business of the Committee would be promoted by members' preparation and attention at the meetings.

Zartman especially recalled his salutary experience in large Senate meetings when the members direct their remarks to the Chair in good order.

5) **Review of FASP Guidelines**

- Meadows introduced discussion of the FASP Guidelines and explained how FASP is constituted and the general purpose of the guidelines in coordinating FASP and Senate activities. She underlined how they call on members to represent their constituencies and to consult widely on the policies and issues before the committee.
- It was suggested that the language of Section II depicting the functions of FASP be expanded to include the fact that others, including Faculty Affairs, might identify matters that should concern the committee. Others pointed out that this is certainly true, but the Senate Constitution delineates FASP concerns broadly and E.C is then empowered to specify the issues it addresses as needed. The regular meetings of the Vice President of Faculty Affairs and the FASP Chair function to raise issues which E.C is notified about. Others may also bring forward issues that FASP should take up in communication with the E.C.

- There were no objections to the idea of removing the word “Academic” from Section II point B so that the guidelines now read more generically that FASP will not take up those issues reserved to EPPC.
- The requirement of Section IV point F that both FASP subcommittees and FASP as a whole consult with the varied functional parts of administration, staff, students and faculty as appropriate for the policy or issues under consideration was underlined as an especial emphasis of the working process of FASP.

#### **6) Election of Vice Chair**

Meadows explained the responsibilities of the Vice Chair of FASP. They stand in for the Chair when that person is absent. They help during meetings by keeping a speaker’s list, and they assume the Chair’s duties if the Chair wants to speak to the issue on the floor. Finally, Meadows noted that a Vice Chair could learn how the committee works to prepare to run for Chair of FASP in the future.

Sistrunk nominated Wilking for the position.  
Schulte nominated Scholz for the position.

Both nominees spoke briefly and a secret paper ballot was conducted. Wilking was elected as Vice Chair of FASP.

#### **7) Secretary Signups**

Meadows passed around the sign-up sheet for members to act as Secretary at one FASP meeting in the future, and the response was amazing and gratifying.

#### **8) Graduation Initiative Report – Discussion Item (Bill Loker)**

This was postponed as Bill Loker was not yet in attendance.

#### **9) Propose EM on Workplace Abusive Conduct and Bullying – Introduction Item**

- Meadows described how this EM passed FASP last Spring as an Introduction item, but that it must be taken up by this year’s FASP Committee at the beginning of the process again. She explained that representatives of the staff union CSUEU had added comments over the summer. It was moved and seconded to send the EM back to the subcommittee for more consideration.
- Sistrunk named the members of the subcommittee as himself, Vincent Ornelas (CFA), Jessica Verardi (CSUEU), Evanne O’Donnell (Faculty Affairs), Dylan Saake (Labor Relations) and McLemore (Student Affairs).
- He went on precipitously to discuss how this subcommittee would continue its work from last year to treat the EM 12-025 Policy on Campus Behavior and Violence Prevention as well. He reminded FASP members how this subcommittee had chosen to divide the older EM 12-025 because it treated both violence and bullying and did not serve either purpose as well as it might.
- He said this subcommittee might learn from the efforts of the Title IX Committee that has formed a group to promote a trauma informed campus.
- Zartman added that the new Vice President of Business and Finance, James Hyatt, was a nationally acknowledged expert about violence policies at campuses since he had done so much work at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University when it had suffered mass violence in 2007. If he had time, he might serve as a resource.

## 10) Subcommittees from 15-16

- a. Internship Policy  
Meadows asked members of this subcommittee how their efforts were going from last year and was told by Hennessey and Rehg that they thought they could complete their work with alacrity. Bill Loker also serves on this subcommittee. Barbara Sudick volunteered to join this effort as well.
- b. EM 12-025 Policy on Campus Behavior and Violence Prevention  
Sistrunk already spoke out of turn about this subcommittee (see Item 9 above)

## 11) Upcoming Items (These May Change)

Meadows introduced several issues that will probably be coming to FASP this next year and some of them may require subcommittee work to complete.

- a. Grant Funded Instructional Faculty Policy  
Meadows explained that CSU Chico had needed this kind of policy to comply with provisions needed to support this type of appointment since 2007. A number of other CSU's have this type of policy in place. She thought we might consider this as early as the next meeting of FASP.
- b. Arboretum Committee EM  
Sistrunk reported that the current members of the Arboretum Committee had completed a draft of a new EM to support their work, but did not know if they had finished with it.
- c. Equity Committee EM revision  
Meadows described how a subcommittee of the Title IX Committee made up by herself, Dylan Saake and McLemore were working to complete a new EM defining the membership and functions of the Title IX Committee. Once this work was complete, the different role that should be performed by the Equity Committee could be articulated. (The Equity Committee is currently defined by an EM, but some of its functions have been taken over by the federally mandated Title IX Committee, though not all of them).
- d. Title IX Committee EM  
(See above)
- e. FRAS EM revision  
FASP recommended, and the committee agreed, that the Faculty Recognition and Support Committee should define its charge more clearly in relation to all the awards it administers, add more guidance for applicants about its awards, and define a clearer timeline of its important yearly activities.
- f. CFU EM revision  
Meadows recognized that Stapleton, as the faculty representative on the Campus Facilities Committee, had called for more faculty representation on the committee and this had been recommended by the Provost and the Vice President of Business and Finance last year.

