

FPPC Minutes
Meeting #1, 4 September 2020

In attendance: Rebecca Sittler (COTA), Robin Richesson (will be Spring 21 COTA), Jalal Torabzadeh (COE), Don Haviland (CED), Dave Stewart (CFA rep), Al Colburn (CNSM), Richard Marcus (CLA), Kirsty Fleming (Fac Affairs), David Wallace (Dean's rep)

Absent: reps from COB, CLA, CHHS, Library

I. Elections:

Vice President election. Don Haviland elected uncontested.
Recording Secretary. Richard Marcus elected uncontested

II. Policies

Two policies to consider: RTP and Faculty Hiring.

RTP Policy:

- Discussion:
 - the Senate's Executive Committee, would like us to revise the University RTP policy:
 - [to account for cultural taxation of faculty of color by revising service definitions] to support faculty whose service includes supporting affinity groups on and off campus.
 - examine the roles of the Department Chair and Dean in ensuring a fair and unbiased review.
 - require implicit bias training for RTP committee members.
 - revise RSCA definitions to better capture and value the scholarship of Black academics and other faculty of color, including for example community-based research. Open forums from Senate may relate to RTP.
 - Dave: We may want to look at: how we are treating digital publications. FC debates. Department debates. Impact on department policies and college policies. Emphasis on research. It was clear we were trying to move towards more research. Existing policy lacks teeth concerning service. Our culture for institutional service is not strong.
 - Richard: Relationship between RSCA funding and RSCA expectations. Seismic impacts. Concern for faculty bandwidth for this.
 - Kirsty: for management. Echo concern about taking on something this big and this emotive "even though, I am 100% supportive of why Jessica wants this done." Energy going into RTP in the while, how are we going to handle people in the pipeline now who are not able to function as they normally would. The interim is a bigger thing to spend energy on.
 - Jalal: as chair of RTP subcommittee in the last round, this is a really big task. I agree with what was just mentioned and not the right time. I support the intention as well. Perhaps department and college level.

- Al: Writing or editing RTP – there is an inherent tension between the documents and the committees. People who have a lot of faith in the committees want a loose document. Those who do not want a more specific document.
- Kirsty: In consultation with director schedule meetings and maintain communication with I/ST External Advisory Board.
- Richard: Middle ground. A sunset (24 month) guidance for current RTP for those in the pipeline. FPPC use Spring to come up with prompts and structure to start implementing in Fall 2021 (2 year process).
- Dave: Likely to be 3 year process.
- David W: In consultation with director schedule meetings and maintain communication with I/ST External Advisory Board. (Don H concurs)
- Dave: Encourage university committees to meet less often so we can adapt teaching. Collecting information and ideas may be partially possible.
- Jalal: If Senate want something from us. Maybe we can recommend that the Senate seeks input from various entities.
- Dave: We haven't heard too much from our new members of the council.
- Rebecca: A lot of these issues about RTP are long overdue. But, I know in COTA we have had retention issues. A lot of these particularities could have a large impact on retention. Our college and department policies are more demanding.
- Richard: attempt to divide what information gathering means: short term needs via open forums for immediate needs, but not working to change RTP – not charging FCs, departments, and Senate committees.
- Al: how do we reconcile short and long term?
- Kirsty: Faculty equity advocates. Every college has one or two. Recruitment and retention. Particular focus on underrepresented faculty. Eg Ana Ortiz in College of Ed.
- David W. This is important discussion to sort out. Opening RTP needs to be careful, deliberative process. I am also thinking if I am an assistant professor of color say it is too hard that is the wrong message. Also taking Don's point about trying to not take on too much.
- Dave: There is a mechanism we can try to make use of. If there is a section of the current RTP that can be benefitted by formal interpretation then there is a process of interpreting the process. The chair of the AS then signs off. There are some problems with this process. Try to get questions for which we need an interpretation and draft an interpretation that the Senate Ex could sign and promulgate. This may be a workaround for opening the whole policy.
- Al: Would that require a fair amount of information gathering? Dave: It is almost too late for Fall 2020 season.
- Jalal: One major thing to consider: recruitment and retentions are interrelated. We are hiring from top 10 or 20 universities but when they face the realities of tools and resources, we lose them.
- Summary: FPPC believes there is a pressing need to make changes to the RTP policy. It is a vital task that requires an inclusive process, which will be

challenging in the remote environment of 2020-21. We recognize both short term issues needing attention (addressing faculty who will come eligible for RTP actions but whose work has been negatively impacted by the pandemic) and long term issues (equity-related issues, RSCA balance, changes to the nature of scholarly activity, etc.). FPPC believes it can address these short-term concerns in 2020-21, probably without amending the RTP policy. It also believes in 2020-21 it can begin formulating questions, gathering information, and creating a structure for opening the RTP policy for Council action in 2021 on the assumption this will be a multiyear process.

Faculty Hiring policy.

- Discussion
 - These are not legal concerns (Kirsty). It is currently done from our office.
 - Need to treat people consistently.
 - Pool approval and reporting. That is built into new software.
 - Kirsty: how much ownership does faculty want over this? AVP FA currently has complete ownership. A new AVP may change it. If the Senate wants ownership it needs to take it. San Bernardino has a Faculty Recruitment Policy. <https://www.csusb.edu/policies/recruitment-selection-and-appointment-staff>
 - Dave: If we do this let's not be Rube Goldberg. We need to be succinct. Let's look at other policies.
 - Kirsty: A lot of the documents and processes in FA could be used towards policy.
 - Jalal: We need at least some guidelines.
 - Kirsty: it all exists. The question is where the ownership should be and how much should change. It is currently nimble but not owned by faculty.
 - Rebecca. We have had good experience with FA handling these procedures. Unclear on need.
 - Robin: There are Search Policies, I have been on several searches. Where did those come from? We had many policies to follow. Perhaps they were from COTA or SOA? I felt like they were University wide.
 - Dave: Rebecca has brought up an important distinction between policy and procedure. Faculty can express what thinking they want in the process. Policy can then direct FA to create procedures including a manual.
 - Don. Agility is important. It has worked with FA. We don't want a Rube Goldberg product.
 - Al: One possibility is to get a presentation on the current process and give advice and consent without policy.
 - Al: There is support for developing this policy? Consensus: yes.
 - Kirsty: There haven't had many problems. When problems do occur they can be enormous. Eg if someone gets an offer but doesn't meet the qualifications (example a doctorate not a PhD).
- Summary: Overall, we feel the system works OK and do not feel an immediate or pressing need to create a new policy. However, we would like to consider

creating a policy for reasons of faculty ownership. We will examine documents at other institutions and then discuss what a CSULB policy would look like.