

**FPPC MINUTES**  
**FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 2025**

<https://csulb.zoom.us/j/85387695171>

Present : Barbara LeMaster, Erlyana Erlyana, Richard Marcus, Jamie Lee Tran, Leslie Andersen, Roger Lo, Estella Chizhik, Lily House-Peters, Patricia Pérez

Not Present:, Rick Reese, Anna Ortiz (Dean Representative), Ted Stankowich.

**Agenda Approval:** Approved unanimously.

**Minutes from 2-21-25 Approval:** Approved unanimously.

**Chair Report:**

- Cleaned up the policies for ease of reading (i.e., accepted changes, and cleaned up grammar, etc., where highlighted). Patent Policy (ensuring nothing is included from the Copyright Policy now that they are being written separately). Copyright policy (ensuring nothing is included from Patent Policy about patents).
- Barbara spoke with Min Yao, CIO, about AI tools. He provided language about the use of outside AI tools, and he encouraged the use of CSULB AI tools.
- The Copyright Policy might need a statement about AI use separate from the university and one from the university.
- Focused the Faculty Hiring Policy on tenured/tenure track faculty. Formatted policy, highlighted newly changed language (e.g., FEA) and remaining questions.

**FPPC Academic Senate Representative Report**

- President Conoley:
  - o Following closely executive order about dismantling of Dept of Ed; concern about pell grants
  - o Concern about immigration orders for resident student and faculty at other universities [not-CSU]
  - o There was an advocacy day in Sacramento to fight for budget
  - o On positive side, President got to present in Chicago on pluralism project; reach out to Religious Studies Dept if you have questions
- Kelly Janousek, CFA Faculty Rights Chair
  - o Had a bargaining town hall yesterday; need to increase membership
  - o Will request commitment to action so Chancellor will listen; will request pledge cards again
  - o Survey: restoration of appropriate class sizes (impacts faculty workload and SLOs); reclassification for lecturers to improve TT faculty; improving hiring and retention of faculty of color and ; salary floor increase; general salary increase to keep up with inflation
- ASCSU Senator Eileen Klink
  - o Report on most recent ASCSU plenary
  - o Lots of new acronyms and terms, for example, lots of emphasis on “systemness”; we are largest system; SHEEO (State Higher Education Executive Officers); AI Common Hub (Reimaging HE- Generative AI)

- Keep an eye out for Senate Bill 790- interstate reciprocity agreements for Distance Education; out-of-state private postsecondary educational institutions
- CFA and ASCSU are co-sponsoring a bill for audits to happen every 3 years for budget transparency
- First reading of the Proposal to Discontinue the BA in English, Special Emphasis Option.
- Second reading of the Proposal to change the BA in International Studies to a BA in Global Studies.
- Second reading of the Proposal to change the International Studies Minor to a Global Studies Minor.
- non-voting liaison between Academic Senate and the [Faculty Personnel Policies Council \(FPPC\)](#) (in progress)
- The continued second reading of the second of the two Master's policies that we were working on in fall 2024: PS 95-07: Policy on Master's Level Culminating Activities.

## **OLD BUSINESS:**

### **1. Second reading of proposed charge for SPOT Task Force. (10 minutes)**

- a. Moved/seconded for second reading.
- b. Leslie: Do want to include library. It is true we don't use the current SPOT, but we do teach and have our own tool. I would like to have a new instrument that would be flexible enough that librarians use it as well. Council agreement by consent.
- c. Approved Charge Unanimously.

### **2. First Reading of Patent policy. (25 minutes)**

- a. Barbara removed anything related to Copyright
  - i. Discussion on whether to keep *1.1 The intellectual property policies of the University shall consist of two components: (a) the CSULB Patent Policy and (b) the CSULB Copyright Policy*. Decision: keep
  - ii. 2.1 "Creator." Removed copyright language.
  - iii. 5.2.1 removed "and proposal of changes" to this policy as it needs to go to the Senate.
  - iv. 5.5 removed copyright
  - v. Remains in places where it was part of a name (capitalized) "Copyright"
- b. Richard: Moved to waive first reading. Unanimously approved.
- c. Leslie: Second Reading. Move to accept as written. Lily second with a friendly amendment to accept as written with our changes. Unanimously approved.

### **3. First Reading of the Faculty Hiring policy with a DEIA lens. (35 minutes)**

- a. 1.11c. "May recommend, in consultation with the dean, additional candidates for interview prior to approving the semi-finalists or finalists for

campus interview.” Lily: Is it new that a provost or dean can recommend additional candidates? Barbara: We have never had a policy, but it has been practice. Patricia: It is rare, but the provost has occasionally asked for an expanded pool.

