



Faculty and Student Policies Committee Minutes

Faculty and Student Policies Committee
Meeting from October 9, 2014
2:30 p.m., Kendall 209

Present: Berglund-Smith, Cross, Crotts, Gray, Kipnis, Lee (O'Donnell), Mace, McCabe, Meadows, Mills, O'Donnell, Ponarul, Pratt, Schulte, Seipel, Ratekin, Rehg, Sistrunk, Tinkler, Traver

Absent: Hennessey, Kirchoff, Pratt, Smith, Root

Call to Order: 2:30 pm, Chair Sistrunk presiding.

- 1) Approved minutes of 10-2-14 with two minor changes suggested by Meadows.
- 2) Approve today's agenda
 - Mills inquired if what are listed as new business are considered introductory items.
Clarification by Cross: Affirmative
 - Move/Second/Pass the Agenda.
- 3) Announcements
 - a. Secretary for today's meeting: Richard Ponarul
 - b. General: None
- 4) Chair's Introduction
 - Chair Sistrunk briefed the committee on the idea behind PCDC
 - How are policies vetted, notified and achieved
 - Example: The new e-mail policy
 - Notification, promotion of consultation and publication
 - Rationalization of the catalog and ease of search
 - Catalog active policies and archive the rest

Meadows expressed concern regarding the structure of the committee. Inclusion of student representation and staff representation was raised and received support.

Tinkler: Where did this come from?

Sistrunk: It grew out of recurrent problems regarding policies that were addressed in the ad hoc Committee on Facilities report last SP14.

Crotts: With President's Chief of Staff as chair it looks like a President's committee.

Mills: Are we doing the administration's job?

Several concerns were raised about the draft.

- “. . .give input.” To whom?
- “. . .updated regularly.” How often?

- What policies are included?
- “. . . accurate and up to date.” Vague
- Some polices are simply legal requirements.
- Consultation: What is the process?
- Union’s role in policy (e.g. e-mail policy)
- There could be situations of urgency with no time for the senate process

5) Subcommittee Discussion/Reports

a. Reports

1. FRAS Discussion: (Schulte) FRAS will raise the issue of criteria for selection outstanding teachers at the end of the year. As of now each year’s committee decide on the criteria for that year.
Discussion ensued. Better to have general guidelines known ahead of time son that teachers know what is considered excellent. Criteria from CELT could serve as a guide.
2. Finals times: Soldavini will report at the next FASP meeting.
3. Academic integrity: A. S. has a meeting of the I.R.A. committee next Friday where part of this issue will be considered.

b. Subcommittees

1. Class size policies: A survey of chairs regarding policies and practices and data on past class sizes will be used to decide on the desirability of a campus wide policy on class sizes. A draft of a questionnaire was circulated and comments solicited. Katie Silliman (Chair, NFSC) has agreed to review the questionnaire in the next round before it is sent out to the chairs.
Discussion centered on difficulties such as the definition of the term “Jumbo,” the WTU for various forms of instruction and the situation where multiple instructors are listed under one section. What is and is not a supervised activity could also be problematic.
2. FPPP Faculty Code of Ethics
The subcommittee is still recruiting members.
3. FPPP Substantive items
Lengthy discussion on what are substantive items and what are editorial changes. General agreement to delay inserting “substantive” changes listed until it is clear how they would fit in the FPPP reorganization document.

6. New Business

a. Proposed Change to FPPP: Definition of Office Hours

Crotts: Since it was postponed definitely the original document should be brought back to be voted in as an introductory item. Then at the action item stage a substitute document can be brought in.

Mills presented an alternate substitute document.

Discussion centered on the difference between units and WTU.

Voted in unanimously as an introductory item.

b. Proposed EM: Committee on Committees

Lengthy discussion regarding the size of the committee, representation of students, relation to the constitution, difficulty of getting volunteers and the proposed frequency of meetings. The proposal was voted down unanimously.

7. Other

Effort to promote committee participation can be addressed again.

Discussion led to suggestion of deleting certain committees and consolidation of committees to deal with the shortage of volunteers. Are supervisory groups charged with populating committees? 20 to 25% of the committees do not meet at all.

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

