

FPPC Minutes
Meeting #4
October 20, 2023

PRESENT: Panadda (Nim) Marayong, Richard Marcus, John (Rick) Reese, Leslie Andersen, Barbara Le Master, Erlyana Erlyana, Lily House Peters (CFA), Tianjao Qiu, Monica Lounsberry, Hossein Jula.

1. Approval of Minutes-October 6. Approved.

2. Announcements

- Not ready to contact IR yet for survey.

3. SPOT update and plan

- Last meeting we discussed the need to “get it right.” In article we reviewed they took at 3 year process. Leslie discussed this as a roadmap. AS Exec : We need to fix the leak and then look longterm.
- Lecturer evaluations are the leaky faucet. Can we come up with a new set of questions as a temporary measure.
- Discussion:
 - It is a lot of work. We do need to fix the issue at least temporary.
 - Concern that we can’t fix it in such a limited fashion. A temporary fix will just change the problem not resolve anything. At the same time, it will significantly delay when we can bring something back to Senate.
 - Support for above concern: If we aren’t fixing it, then what are we doing? Ignoring the reason for the leaking in the first place won’t fix it no matter what we do.
 - Support for concern: Our fix could make it worse. It is a sensitive issue.
 - Confusion or concern with our charge. Also concerned about fixing to leak in a different way. What are the issues with the current SPOT form and process and think about what we can propose to fix it. That would be a great outcome. Loving what consulting with our faculty means.
 - Goal for this year: groundwork and roadmap. Not rush into new set of questions when we don’t even know whether they will work. Potentially more issues.
 - The point about Lecturer evaluation is very important but more comprehensive than just SPOT. We are relying too heavily on SPOT for lecturer evaluation. We need more guidance on how we evaluate as well as how we provide professional development for lecturers. That is a separate policy piece we should consider.
 - Concern from Exec we need to do SOMETHING this year.
 - We could just look at the limitations of our charge and consider only questions.
 - Is ANY entity able to evaluate only for lecturers? Lecturers and TT are in the same Unit so it needs to be uniform.
 - Even if a 911 problem, the wrong solution can make it work.
 - How are we interpreting our charge? If it really is so narrow as to

only consider selection of questions then what committee or council is responsible for the bigger question of how we approach SPOT? It seems like it is a limitation in how the charge was written, not envisioning how we might rethink the SPOT process, rather than an intended limitation of the charge. If that is incorrect, then we need a conversation with that other council or committee on rethinking SPOT.

- The list of questions do not consider the effectiveness and value of the faculty member teaching our student.
- It is easy to get myopic. Student evaluations should not be designed as a comparative metric across faculty (in the theory literature). What it is supposed to be for is a measurement of a faculty member's effectiveness as a trajectory. It has become the execution date for lecturers.
- We do need to keep our focus on student evaluation of teaching.
- We are still planning a set of questions. We are in touch with those who wrote the article we are drawing on. But, pragmatically: What if we were to say for this temporary measure and to satisfy this paragraph on selecting question: The ACE questions are no longer being used and instead are using this. Temporarily we want to do a likert scale with these six questions. (ACE Questions <https://ace.uiowa.edu/ace-questions>)
- Can we add FTEs to use objective measures of workload as well as student evaluations?
- We have kind of done the first part of our charge. It is the second part. IR to help with survey/questionnaire. We can report ACE questions have changed. ("FPPC should review the instrument and the item pool every five years and report review outcomes to the Academic Senate.")
- Use of data? Reliability measures? Information on bias? Many faculty report that students how to complete the instrument (reversing). There is a lot of error as well. We also need IR or whomever is doing analysis to give us data to help us report on. What are the challenges we can report on? Then we can look at the new question approaches of ACE and others.
- Need to know more about the type of biases. Need to reach out to the campus community. For us to do our job to review the instrument that review requires information.
- We may want to advocate for change in charge from SPOT policy.
- I love the idea of doing both directed analytics and consultation with faculty. The comments made me think that maybe we could do some focus group meetings with faculty at different ranks including our lecturers.
- 1. We are a data-driven campus. So, support. 2. Policy questions: six students, response rate, error rate, impact of Mode of Instruction...and a statistician would say that we would be corrective for biases...which can be tricky as we may find identity based biases, rank or position bias, etc. If we find from

data that there are biases, as we assume, then presenting questions without policy change to address it then it will not be well received.

- Are the biases exacerbated by moving to an online instrument? We need to have the research from that. But, the literature says completion rates are 20% less.
- The studies recommend that faculty give time in class for students to complete their SPOTS (even if they are online) to get higher participation rates. Like we used to do with paper but let them log in and complete it.
- Data needed is more than just response rate. Can ATS provide? Can IR access? Lower level data - compare between groups, questions.
- From the perspective of a chair: a lecturer teaches a 40 person 100 level class asynch and has 6 students respond. A tenured faculty member teaches another section of that 100 level class in person, gives time for responses in class, and has 35 responses. There is a full point difference between the evaluations. How do I know what the data is telling me?
- **Action Item. For IR: Is the data available to look at: total students enrolled, response rate, error rate, Mode of Instruction, faculty rank (or at least TT/Lecturer), gender (or other identity), etc? Only if we know what the bias is can we try to correct for it either in questions we create or in policy change.**
- Do we want more open questions or closed questions for survey? Depends on the target of the survey.
- We have to move away from this as an evaluation tool and move towards a teaching effectiveness tool.
- For questionnaire: open question analysis is time consuming. Better to use closed questions? But, another argues, they are a pain in the but but the open questions are useful.

SPOT Survey Questions for Faculty Councils

1. Did the instructor create a welcoming environment for diverse learners?
2. When you think about today's SPOT forms, what questions/topics do you think are missing from the current form?
3. What would be useful to you in terms of support for boosting response rates?
4. How useful do you feel it would be to have the department or college have its own specific set of questions on the SPOTS?
5. Which SPOT form items are most useful to faculty in helping them to improve their instruction?
6. Are there SPOT form items that you feel are redundant?
7. Are there SPOT form items that you feel have little value?
8. Are there SPOT form items that you feel would be valuable to include in a revised SPOT form?

- Consensus: at this point the questions on SPOT are premature. We need data for that. We can focus initially on each question with a couple of themes.
- **Next step. Begin to get some preliminary data from the faculty based on the basic questions by theme. Written out for Council to look at will help think through them. Leslie to put in Qualtrics.**
- There are items on SPOT we don't use and thus should remove. Redundant. We can learn from the faculty what these are.

How does each of the current SPOT questions inform and/or improve your teaching? DRAFT

Review SPOT question #1: How useful is this item in improving your teaching?

Would this item be more useful if worded differently?

Is it redundant to another question?

Is this question needed?

- Action item: Leslie to speak with ATS about data available.
- Action item: Council will work on getting this survey ready to go.
- We are looking to by the end of the year having the data we need and reporting out the changes we will make next year. We can hope to put forward a change to the policy to Senate to pave the way for the changes we need to make to the structure of questions as well as questions themselves.

4. Faculty Hiring “Policy”

- <https://policy.csuci.edu/sp/20/sp20-08-policy-on-recruitment-and-appointment-of-t-tt-faculty.htm>
- https://www.fullerton.edu/senate/publications_policies_resolutions/ups/UPS%20200/UPS%20210.001.pdf
- <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/fa004212sen.pdf>
- https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/2023-06/faculty_recruitment_manual_2022.pdf

5. Department Chairs policy

6. Suggestions for other items to work on

Future Meetings This Semester

November 3

November 17

December 1

FPPC’s charge is online at <https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/faculty-personnel-policies-council-fppc>