- b. 1.22 Role of the Faculty Equity Advocates (FEA). Discussion about the significant budget cuts and lowering of assigned time. Anything that is discretionary funding in the budget is on the table for cuts. Do we need to add “budget permitting?” Hold discussion to the next meeting.
- c. Leslie: Most of this is procedure. Line 24 down is not faculty driven. I would like to see more about our philosophy on recruiting faculty.
- d. Discussion: flipping the order to better emphasize faculty-driving hiring process and policy. 1.25 Rose of the Search Committee.
- e. Patricia: intent to create a DEI and faculty hiring policy. CBA Article 12.22, 23:

*Recommendations regarding probationary appointments shall originate at the department or equivalent unit. Probationary appointment procedures shall include the following: a. b. c. Each department or equivalent unit shall elect a peer review committee of tenured employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending individuals for probationary appointments. At the discretion of the President and upon request of the department these peer review committees may also include probationary employees. Each departmental peer review committee recommendation report shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee. A departmental peer review committee may review and recommend a probationary faculty unit appointment for a temporary unit employee who has received an offer of tenure track employment. Such a recommendation may only occur in a department where there is no current tenure-line recruitment for which the faculty member is qualified. Such recommendation[s] shall be directed to the President or their designee for review, consideration, and response. The decision of the President or designee shall not be subject to Article 10 (Grievance Procedures) of this Collective Bargaining Agreement.*

*12.23 Probationary appointments are normally made at the Assistant Professor or equivalent librarian rank. The President may appoint an employee at a higher rank on the determination of merit consistent with provision 12.22.*

- f. Leslie reminded of useful language in the CSUCI appointment policy:

<https://policy.csuci.edu/sp/20/sp20-08-policy-on-recruitment-and-appointment-of-t-tt-faculty.htm>

### **Background**

*This policy codifies practices for all participants in the tenure-line hiring process to ensure greater diversity, equity, and inclusion in service of the University mission.*

*The goal in hiring is to identify and to recruit the best faculty for the university's academic programs. This superlative reflects qualities of teaching excellence; potential in research, scholarship, or creative activity, area of specialization; and the candidate's ability to serve the university's diversity, equity, and inclusion needs relative to the institution's goals.*

*Recruiting candidates with these qualities requires the work of many groups. This policy puts significant weight on written plans that are created by a hiring department, shared with other internal stakeholders, and jointly approved by a dean, the AVP of Faculty Affairs, and the Chair of the Senate Committee on Equity and Anti-Racism or their designees.*

*This policy takes as a bedrock principle that a search cannot be successful if the process does not account for how the hiring department will support and retain a new faculty member. Though it is beyond the scope of this policy, it is critically important to the health of the institution that there be a caring and thoughtful process for bringing new faculty into the university community. This starts by treating all applicants, candidates, and finalists equitably and with respect. Another bedrock principle of this policy is that the necessary expertise for appropriate assessments, authority, and clarity of purpose rest with the faculty. Absent evidence to the contrary, administration should accept and follow the hiring recommendations of the departmental search committee.*

- g. Barbara will take a first pass at reordering to consider role of administration and faculty as well as the policy emphasis for next meeting.
- h. Erly – allocation is very top down and faculty, chairs don't know what is happening. It is an unknown formula. We as a Council want more bottom-up allocation of resources and [transparency]. Patricia: I find out when you find out and am not involved in that conversation either. I don't know what else is considered. Barbara: Sometimes, CLA Deans have chairs tell each other about their hiring needs in order for chairs to help with college hiring priorities. There have also been cooperative hires across departments, and across colleges, often as a Provost-initiated coordinated hires, and sometimes as faculty-initiated coordinated hires.
- i. Estella: Cluster hires. Lily: there was a cluster hire for AI (CLA and COE) and Black Long Beach cluster. This year there is an Environmental Justice cluster.
- j. Barbara: Losing a faculty member doesn't mean you get a replacement hire.

