FPPC Minutes
Meeting #2
September 16, 2022

https://csulb.zoom.us/j/89208228084
Meeting ID: 892 0822 8084
Passcode: FPPC

Present: Barbara LeMaster, Richard Marcus, Al Colburn, Erlyana Erlyana, Robin
Richersson, Gary Hytrek, Don Haviland, Leslie Andersen, Tianjiao Qiu, Tracey
Mayfield

1. Approval of minutes.
Approved without changes.
2. Announcements
- Introduce Robin Richesson as new COTA representative.
- 4 years ago we passed Permanent Reassignment of Faculty. It has now reached the AS.
3. Revision of University RTP Policy 09-10
- Gary: RSCA came up in faculty rights discussion with CFA. The term "sustained record" - some have reinterpreted that as publishing annually. There could be some challenges as it relates to maternity leaves, etc. We may want to quality that. Gary will bring in some language to discuss at a later date (before forwarding to AS).
- Tracey: "Open Access Publishing." Looking to add: regardless of the publishing medium. Confusing predatory, online, and open access publishers.
(a) section 8
- 703-721. Decision to remove public hearing, have all faculty including lecturers attend hearing, but only tenured and probationary vote.
- Discussion about whether hearing needs to be public to include the campus community;
- Tracey: we should clarify which faculty – we mean the *university* faculty
- Discussion about Tian's point as to whether the hearing should be open to students and staff. Consensus was that the hearing should be for faculty only; faculty do not weigh in on evaluation policies for staff members or student assistants; staff and students will be represented on the Academic Senate so it will be public. General support for the idea of inclusion in general but in this instance the issue is so specific.
- Motion to approve (Don) and second (Robin). Yea = 7 – Motion passes

(b) Erly asked if we could we go back in order of sections – resuming with Section 5?

- Al noted that Section 3 need consultation with others that is pending
- Sections 4-5 are harder and will take more time
- Sections 6-7 are pretty clean and not too challenging
- Agreement to proceed with the agenda

(c) sections 6,7

- Changes to 6.1?
    - Should we replace Division of Academic Affairs with Faculty Affairs to be more accurate, since Faculty Affairs did not exist when the policy was last done?
    - General sense is that this might be a good idea.
    - We will hold until Malcolm is with us to weigh in and confirm the value of this choice.
- Section 6.2 and 6.3
    - Erly noted that 6.3 calls for posting eligible candidates, but during COVID and even now it may not be posted
    - Suggestion - "publicly distribute" or "distribute to the department" - or do we need to be more clear that it does not mean just faculty, and it does not mean the community
    - Barbara – should we say "distribute electronically"
    - Tracey – we should be specific that it goes to faculty and staff and students in the department; but how we distribute it (post, electronic) we remain agnostic; what about "share" with department faculty staff and students
    - Barbara: should we modify department with "program" as well, since there are some independent programs
    - Tian: how do we ensure departments do this? Answer: there is variation and enforcement is challenging but presumably if the department does not adhere this might come up in a grievance
    - Erly: we should remove staff and add academic administrators; recommend also removing "department faculty" and say share with faculty to be more inclusive because non-department faculty may contribute during the open period
    - Significant discussion over whether departments should be required to send electronically to faculty and staff.
    - Barbara: posting paper is fine as a minimum standard – but our students do not use paper and some faculty never come to campus; we're in period of transition and we really should say departments must send something electronically

- Consensus the goal is transparency and that at a minimum departments should both physically post something and distribute by email
- Discussion about open period – how long has it been around, whose idea was it, what is the goal, and how should it be managed by candidates (should they encourage people to write, be discrete?)
- Al: 6.3 says to post a list but doesn't address submissions.
- Jalal/Barbara: No information on what needs to be done with that which is submitted.
- Barbara: Who does the open period benefit from open period? The union probably isn't in favor unless there is a way to reverse negative outside inputs.
- Don: "Announcements shall invite" … can be introduced in 6.3.
- Don: "The announcements shall statements and opinions about qualifications and work of the candidate by other persons identified by name."
- Difference between supporting documents and community inputs.
  - Section 6.4 (new)
    - "a copy of all open period statements and opinions…" to be clear.
    - Tracy: Reminder that these are opinions. Supports the language.
    - Statements – need a wet signature, etc? Do we want a statement?
    - Leslie: This is the relevant language from the CBA: "Information submitted by the faculty unit employee and by academic administrators may include statements and opinions about the qualifications and work of the employee provided by other persons identified by name."
    - Richard: Is the mode of submission a procedural rather than policy question? (Not convinced we should include mode of submission in the policy.)
    - Al: Named submissions vs mode mode of submission. Bring out "name" even more. Add: "…persons must be identified by name." (They can't be anonymous.)
    - Jalal: There are other policies such as on academic administrators. We can borrow.
    - No decision. We will pick up at 6.4 next time.
  - Al will forward a link to the most up to date version.

Future Meetings This Semester
Oct. 7
October 21
November 4
November 18
December 2

FPPC's charge is online at https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/faculty-personnel-policies-council-fppc