

FPPC MINUTES
FRIDAY, March 7, 2025
<https://csulb.zoom.us/j/85387695171>

Present : Barbara LeMaster, Erlyana Erlyana, Richard Marcus, Patricia Pérez, Rick Reese, Jamie Lee Tran, Leslie Andersen, Roger Lo, Ted Stankowich, Anna Ortiz (Dean Representative), Lily House-Peters (joined while working on #3).

Not Present: Estella Chizhik.

NEW BUSINESS:

Agenda: Approved.

Minutes: Approved.

Chair Report: Discussed FPPC creation of a subcommittee to address SPOT issues since the idea of a task force was rejected by AS Exec at the end of last year. Barbara was invited to and attended the AS Executive committee meeting to address the FPPC request to create a subcommittee to focus on the SPOT issues. After discussion between the AS Exec in terms of whether FPPC would create a subcommittee and Task Force, the AS Executive committee members decided on creation of a task force. AS Exec directed FPPC to write the charge for the task force (TF). TBD if the TF will report to FPPC or the Academic Senate (AS). FPPC will give the TF charge to the AS Exec, and then it will go to the entire AS. Chris Karadjov, Chair of the Commission on Athletics (COA) about our revisions on the FAR policy. The FAR revisions were never brought to the COA. There have been issues around the position. The position includes 6 units per semester and \$10,000/year, and there have been multiple applicants in the past. The current policy allows for a person to do more than one set of terms in the position. The FPPC proposal addresses the issues that have come up. The COA Chair was supportive of the FPPC proposed policy changes, and said that there was no reason to bring them to COA before going ahead with our changes and submission to AS. Barbara also met with the Chair of the University Awards Committee, Laura Gonzalez. Barbara checked on the Awards Committee questions. The committee members want to make sure that colleges explain why they selected their nominee (transparency). Next, Barbara mentioned that Patricia Perez sent what she had written for the Faculty Equity Advocates on January 6th. We will look at those changes today.

Senate Report (Erly): Two discussions. 1. Not much from president and CFA. No new news. 2. new business brought up in AS about the FPPC volunteers need. 3. Senate approved new degree title for Child and Family Studies and I/ST first reading. 4. Policy discussions: policy on culminating activity for MA degree. Close to approval. 5. Discussion on emeritus policy.

OLD BUSINESS:

- 1. Review FAR Policy, discuss requested changes, and any changes FPPC votes to put forward.**

The term of office of the faculty representative shall be four years. After evaluation of the incumbent faculty representative, the Committee on Athletics may nominate this representative to the Academic Senate normally for no more than one additional term. Normally a FAR shall serve no more than two (2) consecutive terms.

Received a First and Second. Passed unanimously.

We added:

EVALUATION

A FAR shall be evaluated by the President or designee at the end of the third year of each term they serve.

Moved and seconded. Passed unanimously.

Under SELECTION OF FACULTY ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVE (FAR) Section C:
Nominate a minimum of two faculty members to be considered by the Academic Senate. ~~[, except when the incumbent is being re-nominated]~~ The Academic Senate shall vote to recommend one or more of these nominees to the President of the University. The part in the brackets has been in policy. Discussion is about removing this so that there are always two recommendations.

Moved and seconded. Passed unanimously.

OVERLAPPING TERM. Recommended change of a new faculty representative shall be appointed by the end of the spring semester of the penultimate term of the outgoing FAR.

Discussion: the reason for the change to “penultimate” rather than “third year” was because there was discussion of extending the term. As the FPPC did not change the term, the change in language is not needed. The change was withdrawn and the original language of “third year” remains.

The policy, as amended, will be sent to the AS.

2. Review policy AS 21-05, the University Awards Committee (UAC) policy, and the UAC requested policy changes as follows:

ISSUES/RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE •

- Not all colleges provided a rationale for their recommendations. Rationale is helpful to the University Awards Committee and helps determine whether the colleges followed DEI criteria and other best practices.

4.3. Discussion of whether the committee needs to provide a “rationale” for who they chose or the “criteria.” The second question is about the comparison to others.

“shall identify the nominee and shall provide a brief justification for how the nominee was selected and shall provide a brief rationale for how the chosen nominee was selected over other nominees.”

Richard. Just concern with language smoothing: “shall identify the nominee, provide a brief justification for how the nominee was selected, and provide a brief rationale for how the chosen nominee was selected over other nominees.”

Erly. Two sentences. “shall identify how the nominee was selected. Provide a brief rationale for how the chosen nominee was selected over other nominees, if applicable.”

Leslie: Explanation. “shall identify how the nominee was selected. Provide a brief explanation for how the chosen nominee was selected over other nominees, if applicable.”

Barbara: Bringing together the key words with language smoothing. “shall identify the nominee, provide a brief rationale for how the nominee was selected, and provide a brief rationale for how the chosen nominee was selected over other nominees.” Richard: “if applicable” no longer needed. With this transparency mechanism, a committee can give the rationale that there was only one nominee. Agreed.

