

FPPC DRAFT MINUTES
FRIDAY, Mar 20th, 2026
<https://csulb.zoom.us/j/81418150652>

Present : Barbara LeMaster, Erlyana Erlyana, Patricia Pérez, Nim Marayong, Kumars ZandParsa, Anna Ortiz, Leslie Andersen, Estella Chizhik

Not Present: Chris Duerringer, Lily House-Peters, Rick Reese

Agenda Approval: approved - unanimous

Minute approval from 3/6/26: approved - unanimous

Senate Representative Report (Erlyana Erlyana): N/A

Chair report (Barbara LeMaster): Barbara reported on her presentation to the Academic Senate regarding the faculty athletic representative policy:

- Explaining the decision to include "normally" in term limits to allow for exceptions while still providing service opportunities
- The Academic Senate raised questions about presidential evaluation of FARs, which Barbara confirmed would allow for potential position changes.
- Barbara also mentioned that the Committee on Athletics has requested her presence at their March 25th meeting to discuss the policy further.
- The Committee on Athletics' interest in implementing term limits, which Barbara explained was driven by committee members wanting the opportunity to hold the position themselves. The Academic Senate will review this matter, with a representative from the Committee on Athletics planning to attend the discussion.

Faculty Center Advisory (Nim Marayong): Report from FC Advisory board meeting on 4/8:

- The Lecturer evaluation policy task force is still working on the policy. The draft will likely be forwarded to FPPC in the Fall or later after a review by AS Exec and Faculty Affairs.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **T/TT Hiring Policy:** The meeting focused on reviewing and refining faculty equity advocate (FEA) roles and responsibilities within the academic hiring process.
 - a. **FEA (Faculty Equity Advocates) Role Discussion:** The group discussed the role and responsibilities of Faculty Equity Advocates (FEAs), particularly focusing on language refinement and best practices for equity and inclusivity in search processes:

- i. Leslie suggested adding a reference to FEA training to ensure consistency, which Barbara agreed would be implemented through academic affairs.
 - ii. Panadda raised questions about the specific involvement of FEAs in different stages of the process and whether they need to approve or check certain steps before progression to the next stage, but these questions were left for further discussion after reviewing the existing language in sections 2.34 to 2.39.
 - iii. The group discussed language regarding FEA's role in working with department tenure-track search committees. They debated whether to explicitly mention combating unintentional bias in the first sentence or incorporate it elsewhere in the text. After discussion, they agreed to add "combating unintentional bias" at the end of the sentence about consulting with academic affairs, while removing a redundant second sentence. Patricia suggested this approach would better reflect the broader role of FEA beyond just bias prevention.
 - iv. The group discussed the role of FEAs in tenure track recruitment processes. They clarified that FEAs should provide input on position description templates and department-generated position descriptions, though the specific documents needed clarification. The team agreed that FEAs should review all position descriptions, with the flexibility to be involved in either developing or reviewing these documents. They also discussed the recruitment and advertising plan, determining that FEAs should provide input to search committees on these plans and processes.
- b. The group discussed streamlining language around FEA (Faculty Equity Advisor) responsibilities in hiring processes. They agreed to combine repetitive bullet points about document input into a single comprehensive statement covering position descriptions, recruitment plans, and screening checklists. The team debated the appropriate level of FEA involvement in the search process, ultimately deciding that FEAs should provide feedback on diversity in the initial stages but should not have authority over final appointment decisions or serve as additional search committee members. They also discussed the need for clear processes around how FEAs would raise concerns about equity issues during searches, with suggestions to report to deans and directors rather than directly to individual faculty members.
- c. The group discussed and refined language regarding the Faculty Equity and Affairs (FEA) role in tenure track faculty searches. They agreed to use "facilitate equity and inclusivity throughout all stages of the tenure track search process" as the main description of FEA's role, while clarifying that FEA would work with search committees in the initial stage and with various entities throughout the entire process. The team also streamlined redundant language around equity and inclusivity components and discussed how to

better organize the document's structure to clearly present FEA's framework and specific responsibilities.

- d. [Review and provide feedback on the revised FEA \(Faculty Equity Advocate\) language and related policy sections before the next meeting \(April 17th\).](#)
- e. **Letters of Recommendation** - previously tabled due to concerns about potential bias and whether they represent outdated practices. The group discussed the process for letters of recommendation and reference checks during the hiring process. They clarified that candidates could choose between letters of recommendation or verbal references, with the process occurring at the finalist stage before campus visits. The dean or designee conducts a reference check with the most recent employer of the final candidate, while the search committee chair handles letters of recommendation. The team also discussed the purpose of reference checks, which is to verify information provided by candidates and ensure they are not hiring unsuitable individuals.
- f. **Dual-Career hiring** - the team discussed terminology for accommodating partners and spouses in academic hiring, ultimately deciding to use "spouse/partner" without the "S" prefix to maintain consistency with other documents. They agreed this refers specifically to academic partners, not staff members, and determined it would be too complex to address multiple partners in the current scope

NEW BUSINESS: Barbara announced that the next working meeting will be held on April 17th, with a potential additional meeting on May 1st if needed, followed by an organizational meeting on May 15th.

SPRING 2026 MEETING DATES, 12:30-2:30 Fridays

~~February 6, 2026~~

~~February 20, 2026~~

~~March 6, 2026~~

~~March 20, 2026~~

April 17, 2026

May 1, 2026 (organizational meeting)

(May 15, 2026 if needed as our organizational meeting)