

FPPC Minutes  
Meeting #7  
December 1, 2023

<https://csulb.zoom.us/j/6743069599>  
Passcode: FPPC

Present: Leslie Andersen, Rick Reese, Panadda Marayong, Josh Chesler, Hossein Jula, Barbara LeMaster, Tianjiao Qiu, Erlyana Erlyana, Lily House Peters, Patricia Perez

1. Approval of Agenda - approved
2. Approval of Minutes-November 17 - approved
3. Announcements
  - Executive Committee denied request to open and review department chairs' policy.
  - As a group, in the future we can decide whether we want push back and ask them to reconsider.
  - The new RTP policy passed the faculty vote - it does still need the President's concurrence. Now we'll look to Faculty Affairs for guidance on implementation.
4. SPOT Update
  - Person at Cal Poly SLO is preparing report of SPOT practices across CSU and will be releasing it this week
  - Also shared with Leslie 4 campus-specific policies and Leslie will share with FPPC.
  - In her quick review, one of our SPOT issues is less the instrument and more how the instrument is used across campus. Other campuses have more specific campus guidelines on how SPOTs should be used.
  - Might we want something like this campus guidance document.
  - This might inform our survey in the spring.
  - Barbara this survey - do we need to have a better sense of what we're trying to find out before we send a survey? Were we going to visit Faculty Councils to get a better sense of what we want to know before we do the survey?
  - Leslie shared the existing draft of a survey and each FPPC member was to bring the survey to Faculty Council and the council would decide how they want to distribute the survey.
  - Nim thought we'd decided to first get the data from ATS so we can see what it looks like and then we could approach faculty councils?
  - Leslie wonders how much the ATS data will actually inform our survey. ATS will provide things like response rates and things like that.

- Tian wondered how much we should focus on response rates, since we can't really set a policy for that and students already have little incentive. The value we can provide is helping to create or choose questions that faculty can use for their self-improvement, give guidance on how much importance we should give SPOTs.
- Lily noted that we must remember lecturer faculty here, since the evaluation process is different for lecturers than tenure-track. SPOTs play a greater role in lecturer evaluation.
- Leslie points out the question is both the instrument and the process, and she feels the process is the most important.
- Barbara said we need to know the purpose of SPOTs, then we can make decisions about what the good questions are. And if students are not responding, then its worthless to be trying to revise questions. So who knows the purpose of the instrument to begin with?
- Leslie notes that this all starts from the CBA. It says we have to do something.
- Josh wondered if FPPC does have some role in defining purpose and use of SPOTs? And could we require faculty to devote class time to bump up responses?
- Leslie we are charged with evaluating the question bank, but we are realizing this is a much bigger issue than just the question bank. And since we are FPPC, it seems it falls within our purview to look at process.
- Rick pointed out that his understanding from his work is that SPOTs it's double-edge sword: for a faculty member to use to defend oneself if needed and to evaluate lecturer faculty.
- Tian noted that not all courses are evaluated - faculty can choose what 2 to evaluate. Faculty teach both large and small classes, etc. so there equity issues that impact evaluation and we need to keep this mind.
- Don noted that the purpose of SPOT is both to evaluate and to help faculty improve. This suggests we need to look at response rates and try to boost them since otherwise the information be of limited value.
- Barbara noted Nim's comment in chat that FPPC can give guidance on how SPOTs are used. And since the policy says the instrument is about instructional effectiveness, we should guide question selection with goal of supporting instructional effectiveness.
- Monica noted there is broad acknowledgement that SPOTs are limited in assessing instructional effectiveness. We really want to ask faculty: how well does this item help you improve your instructional effectiveness.
- Current SPOT policy: <https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/policy-statement-17-05-student-evaluation-of-teaching>
- Erlyana asked: are we charged with revising the policy? Or are we just addressing the instrument?
- Leslie said the consensus seems to be that we need to address the entire process, that do just look at the items alone is not enough. We could focus just on the instrument - in which case we might just ask faculty the question Monica posed above about whether each question does or does

- not support instructional effectiveness.
- Leslie will be reaching out to members of the Faculty Formative Feedback project as well to get their input.
- She asked: do we want to focus on looking at just the instrument? Then advise the senate that we believe we think the policy needs to be done, there are many issues, but this is bigger than FPPC.
- Barbara said she'd argue that none of the items are useful for improving her instruction, but they are (or may not be) useful for giving information of students' observations on how effective her teaching is.
  - Would also ask how useful each comment box is on providing perspective on teaching effectiveness.
- Monica suggested: How helpful is this item in facilitating your reflection on your teaching effectiveness?
- Nim - are we really going to evaluate each question for whether it has value? If so, the broad question may not be as useful vs more specific questions about each item.
- Agreement that we will focus just on Section 3 of the SPOT policy and we will review the items and instrument. And we will also advise the EC that we believe there are bigger process issues that need to be addressed.
- Leslie believes that if we can assess the value of specific questions, get useful feedback from faculty on the SPOTs, and consider some college/department specific questions then we make some good progress.
- The plan now is:
  - We will get ATS data to see if it might inform anything we want to ask on the survey
  - We will also put the survey together based on the current SPOT questions but we'll need to decide how to ask. We'll let Fac Councils decide how they will get the data (survey all faculty, etc.).
  - Survey results will hopefully give us guidance on questions to dump, what to reword, what to add - and we can therefore make a recommendation to the Senate.

## 5. Copyright and Patent policies

- Leslie noted that perhaps the names should be changed to make the Copyright Policy in particular more distinct vs. lots of similar names on the internet.
- Leslie suggests that we send it to Senate and make clear that it should be discussed on the Senate floor.
- Nim wondered if we should share the proposed policy with college faculty? Should we reviewing this ourselves?
- Barbara supports us taking up the policy itself and taking it to faculty. Faculty have concerns about materials on Canvas and the like and the university "owning" that material.
- Leslie said it's unclear whether FPPC can do anything as a council?
- Barbara noted that an ad hoc group has no authority to present, it's really up

to FPPC what it wants to do?

- Patricia wondered if these new policies would supercede even lower-level policies at the university? And has counsel looked at this? The policies feel very jargony and it seems counsel should look at this?
- Leslie notes this came from administrators, not from the faculty.
- Leslie noted we can spend the time to heavily edit this, but are we qualified to do so? And the Senate will still debate it heavily. Perhaps we get some more direction from the EC of what they expect of us here, so we don't just send it along and imply our consent or support without having done due diligence.
- Leslie will reach out to Jade for clarification.

## 6. Faculty Hiring "Policy"

Adjourned at 2:21

Submitted 12.1.23

Don Haviland

Meetings for Spring Semester

February 02,16

March 01,15

April 19

May 03

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