- k. Estella: The policy we are building starts with the search. In this conversation there should be some thought about how departments of colleges ask for TT hire. Talk about needs. Talk about cluster hire.
- l. Richard: We tend to have departments enter requests in a vacuum and set up competition. The measurement of successful request is commonly opaque, varies with change of provost, and varies with exogenous change of needs. How do we introduce language that encourages less competition and more thoughtful, transparent deliberation? Of course the provost makes the determination, but it would change how both departments and colleges frame their requests in a more collaborative fashion to meet a broader vision of a college.
  - i. Patricia: Originate at the department level. We can leverage that. I don't know what that could look like. I get an estimate – likely up to 25 hires next year. I update a memo. At the college level that is distributed to the chairs who make their cases. Provost then decides which departments, in which areas. Different opportunities for intervention. Defer for what that might look like.
  - ii. Patricia: We have that part of the CBA that allows for department input.
  - iii. Richard: What I am hearing is using this policy to look at how we implement that CBA line to make it less competitive between departments and more collaborative and collective leading to more creativity in cluster hires, joint hires, or complementarity.
  - iv. Estella: Seems very quantitative. Where is the qualitative aspect of faculty-initiated hires? As Richard asks: how can we be more collaborative? Start much earlier – even end of the previous year – to have conversations beyond the college.
  - v. Lily: I appreciate the suggestion that after we approve the TT that there is a lot of desire for a policy on FT lecturer hiring.
  - vi. Barbara: In the first FPPC meeting of this semester, the policy priorities are laid out, and the lecturer hiring policy is next on the FPPC agenda. Plus, completing the T/TT faculty hiring policy should give us a template to work with when writing the lecturer hiring policy. We also already have some of that written from having tried to incorporate lecturer hiring into the T/TT faculty hiring policy. The hope is that the groundwork should facilitate the writing of the lecturer hiring policy.

#### 4. First Reading of Copyright Policy. (35 minutes)

- a. Barbara: We do not have any language about AI and may need to add it.
- b. Richard shared some resources. Barbara found the GU page particularly useful.
  - i. <https://guides.library.georgetown.edu/ai/copyright>
  - ii. <https://businesslawreview.uchicago.edu/online-archive/developing-coherent-national-strategy-artificial-intelligence-ai-and-copyright-law>

- iii. <https://libguides.csun.edu/c.php?g=1377855&p=10188468&utm>
- iv. <https://guides.library.ucdavis.edu/genai/copyright>
- v. <https://guides.lib.usf.edu/c.php?g=1315087&p=9690822&utm>
- vi. <https://guides.lib.usf.edu/c.php?g=1315087&p=9690822&utm>

- c. 1.4 “The University makes no claim of ownership or use rights, or obligation between the university and creator(s), regarding any intellectual property except:” meaning that everything in the list that follows has a claim. These tend to have separate agreements. Does this need to be revised? Particularly “limiting claims to the funding agreements” in the second to last bullet?  
Patricia: Article 39 in the CBA. This is an excerpt.

*Faculty bargaining unit employees may use for non-CSU purposes materials created by them without extraordinary University support, if in the past the CSU has never disputed the use of such materials by faculty bargaining unit employees for non-CSU purposes. Such works may include, but shall not necessarily be limited to, class/lecture notes and materials; course syllabi; instructional text and manuscripts; theses and dissertations; articles; nonfiction; fiction; poems; musical works; dramatic works including any accompanying music; pantomimes and choreographic works; pictorial, graphic and sculptural works, or other works of artistic imagination; software; educational software; or plans, patterns and works of art or design including works that are used in connection with online or hybrid instruction, transmitted electronically, and/or stored on CSU or third party provided servers. Unless there is a separate individual agreement or past practice at a campus to the contrary, faculty bargaining unit employees shall be entitled to grant licenses or make assignments with respect to such materials to publishers and publishing agents, or any other third party. Unless there is a separate agreement to the contrary, consistent with this Article, neither the CSU nor third party providers are entitled to grant licenses or make assignments with respect to such materials to publishers and publishing agents, or any third party.*

- d. Barbara: Concern for an AI Avatar. That someone could take our notes and create an AI Avatar of us. Barbara:
  - i. An AI Avatar is equal to a faculty member.
  - ii. Erly. You can plagiarize. In the cheating and plagiarizing policy?
  - iii. Barbara: Like with writers guild. Using AI for writing. The university could recreate use from our work. Do we need to be specific to AI use of our work?
  - iv. Richard: 1. I think the response from the university would be that it is not the intent to use an AI to get around usage or ownership rights. I therefore support Barbara’s point that it is straightforward to just say

an AI is equivalent to the faculty member creator. 2. This is not for this policy, but it is also an ethical concern for how a faculty member uses the AI for themselves; if a faculty member were to create an AI for themselves, particularly one that alters their identity.

- v. Leslie sharing library copyright alliance:

<https://www.librarycopyrightalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/AI-principles.pdf>

- e. Patricia. From 00-07 Statement on Professional Responsibility

- i. *Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligations to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.*

- f. 3.3 Student Copyrightable Works. Why are theses the property of the University? Why must it be requested by the student to retain a copy of the work when undergraduate student work remains solely with them.
- g. Barbara to ask Jade about line 210 and AI.

Meeting Dates for Spring Semester (1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Fridays, 12:30-2:30 p.m. online):

~~February 7, 2025 (time-certain meeting with Brenda Vogel at 1:00 p.m.)~~

~~February 21, 2025 (time-certain meeting with Jade Sche at 1:00 p.m.)~~

~~March 7, 2025~~

March 21, 2025

April 18, 2025

May 2, 2025