

FPPC Minutes  
Meeting #9  
February 16, 2024

Present: Leslie Andersen, Richard Marcus, Hossein Jula, Erlyana Erlyana, Panadda Marayong, Patricia Pérez, Don Haviland, Monica Lounsbury, Lily House-Peter, Rick Reese, Josh Chesler, Tianjiao Qiu

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes-February 2, 2024
3. Announcements
4. Copyright/Patent Policy
  - starting 12:58
  - Leslie: “Copyrightable Policy”? Why use this?
  - Leslie: This was drafted by ORED to send to Senate (concern with federal compliance).
  - Leslie: Do we want an overview to send on to the Senate on the “obvious” pieces, or do we want to heavily edit this? Do we want to take this on or punt this?
  - Don: I am not a lawyer. I looked for logical inconsistencies. Potential problems with the Patentable policy. Why not an Intellectual Property Policy - Copyright? Agreeing with Leslie. Need input from other fields. Maybe not go too hard on it now? But, what are the major changes?
  - Lily: Should this go to our FCs? Leslie: How much time do we want to spend with this when it will be discussed so heavily on the floor of the Senate?
  - Leslie: May be premature for FPPC to take to faculty as opposed to Senate to do so. (?)
  - Richard: Shared 2015 Provost Letter on IP. Discussion followed about context and the need for clarification about what we are trying to accomplish.
  - Leslie: How do we handle changes from Senate to an admin created document.
  - Monica: We hire faculty to create syllabi, etc. The university makes no claim of organization except under these things.... Patentable material. The university has rights. You receive the grants because you’re at the university.
  - Leslie: Some of that is defined. Syllabi belong to the creator not the university.
  - Richard: Concerns of faculty protecting instructional materials and related. We don’t want to create disincentives to faculty engagement in online learning, new practices and innovation, etc.
  - Lily: Concern about AI. CoPilot, ChatGPT, etc how do these integrate with Intellectual Property. How will AI use our Intellectual Property? Do we want this part of the policy? We know AI regularly violates copyright in taking material and not citing.
  - Leslie: Discussed AI with Pei Fang who said Academic Senate Exec Committee does not feel we are ready to create a policy about AI. AI is certainly a moving target. The AI Steering Committee is trying to help us understand how AI can be used and how AI can have an impact on

pedagogy.

- Leslie: Everyone comments in these documents. Leslie will incorporate. We can come to a place where we can do enough editing/massaging that we can send it back to Jade. There are a lot of issues to consider.
- Nim: Can we share this with our colleges for perspective? Leslie to ask Pei Fang.

## 5. Faculty Hiring “Policy”

- Leslie: We were not asked for a Faculty Hiring Policy. We were asked to look at hiring guidelines, but felt it is not possible without a full policy. *Cautiously* moving forward with a policy discussion. Is this what we want to present to Senate?
- Erly: Have we decided if we are going to limit just for tenure/ tenure-track only? Rick: Same question.
- Lily: I think for fulltime lecturers this may be important.
- Rick: What is meant by “tenure density;” what is the metric or goal? Leslie: the language comes from other CSUs (SDSU says 85 percent Tenure Density policy objective). Rick: in the early 2000s the state set 75%.
- Consensus that FT Lecturer is different from other lecturer categories. Adding TT and Recruited FT Lecturers.
- Monica: Why again were we deciding to take this up? Leslie: We were asked for guidelines, but then, in discussion with Patricia, determined that more policy guidance is needed for faculty input into hiring and that it would be difficult to set guidelines. Monica: But requests come from faculty to deans and then we rank and request priorities (?)
- Patricia: There were a couple of things. The searches were being facilitated by the faculty affairs protocol rather than a policy driving the process. Then we got into a separate discussion about disentangling policy and protocol. Once pulling protocol out of guidelines there wasn’t much left.
- Monica: It is not my impression that faculty have no input.
- Leslie: We are not going to repeat the procedure in policy. This is an overarching statement of principles. Faculty hiring needs to be part of long term planning, plans for support and retention, recognize that faculty have the expertise to hire without excessive administrative interference (in library we don’t even get to make a recommendation; we can only do a pro / con list). etc and we don’t have such things in a policy.
- Monica still need to follow EEO etc. There is a balance. A policy from faculty - I think it is great.
- Leslie: The goal is more shared governance documented by policy.
- Erly: The trigger is to make sure the DEI principles are within the hiring policy. Without a policy, we can’t create a series of DEI principles without policy. We have protocol without policy.
- Leslie: from the hiring guidelines: Required qualifications should be position-related, essential, not overly restrictive, and not prejudicial to any group.
- Monica: Roles and responsibility in the recruitment and hiring process to help create transparency. To the degree these are in existing protocols, why do we need a policy?
- Leslie: Faculty input and clarification. The additional parameters in

policies (including hiring best faculty for university programs) is not in policy anywhere.

- Patricia: Require participating in diversity training for search committee. The policy would be a good place for that.
- Richard: Supportive of diversity training for all search committees to ensure no matter what an individual's particular beliefs that we are consistent across committees in a processes. Siimilarly, for transparency across all committees we can ensure greater consistency about roles and decisionmaking within and between colleges.
- Leslie: Stanislaus' handbook is really great on training:  
[https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/2023-06/faculty\\_recruitment\\_manual\\_2022.pdf](https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/2023-06/faculty_recruitment_manual_2022.pdf)
- Leslie: We don't want lengthy. We don't want to repeat what is already part of faculty affairs.
- Leslie: Do we want to add something about cluster hires?
- Nim: Spousal hiring/Dual Career? Rick and Monica support.
- Leslie: Impact of hiring workload on committee members? Rick: yes.
- Leslie will format and incorporate these elements as questions to bring back to the group to work on. Intent to get into a form to present to AS Exec.

Future meetings for Spring Semester

March 01,15

April 19

May 03

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