Committee concurrence on the language above. Moved to use this in every place this phrase is used in the document. Seconded. Unanimous.

The policy, as amended, will be sent to AS.

3. Charge for the EVALUATION TASK FORCE

Discussion about the use of the word “Evaluation”. SPOT does not. Patricia pointed out the CBA (15.15) uses “Evaluation” but “also known as “student opinion” and “student perceptions.” Consensus around “Student Perceptions.” Erly: As we currently use “SPOT” then maybe just use “SPOT Task Force” (STF). Patricia appreciates this as it avoids confusion with ETF (Evaluation of Tenured Faculty). Consensus that this is a good direction, but the AS will weigh in.

Discussion of charge:

Barbara: I have written a draft of the charge which I circulated with the invitation to this meeting.

1. The exploration of the best practices across the CSU of instruments of student perception of teaching effectiveness. Richard: remove “CSU” to leave open to

learning from higher education. Barbara agrees. Changed to: "The exploration of the best practices across the CSU in higher education of instruments of student perception of teaching effectiveness." Erly: Assessment rather than Exploration? Barbara changed to: "The assessment of the best practices across the CSU in higher education of instruments of student perception of teaching effectiveness."

2. "The engagement of the university community in the design and/or selection of a new evaluation instrument regarding the student perception of teaching effectiveness."
3. "The proposal of a student perception of teaching effectiveness instrument."

Discussion of Charge. AVP Faculty Affairs (Patricia Perez), AVP for ATS (Shariq Ahmed, two faculty members from CLA, one from each of the other colleges, 1 lecturer (FT), 1 lecturer (PT), 1 undergraduate student, 1 grad student, 1 FPPC member, 1 CFA member, 1 AS liaison.

Patricia: Librarians? Barbara: Librarians don't use SPOT. We can add them to be inclusive if that is the will of this group.

Anna: Why additional representation for CLA when there are particular supervisory needs that differ for CED and CHHS? Richard: Really two questions: one is about faculty representation. That is much larger than this question as all the senate gives a distribution of 2 from CLA and 1 from every other college because it has so many more faculty members to represent. If that is changing or needs to be readdressed that is an AS question not an FPPC question. The second question is about whether we have the skillset on the task force to deal with supervisory needs. We may consider a specific position for someone with that skillset, rather than representation if that is a concern.

Term: Members serve one year but may serve additional terms.

Steering Committee: AVP FA, AVP ATS, Elected Officers of the TF.

Meeting Schedule: Second and Fourth Fridays 12:00-2:30 via Zoom

FPPC agrees this is a successful "First Reading."

4. Review the Faculty Hiring policy with a DEIA lens, look at new FEA sections, then at completed sections for section-by-section vote.

In Fall discussion through 1.22. Discussion about the Role of the FEAs (1.22). The AS Exec sent an email with our charge. We should only work on the hiring policy for TT faculty not lecturers, coaches, etc. Next thing we can take up is a hiring policy for lecturers (separately).

Lily: Why? We only have 25 hiring lines in 2025-26 and we will have more for lecturers. What is the rationale for dividing? Barbara: no rationale given. But, we can do them concurrently. We were finding that it wasn't working well in one policy. It is our decision, though, and we could make one document. Please look at it and see whether you think leaving lecturers in this document works. In a few places, it seems that we need different language for lecturer inclusion. It might make more sense to make a separate policy for lecturer hiring. Please take a look and see what you think.

Returning to 1.22. Added 1.22 on FEAs.

Added: "FEAs work collaboratively with Faculty Affairs, College Deans, Department Chairs, and Department Search Committees in infusing best equitable practices in recruiting and retaining junior faculty with the expressed purpose of...a-d (institutionalized systems of oppression)"

Question about why e.f.g. referring to RTP are in a hiring document. Erly: should delete. Anna, Barbara, and Richard agree.

Leslie: We tend to conflate policy and procedure. We should leave out procedure as much as we possibly can.

Richard: Recommend to keep the bold part as quoted above but all of the "with expressed purpose..." forward gets deleted because it may change over time. We don't want to change the policy with evolving role of FEAs. Anna: Concur but keep the basic tasks of the FEAs.

This is a first read. Barbara instructs everyone to read before the next meeting.

Leslie: Should we think about DEIA language. Perhaps we want to say some things in a different way.

Lily: We shouldn't obey in advance. We should keep the language as it is now.

Barbara: For now, we will leave things as they are. Hope to get this done this (academic) year. We should look between now and the next meeting at whether Lecturers should be a separate policy. Erly: Track changes? Barbara: That's an idea.

5. Review Patent policy for possible changes, and section-by-section acceptance.

Written by ORED using the 2016 IP. They separated Patents from Copyright to allow us to more easily comply with Patents. FPPC worked on this last year as Patents. It

is close to finished. Barbara: Instructs everyone to read closely for 3/21 meeting in order to have a first meeting and second reading/vote 4/18.

Richard: We may be able to waive first reading of Patent on 3/21 in order to save time for the more challenging Copyright policy.