



Faculty and Student Policies Committee Agenda

TO: Faculty and Student Policies Committee
FROM: Laura Sparks, Rotating Secretary
DATE: September 23 2021
SUBJECT: FASP Meeting Minutes – September 23, 2021 at 2:30 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING Via Zoom:

<https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/2154349094?pwd=aTYlSIVNVzBmMzZuQVVDMEVmUFJxQT09>

[Zoom Link](#)

Zoom ID: 215-434-9094

Password: 279547

Attendance: Tim Sistrunk, Duncan Young, Ella Snyder, Ennies Musvosvi, Miriam Walter, Rebecca Ormond, Adam Irish, Dennis O'Connor, Todd Gibson (proxy for Jennifer Underwood), Nicholas Burk, Julie Monet, Nicole Sherman, Jen McKee, Brian Oppy, Jeff Trailer, Elizabeth (Betsy) Boyd (proxy for Kathy Kaiser), Terence Lau, Laura Sparks, Karyn Cornell, Jason Stapleton, Jonathan Day, Shrija Dirghangi

1. Approve [FASP Minutes 9.9.2021](#)
 - a. approved
2. Approve Agenda
 - a. approved
 - Subcommittees [EM-Policy List 21-22](#)
 - On hold: Subcommittee to rewrite University Public Safety Advisory Committee EM; possible integration with Task Force
 - Sistrunk requests that FASP members email him about joining/changing subcommittees
 - Boyd would like to reach out to A.S. and VP for Business/Finance to consult re: University Budget Committee EM (no objections)
 - Snyder offers to recruit more students from diverse backgrounds/majors/perspectives to join subcommittees
 - Sistrunk notes that Cheri Chastain is leaving Chico State (she will be missed!)
 - O'Connor asks about reaching out to Chico State Enterprises
 - Sistrunk briefly reviews each subcommittee currently in the works
 - Irish asks about opening communication with campus members for Workload Efficiency Project; Sistrunk recommends starting with the Deans; Boyd notes Jeff Trailer had created a formula for counting service

- [FASP Subcommittee and Document Handling Protocols.pdf](#)
 - Sistrunk reviews EM development and handling processes; stresses importance of consultation during policy research and drafting
 - [EM Template](#)
3. Discussion Item: [Targeted Harassment of Faculty - Best Practices](#)
- a. Sistrunk offers overview of Targeted Harassment policy draft from Spring 2021; thanks to Corey Sparks (subcommittee chair); “Response Actions” or best practices are central to document (local resources, contacts, etc.); meant to be advisory; notes Penn State as a model; recommends institutional power be used to support those who have been targeted; includes summary at the end of other campus groups (info may or may not be integrated into final policy)
 - b. Sistrunk solicits perspectives from FASP (should this be an EM?)
 - c. Ormond asks whether Penn State has an EM on this; not quite clear what their equivalent would be
 - d. Sistrunk: draft looks almost ready; could come back to FASP soon
 - e. Irish: If it’s a policy, it could require action; if it’s an EM what would be separate resources and what would be required actions?
 - f. Boyd: What is President’s Office perspective on this? Legal Counsel shut this down previously
 - g. Cornell responds with Brooke Banks’s (President’s Office) perspective: recommends “best practices” route; we can’t restrict free speech through a policy
 - h. Snyder: Could be unconstitutional in parts; but we need to show faculty we support them
 - i. Oppy: Not unusual to get complaints about faculty from community members, etc.; if this were policy, could it get used against other faculty?; supports best practices/resources approach
 - j. Sparks: Resources sound good; but how can we help the institution take the appropriate steps to support targeted faculty?
 - k. Irish: We want to believe institution has our back; but what if faculty say terrible and offensive things? would a university president, for example, have the room to condemn those statements? resources seems like a more flexible route
 - l. Lau: Points to draft’s definition of “harassment,” which includes the phrase “seriously annoying” – what would it mean to adopt this definition from CA criminal code, esp. if “beyond a reasonable doubt” is not required?; “we should not be the manners police”; how is Targeted Harassment different from bullying?; concerns about admin having to expressly support all views
 - m. Boyd: Could we do something similar to Ethics component in FPPP (as an alternative to EM)?
 - n. Lau: Title suggests “best practices” for harassing faculty
 - o. Sistrunk invites future conversation about this draft
4. Announcements
- a. Boyd: Invite to University Budget Committee meeting next week (during usual FASP meeting time). All are welcome!

- b. Sparks: Invite to Stephanie Sparling Williams (virtual) lecture for Humanities Center tonight at 5:30: "Black Feminist Critique and Ontological Reconciliation in Artist Lorraine O'Grady's Diptychs"
5. Other
6. Subcommittee meetings
 - a. Sistrunk: Lots of opportunities for revision/updating in FPPP (e.g., "professional activity," Code of Ethics, etc.); also Senate Resolutions to revisit
 - b. Ormond sent out invite to FPPP subcommittee meeting, so anyone with ideas can contact her
 - c. Boyd: Invite to UBC subcommittee meeting right after FASP adjourns
7. Adjourn – 3:47 pm

Links to:

[Academic Senate](#)

[Faculty & Student Policies Committee \(FASP\)](#)

[Current Executive Memoranda](#)

[The FPPP](#)

[The CBA](#)

[The Constitution of the Faculty](#)

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