

FPPC Minutes  
Meeting #8  
February 2, 2024

Present: Leslie Andersen, Don Haviland, Panadda Marayong, Josh Chesler, Hossein Jula, Barbara LeMaster, Tianjiao Qui, Earlyana Earlyana, Lily House Peters, Monica Lounsbury

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes-December 1, 2023
3. Announcements
4. SPOT

- Leslie spoke with Faculty Formative Feedback project. It is a volunteer only project. Discussed the “fix the leaky faucet” idea and recommendations for new questions. They thought that was a very bad idea. They thought to alter the SPOT questions now with the intention of a temporary or initial change on the way to a bigger change would confuse the faculty, make them unnecessarily have to adapt to new questions, etc. They are in it and measuring it.
- Leslie: ATS data on breakdown received. Modality. By college. Back to 2017 not just 2023. Not by question, but that could be pulled out. But, all we are getting is response rate information. Response rates on paper higher than online.
- Leslie: What is a survey, if we go that way, going to tell us. What will we ask?
- Leslie: We have Katie’s report of the whole CSU.
- Leslie: This issue is bigger than this Council. Unclear we can solve anything. We can say the questions as they are are ineffective, but we can’t just pick and choose a couple other questions even from the old database and hope the result will be better.
- Leslie: Recommend a campuswide committee be set up to study this as has been done at other CSUs.
- Richard: Supporting Leslie that this is large scale and interim measures don’t help. Leaving it to Exec Committee as to whether an AS Task Force, joint committee, or widening the interpretation of the FPPC charge is the best approach, but it is beyond our current scope.
- Don: Supports Leslie’s point as well.
- Tian: We use SPOT in many ways including impacts on promotion and economic impacts. It is a very problematic rating, especially used in arbitrary ways.
- Monica: Leslie spoke with Faculty Formative Feedback project. It is volunteer only project. Discussed the “fix the leaky faucet” idea and recommendations for new questions. They thought that was a very bad idea. They thought to alter the SPOT questions now with the intention of a temporary or initial change on the way to a bigger change would confuse the faculty, make them unnecessarily have to adapt to new questions, etc. They are in it and measuring it.
- Leslie: They forgot to work on Lecturer Evaluations.
- Leslie has made one document (copy paste) from every RTP policy to see

how SPOT is used. Summary pending but they are different. It is also different how it is used for Lecturers vs TT.

- Leslie: Kathleen Dyer report also argues that the quality of instrument (formative) is what matters, not the single question choices from a databank. Only one campus (Fresno) uses a test for reliability and validity.
- Don: In lieu of our writing a white paper we could write a memo and refer to the Dyer report.
- Leslie: The instrument needs to be sound for committees but also for instructors to find it useful. It needs to be meaningful to everyone involved not just an exercise.
- Erylana: Totally agree.
- Josh: Support Don's memo idea.
- Barbara: Support Don's memo idea.
- Richard: If moving towards Don's idea, I would not support a survey. That would become the task of whomever is charged with this larger process.
- Josh: Agreed. Maybe a survey could just be suggested as a possible way get information about... whatever is needed.
- Barbara: Agrees with Richard.
- Nim: I agree. A memo with a list of recommendations. The survey is premature.
- Erly: Agreed with the memo & include survey as recommendation.
- Erly: Concern about CFA.
- Lily: Long term that is a good idea. If we need something this semester, I wouldn't right now in CFA, given the problems, give tasks. Opening that up in bargaining is a longer road.
- Leslie: What I am most concerned about in SPOTS is absence of Lecturer Evaluation Guidelines. That is procedural, not in our purview. It is the most leaky faucet.
- Leslie: Conclusion. Move forward with a detailed memo based on our research of this issue. Recommendation: A campus wide task force be appointed to study this issue and come up with an alternative instrument (deliverable). We will consider that to be our way of satisfying that paragraph in the SPOT policy.
- The above language was voted on. Unanimous support.

#### 5. Faculty Hiring "Policy"

- Leslie: "Policy" in quotes because it is a slow walk through principles to a policy as Richard discussed in the fall.
- Leslie: My favorite is the one at CSUCI.
  - As of now it is the dean. The CSUCI basic language is that the administration should take the advice of the faculty committee.
  - Create a diverse and inclusive faculty
  - Faculty hiring shall be part of university/college/department long term planning
  - Recruit and hire the best faculty for university programs
  - College/department plans for the support and retention of new faculty
  - Recognition that faculty have the expertise to assess, evaluate and select new hires without excessive administrative interference
  - Recruitment of qualified lecturer faculty for permanent positions

- Richard: concerned with different processes between lecturers and TT
- Erly: only consider TT in this?
- Nim: Lecture hiring can be very different. But, there should be guidelines for lecturers.
- Richard: Concern that the principles and the hiring process are iterative because we cannot assume faculty development with part time faculty. I would advocate either very carefully creating subcategories in the policy by faculty type or else focus only on TT as CSUCI does. This is a practical point.
- Tian: Workload. The deteriorating situation. What will be the compensation for the participation? Concern for student complaints over faculty workload.
- Leslie: SDSU has a 85% TT ratio as a policy labeled as “highest fiscal priority.” We could put something like that in ours.
- Erly: Yes, need more work for lecturer hiring. Faculty input is only for tenure-track, not for lecturer hiring. Generally recommendations come from a colleague, they get an interview, then if an opening, they are hired. We need to be more inclusive. Maybe ask Pei Fang is this for all faculty hiring?
- Leslie: They did not give us this assignment. They said to do something with those hiring guidelines. We said we think there needs to be something more.
- Leslie: Most things to do with hiring faculty the process comes from Faculty Affairs is the majority across all CSUs. It is a minority of CSUs that have a policy about the faculty hiring process.
- Leslie: Right now, there is no place for these guidelines except for them to be included in Faculty Affairs’ process. FPPC is saying there should be more faculty governance on faculty hiring. This would be how it would go, making a policy for academic senate.
- Tian: For our contract, we include all faculty - but department governance, lecturers are not there. Why should we separate faculty, one group from another?
- Leslie: We need to keep our focus on shared-governance in faculty hiring. If we want faculty to have a say in faculty hiring, how will we do that? A guideline won’t do it. We would need to have an academic senate policy.
- Leslie: You have all the tools in the toolbox. Links to the other CSUs, the hiring guidelines (one with my edits and things), Patricia’s tenure-track search protocol. Add comments, changes, things we should put in here, have at it! To say it’s a draft, is [haha] true. What do we want to say?

Reminder - Patricia was surprised that we do not have shared governance on faculty hires, but that it comes from Faculty Affairs

We are down to five faculty now so we don’t have a quorum. Let’s leave it there and have a good weekend!

