

FPPC Minutes

Meeting #3

October 6, 2023

PRESENT: Panadda (Nim) Marayong, Richard Marcus, John (Rick) Reese, Leslie Andersen, Barbara Le Master, Erlyana Erlyana, Lily House Peters (CFA), Patricia Pérez (FA), Tianjiao Qiu.

1. Approval of Minutes-March 17 and September 15

- March 17. FPPC determined there are not enough voting members carrying over from last year. Agreed to forward to Senate as “Unapproved” Minutes.
- September 15. Approved with a few minor edits.

2. Announcements

- Exec Senate not opposed to the Full Faculty Hiring Policy but were skeptical and want to know what other CSUs are doing.
- Exec Senate wants us to focus on the SPOT charge on charge.

3. Survey of other CSUs faculty hiring

- The original question is about introducing DEIA policy for hiring. FPPC is debating whether it can or should do a DEIA policy for hiring without a Faculty Hiring policy. If we aren't creating a Faculty Hiring policy then where would a DEIA policy for hiring go?
- Leslie reviewed other CSUs. Did not find a faculty hiring policy from any other Senate. We can do one if we want, but it would make us an outlier.
- Most mix policy and procedure.
- Debate over whether to take this on. The arguments “for” were that “appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion” is the first line of our charge. The last three went to recent work on RTP. This goes to “appointment.” Against: others CSUs don't have them. It is a mix of policy and procedure from Faculty Affairs. Senate Exec is skeptical (but not “no.”)
- Action Item: Leslie to start on a draft and collection of materials in a common folder. She will also pull policy elements to consider from other universities. Others can contribute to the common folder.

4. SPOT

- Review of statistics
 - Katy Dyer from Fresno is working on a SPOT report on how they are doing it.
 - Response rates:

Student Perceptions of Teaching		Overall SPOT response rate	
		Summer 2022 - Summer 2023	
		SPOT Questions - Overall Response Rates as of 8/15/23	
Overall Response Rates - SPOT Likert Questions - Terms: Summer 2022, Fall 2022, Spring 2023, & Summer 2023			
Total Number of Responses	Total Number of Enabled	Response Rate	
146,609	348,480	42.07%	
Q1.3 - Class time was used efficiently.			
Total Number of Responses	Total Number of Enabled	Response Rate	
142,072	348,480	40.77%	
Q1.3 - Concepts were presented in a manner that helped me learn.			
Total Number of Responses	Total Number of Enabled	Response Rate	
145,604	348,480	41.78%	
Q1.3 - Assignments contributed to my learning.			
Total Number of Responses	Total Number of Enabled	Response Rate	
144,456	348,480	41.45%	
Q1.4 - The instructor responded respectfully to student questions and viewpoints.			
Total Number of Responses	Total Number of Enabled	Response Rate	
144,244	348,480	41.39%	

- Possible to breakdown more by college, department, and mode of instruction?
- Online responses are overall about 20% lower in a Boysen
- One of the best practices is using a vetted instrument (which we don't; we work from a basket of questions)
- From Summary and Conclusion of Boysen 2016

A review of research on the administration, interpretation, and utilization of student evaluations of teaching illustrates some evidence-based rules for their use in pedagogical improvement. Effective use of student evaluations follows these evidence-based guidelines:

- Use standardized, multidimensional student evaluation surveys that have well-established reliability and validity.
- Ask for specific, rather than general, feedback in open-ended questions.
- Both online and face-to-face evaluations can be valid, but administer face-to-face evaluations when a high response rate is the priority and online evaluations when extensive qualitative feedback is the priority.
- Offer explanations, demonstrations, reminders, and inducements to increase response rates to online evaluations.
- Use established methods of qualitative and quantitative analysis when interpreting the results of student evaluations.
- In consultation with a peer or teaching expert, use the results of student evaluations as a basis for self-evaluation and goal setting.
- Council survey and preliminary discussion of how to proceed

- ACE no longer supports a question bank. Instead, they focus on learning focus and formative assessment.
<https://ace.uiowa.edu/formative-assessment-strategies>
- What is the better focus on equity?
- There is a whole literature on the bias. How do we de-emphasize the role of SPOT. This is not the only indicator.
- We tabled at an earlier meeting that the CFA has been interested in how we evaluate evaluators of RTP.
- Additional cite for questions: <https://www.ideaedu.org/>

 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?

-
- Do we want to ask FC to consider not just how we improve what we do but alternative approaches altogether?
- What do we want from FCs? FC execs fill it out, representatives fill it out, reps to go to their departments to seek input and have FC collate? If not the latter, it won't be as representative.
- Asking everyone, we learned with RTP, is overwhelming. That took 2 years. Asking FCs to collate responses from departments is an intermediate action between only executive responses and full outreach.
- If we are asking bigger questions like “summative” vs “formative” assessment, we need more robust questions. It is likely the writing would take to the next year. Consensus: taking the time to do it right.
- The framing of the questions is important. If it is Likert scale then it becomes more subjective, particularly if limited to a FC and not the full body.
- I don't think we can know “better” unless we know what the issues are, and what “better” would mean.
- The questions we have from ACE has been at the least superceded. The direction itself has been superceded - the number of questions (4 or 5) and the framing (formative, focused in learning not instructor summative assessment).
- Does CFA have information about what the issues have been with SPOT?
- Are we recommending to Senate Exec that we look broader? anticipating a CSU wide report, looking at a faculty survey. Or, are we just trying to follow reviewing questions and move on?
- We are headed towards the former. In order to address concerns about the bias of these instruments towards particular identity groups: women faculty, faculty of color, faculty with a first language other than English, etc.
- How can we try to replace questions if we don't know what has or hasn't been working? We are at a new juncture with changes

to assessment, new RTP, no one likes SPOT, we have challenges to how it is being used in some departments and colleges.

- Consensus: It is time we address this issue and get more useful information from SPOT even if it takes more time.
- Action item: Leslie: will contact IR to help us create a survey.
- Cite the CBA at the top of the survey to make clear that “none of the above” isn’t an option.
- Action Item: All: Take another look at questions. Consider questions from other perspectives (asking the “bigger” questions about how we approach SPOT). Make question recommendations and question grouping recommendations.

5. Department Chairs policy

- Tabled for next meeting

Future Meetings This Semester

October 20

November 3

November 17

December 1

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