Faculty Personnel Policies Council Agenda

Meeting Minutes #4

November 3, 2017

In attendance: R. Marcus, L. Kermode, A. Colburn, J. Torabzadeh,. G. Reynolds, S. Pavri. J. Pattnaik P. Soni,D. Ottolia Absent U. Lassiter, Liesl Haas, M. Wile, H. Ramachandran

1. Approval of minutes from last meeting. Approved

2. Announcements

* Norbert update.

3. Discussion and Question Generation re: Policy on Avoidance of Conflict of Interest on Personnel Matters

* Policy in conflict with Handbook. In Exec the consensus was to come back to FPPC. Procedurally it is still in Senate. Our task will be to take a look at look at Chancellor’s Conflict of Interest Handbook and figure out how to alter the text. Al will ask CSULB Counsel to interpret. Our task is to come up with questions for him.
* The issues of concern: Lines 15-20 and 23-25. Policy says that as long as it is disclosed. Handbook can be interpreted as can’t vote. Questions for Counsel:
	+ Q1. What is the definition of material financial interest? Is it only salary or are non-remunerated benefits such as assigned time, committee assignments, and student advisors reassigned time a material financial interest?
	+ Q2. Does voting in a department constitute a material financial interest? (eg the additional chair salary benefits the spouse).
	+ Q3a: Does the language introduced in the policy – oversight by the dean, director or AVP – obviate the problem of direct benefit to a chair? Q3b. If the chair is interviewing and recommending hire (of a lecturer) but the lecturer or course assignment is contracted by supervisor does that move the locus of responsibility away from the chair?

4. Development of a policy to implement Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 20, Section 37 (<https://www.calfac.org/resource/collective-bargaining-agreement-contract-2014-2017#article-20)>

* Can policy’s reassigned time be for something “new”? Interpretation is that the intent is not remuneration for work completed for a previous academic year but also not meant to inspire new creative activities. It is meant to compensate for demonstrable current workload spikes.
* 2.2 – 2.3
	+ Praveen: $1.3m per year for each of two years. Applications should not be too burdensome. Faculty member needs to make the case and it is the job of the committee to look at the workload of the person and then decide if they deserve the assignment. According to AS Statewide 20.3.7 was meant for cultural taxation.
	+ Shireen: there are immeasurable impacts on time (students seeking additional mentoring, etc.). Members concurred that this is measureable through extraordinary service to students.
	+ After discussion committee decided to eliminate from policy and create a 2.2 referring to CBA.
* 3.0 Application Materials
	+ Committee debated application materials and agreed on the language that materials shall “minimally consist of” to ensure that the committee has the flexibility to additional materials at its discretion.
	+ Committee completed policy through end of 3.0
* For the next meeting the Council agreed that the issues to resolve are:
	+ Selection process – how much guidance to give committee
	+ Committee structure: College level? Relation to University level?
	+ Information provided to applicants (who will write to those who are rejected)