

FPPC Minutes
Meeting #2
September 15, 2023

PRESENT: Panadda (Nim) Marayong, Richard Marcus, John (Rick) Reese, Leslie Andersen, Barbara Le Master, Erlyana Erlyana, Lily House Peters (CFA), Patricia Pérez (FA), Hossein Jula, Tianjao Qiu, Don Haviland, Josh Chesler, Monica Lounsbery (Deans Rep).

1. Approval of Minutes-September 1

- Edits: #3 Patricia - there are two types of full time lecturers in CBA (15 units). Since the implementation of Qualitrics to Administer SPOT (not that SPOT is new).
- Lily: Request to use “Lecturer Faculty” as opposed to “Lecturer” for minutes going forward.
- Be careful about naming.

2. Announcements

- Additional policy areas for this year: Policy 11-06, Department Chairs (Don) - clarify voting rights; RTP - evaluator guidelines (Lily).

3. Representative to the Faculty Center Advisory Board

- Don Haviland elected by acclamation.

4. Faculty Hiring Policy (do we want to recommend one?)

- Leslie: Senate Exec does not support developing a faculty hiring policy. The FPPC discussed last time that it would be difficult to handle equity-minded guidelines without having any standing faculty hiring policy or guidelines. We don't have anything into which to incorporate or to expand. Should we communicate that concern back to Executive Committee?
- Josh: The recommended best practices for equity hiring change frequently. Could we write a policy that delegates that power to Faculty Affairs and place requirements (rather than providing guidelines).
- Patricia: Surprised there is no change in protocol since 2018. It is being updated now and will be circulated. That is just a protocol. We are in many ways dictating because there is no policy. I would rather see one shaped through shared governance.
- Tian: We have some discussion last department meeting about current hiring. Dean and provost added additional semi-finalists that the committee did not include. We can specify the role of the committee, dean, provost. Also, equity issues commonly come from the committee (voting faculty). The committee felt it cannot provide broad representation itself. How can we make it more inclusive so that lecturers can have a word? This can help address DEI issues.
- Leslie: Is it possible to work on this independent of a faculty hiring policy?
- Richard: Can we propose to Executive Committee that we will cautiously work on a Faculty Hiring Policy separating from guidelines. It is not clear to Richard whether equity minded hiring guidelines are in our charge (as opposed to policy that is equity-minded shaping an equity minded hiring guideline from FA). Once that policy is completed we can then

discuss whether the more specific guidelines are in our charge.

- Leslie: Shares Richard's concern about policy vs procedure in our charge.
- Barbara: Also concerned with our charge and that we need to focus more on policy rather than procedure.
- Erly: Supports working on policy first.
- Leslie: Patricia's point is well-taken the FA is running the hiring of faculty.
- Richard: processes for hiring TT and Lecturers is very different and even between types of Lecturers is different. A policy gives us an opportunity to help ensure equity-mindedness across hiring processes and types, ensuring even application of it.
- **Leslie: Will respond to executive expressing a desire to cautiously move forward with a policy and clarify their concerns.**

5. SPOT (does the POLICY need revising or just the instrument?)

- The question bank from ACE is no longer there.
- Instead, ACE is recommending: Instructor (Organization, Clarity, Learning Focused), Course (Learning materials, assessment, support), College Optional, Open Ended
- Don: All classes with a C classification and six or more students shall be evaluated
- Erly: Any data we can look at? We have to be careful how we ask. I would like guidance.
- Leslie: What I am bringing up is that ACE doesn't recommend the question bank approach at all. If we are going to follow their lead then we would change our approach.
- Nim: Similar conclusion. We first want to find out clarification from Senate about charge. Just instrument or policy itself?
- Barbara: Clarification of charge. Just modify the instrument? If so, what is going wrong? Student response (outside of what we can do?).
- Leslie: Executive is saying not to review the policy at this time. The instrument is in our charge.
- Lily: we are out of concern with 4.0 Access with move on line.
<https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/policy-statement-17-05-student-evaluation-of-teaching>. Can we provide recommendations to ATS as part of our charge on how to carry out?
- Leslie: College specific questions are currently included but not executed. Discussion with ATS needed about Access for that.
- Richard: Agree about the question of instrument. Much more formative for faculty member; less summative. Challenging to use these new question types to evaluate faculty other than are they Maybe we can do some homework on trends ourselves (Don can help?). NB: In 2017 we decided to limit scope of the policy review to factors tied to going online. The implication is that we will go more than a decade without considering the broader question of approach and policy on how we consider evaluative instruments of faculty.
- Hossein: Invite someone (faculty experts) to FPPC to help point out challenges.
- Don: On Formative assessment. We did lose the global question like #5 "overall instructor effectiveness" moving away from summative. But, overall as we as faculty on RTP to draw conclusions. More concrete

operationalization from committees. Could be used in summative ways, but in RTP policy we are pushing more towards the formative nature. As Richard has said, we haven't addressed these issues in many year, perhaps it is time for some housekeeping.