Meadows adumbrated other issues that she and Blakesley had identified as potential business for FASP.

- EM 86-005: Adjunct Appointments at CSU Chico. This EM is outdated and does not comply with the latest CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.

- The FPPP should be modified in dealing with Lecturer rebuttals of their personnel reports.
- There should be clarity about the Leaves without Pay policy.
- EM 98-011: Statement on Final Exams needs to include practice for online examinations and other issues.
- EM 78-8: is obsolete and only found in a type written copy, typed by a typewriter.
- Changes need to be made to FPPP 11.1 about Periodic Evaluation to address promotions to Full professor more ably.
- There are questions about how small departments conduct their RTP processes.

Meadows invited everyone to divide into small groups and consider issues that we had already heard our constituents discuss that should be taken up by FASP. The groups produced a series of recommendations that included:

- The need for clearer processes to expedite and evaluate the charges that Facilities Management Services asks of academic units.
  - changes needed to labs and other facilities impact some programs more significantly than EO 1000 and are seriously impacting teaching
  - FASP should invite Tom Ussery and Kevin Doyle to discuss these issues
- Travel expense claims that require individual itemized expenses are unworkable and unnecessarily time-consuming
- Department curriculum committees should determine class size limitations based on pedagogical reasons (this is not the Deans' purview)
- Why is there such variation in the numbers that constitute a single class? Some define a single course as limited to 60 or 100, and some say 75. How does this coincide with the custom that a "double class" is 120?

The small group reporting out to everyone was suspended as Bill Loker arrived to discuss item 8. These final group suggestions were taken after discussion of the Graduation Initiative report.

- Have Student Life and Leadership people meet with Academic Senate to orient faculty to their work
- Upgrade AS Governmental Affairs policy agenda to include food security and diversity
- Need to make the Academic Department Manual up to date and coherent

#### **8. Graduation Initiative Report – Discussion Item (Bill Loker)**

Loker explained that this initiative had been ongoing in the CSU since the Chancellorship of Charles Reed in 2007. Loker's meetings with EPPC and FASP today are an attempt to consult with faculty as required by the Governor's Department of Finance that is offering the CSU system some \$35M to promote further graduation initiative efforts this year.

Loker depicted earlier Chico graduation initiative efforts (which are outlined at <http://www.csuchico.edu/gradinitiative/index.shtml>). They show how Chico successfully met goals to alter the rates of our students taking six years to graduate, first generation students, at-risk students and transfer students (comparing 2007 to 2015 numbers). The Chancellor's Office began the process of redirecting goals in October 2014 to improve all the categories by 2025. The Governor's Department of Finance has declared these newer goals are not ambitious enough. They would like there to be no gaps between first year students, minority students and low income students as measured by Pell eligibility. They would like an impact that is almost immediate and to meet these very ambitious goals Loker calculates that we will need to matriculate 400 students who currently look slated to graduate in 4.5 years to 4

years and 200 transfer students slated to graduate in 2.5 years to 2 years in the next year to gain the roughly \$500,000 that it looks like Chico would receive with a successful application and plan.

He outlined a three part short term plan that could garner us beginning support.

- 1) strengthening advising
- 2) increasing data capabilities to track and evaluate students (ie. analytical information gathering, dashboards for Chairs, etc.)
- 3) instruction support (supplemental instruction esp. for 1st to 2<sup>nd</sup> year students, STEM, REACH, reduction of complex requirements, etc. )

There were many questions and comments:

- Money and food insecurity impact students
- Students need support outside the classroom to feel connected to campus
- Students must work –should we advocate for free tuition?
- What about study abroad?
- We tell students to take minors and certificates to distinguish themselves
- Unfair expenses to have to take intercession
- More tenured teachers would give students more sections do they can graduate and don't have to wait for classes
- How about an emergency reduced course fee?
- some majors cannot be shortened (accreditation, state requirements, etc.)
- do we know how many could benefit from special topics courses or other substitutes?
- Should EPPC be proactive and suggest departments look at roadblocks?
- What is the data on the biggest reason people don't graduate?

## **12. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 4:21

Respectfully submitted, Tim Sistrunk