- Josh: What is available technologically? If the question bank then is it easy or hard to add questions. Can individual instructors add? It would be useful to bring someone who understands technology to address some of these questions.
- **Leslie: Will ask ATS to address FPPC.**
- Lily: We have some programs that cross over colleges (eg ES&P). Unclear what types of things fall to the faculty member. Example: What does "help" mean? What if in a science or math class there is not appropriate tutoring center "help" (and this is reflected erroneously against the faculty member).
- Monica: Developing a survey to college FCs. Like Don, maybe the dusting off is a good place to start.
- Leslie: The response rate for SPOT has plummeted.
- Lily: The students have no motivation or incentive to complete these
- Tian: Concern for the validity. We are pursuing this again and again but can't address it.
- Leslie: We cannot change requirements to complete SPOT (eg we can't withhold grades)
- Hossein: It is not just the number of responses, it is also biased. Those who do respond online are those who are angry about something. How far are we from the objectives of SPOT? Changing the questions may not answer that.
- Leslie: Are there other, newer question pools?
- Leslie: Student Perceptions of Teaching to satisfy CBA. CBA is a big, larger discussion. We have to have something. What we have been doing satisfies CBA. Would we be opening a can of worms to do something else?
- Tian: Question pool. What is the starting point? Is there a concern with the existing pool. Why are we focusing on the question pool? How do we evaluate that?
- Richard: I am unsure, but perhaps there aren't because that is no longer considered a best practice?
- Monica: the paragraph that we are looking at have already been done - charge to review the instrument every 5 years. I didn't think we would be looking at the common items in the first sentence. This conversation is about the full scope of the paragraph ("*The Faculty Personnel Policy Council (FPPC) shall select the common items from nationally recognized, valid, and reliable item pools. The FPPC is responsible for creating instructions for using the instrument, items, and/or item banks. FPPC Should review the instrument and the item pool every five years and report review outcomes to the Academic Senate.*")
- Monica: Some of the points today are very valid. Reduce bias. Low response rates. Reiterate form and functionality of what these evaluations are for. We should be focusing on the spirit of the feedback to the faculty member.
- Josh: if our questions were nationally recognized and reliable from ACE and no longer used by ACE then maybe they are no longer recognized and

reliable.

- Leslie: This is where ACE has gone with their thinking:

Revise end-of-course student ratings	Encourage ongoing student feedback	Promote systematic peer and expert observation	Offer comprehensive educational resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduce new core questions with fewer items, using simple items with low bias• Likert questions: 3 instructor-focused, three course-focused• Add structured, open-ended questions• Limit centralized support for department/program specific items, discourage lengthy end-of-course surveys• Standardized tool for collection of data	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Encourage use of formative feedback to instructors• Develop pool of formative assessment tools and share campus wide as ICON modules• Create easy-to-follow instructions to help interpret, and report out assessment results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop instruction sheet for pre-observation meeting, observation, and post-meeting• Develop structured form for reporting peer observations• Create a platform for instructor-owned peer feedback of teaching• Encourage use of expert resources on campus including but not limited to the Center for Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conduct training programs for DED and AD-Faculty on multifaceted nature of teaching effectiveness and biases in measures• Create videos for students (to show in class), instructors (to show good practice), and DCG/CCG/Dean (to explain biases)
Build Supportive Culture & Infrastructure			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Select rating software that support API, allows customization to drop redundancy and add college optional items• Partnership with Provost Office (policy and ongoing oversight) and ITS (infrastructure and software implementation), creation of standing steering committee• Conduct extensive marketing efforts to build awareness and support for the new programs across all colleges.			

- Erly: Support Monica's idea of a FC survey.
- Leslie: I can make up a Qualtrics if FPPC members will give questions.
- Nim: Before faculty survey want to hear from ATS. Without hearing more about technical issues, it is difficult to formulate questions.
- Barbara: If we send to FC the job of each representative is to take this back to their department and their program.
- Monica: I do not know what value the individual questions have for our faculty to improve their practice. It might be good to learn just that from faculty councils.
- Leslie: Will create an open one drive in our folder for questions to avoid multiple emails.

6. Policy 11-06, Department Chairs (proposed by Don)

- Don: Who can vote? Who can serve on nominating committee? Role of lecturer faculty? Voting process (post pandemic). It requires a written ballot as of now.
- Monica: Evaluation of chairs missing in the policy
- Richard: If taking this on would expand the question of who can vote to consider relationships and power relationships in the department further.
- Tian: We have current issues. Who can vote - intentionally removing faculty to change their role and access. Who can monitor electronic ballot is an issue. Department chair can form an interest group. Who oversees or monitors complaints?
- Leslie: Will take this to Exec to say we would like to address/update this policy.
- Leslie: Is the language in 2.0 in the CBA? Don to investigate. Patricia: Quick scan of the CBA does not capture "vote"
- Josh: If opening consider the option of "co-chairs."
- Monica: We need someone to sign and be contact. So, if co-chairs needs a designee.
- Barbara: in CLA. We have had co-Chairs. They designate each of their responsibilities.
- Monica: From a dean's perspective I love the idea of additional people involved. As long as the duties between co-chairs is delineated.
- Leslie: Associate Chair is already in policy.
- Lily: Clarifying Associate Chair vs Associate Professor as Chair.