

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Minutes
Meeting #10
March 5, 2021

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Jo Brocato, Robin Richesson, Praveen Sinha, Norbert Scherer, Kirsty Fleming, Terry Ross, Don Haviland.

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

- Agenda approved without revisions.
- Minutes approved without revisions.

2. Announcements

- Survey results [<https://tinyurl.com/a47f64bt>]
 - A lot like earlier feedback – faculty want more clarity in RTP,
 - to modernize the definitions of RSCA products (tenure worthy RSCA products), and
 - equity issues.
 - Norbert: Not possible to capture everything. Do we need a statement along those lines that we are striving for clarity but it is complicated?
 - Kirsty: Balance between clarity and flexibility
 - Robyn: challenge of tying the activities to a section. Kirsty: how do we get people to directly connect to the policy? The form needs amending (but I have not had time yet.).
 - Praveen: Candidates not always providing necessary support. Kirsty: If you haven't documented your case then the reviewers document what they have. RSCA can be unsatisfactory. Jo: Should be prescriptive to the department for how to complete their files.
- FPPC Chair attending next meeting of President's Equity Commission to discussion RTP

3. RTP Policy revision

- Revising 1.0 Guiding Principles

- 1.2.1 Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the department, college, university, community, and the profession. Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in all three of the following areas:
- instruction and instructionally-related activities;
 - research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA); and
 - service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession.

1.2.2 RTP reviews must be clear, fair, transparent, [“consistent” was debated and the excluded] [“independent” was debated and excluded]and unbiased at all levels. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet department, college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for advancement. Faculty achievements may vary from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

- 1.3.1. CSULB values diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- [NEW BULLET]: CSULB recognizes that cultural taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should be interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities and include mechanisms to mitigate them.
- 1.3.3. Faculty mentoring, advising, and other similar interacts [discussion about the iterative process; wanting to make sure letters of recommendation, being an ally, and other activities help this process] help create a supportive, inclusive, collegial environment benefitting the CSULB community. This policy should be interpreted as valuing these actions. All college and department RTP policies should implement mechanisms to recognize these contributions, even when they are difficult to document.
- 1.3.2. CSULB recognizes that faculty create and disseminate RSCA in widely varying ways. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should value diverse forms of RSCA and create mechanisms to recognize and reward them.
- 1.3.4. Shared governance is vital to CSULB’s mission. Good academic citizenship requires all faculty, especially those privileged with tenure, to contribute to the process at more than one level. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should acknowledge and reward service in shared governance.
 - discussion about whether to keep “more than one level.”
 - Norbert: Concern with people not thinking beyond their department, even when going up for full professor.
 - Kirsty: it isn’t about what people are doing, it is about what we want them to do in the future. Over their career, we want people contributing in different ways. I therefore like it as written.
 - Concur: leave as written
-
- 1.3.5. Though all faculty must contribute to CSULB’s mission in all three areas of teaching, RSCA, and service, faculty have diverse strengths and ways of supporting CSULB’s mission. This policy should be construed ~~as allowing for adjustments in the balance between teaching, research, and service~~ as allowing

Commented [JB1]: Would the statement about cultural taxation work in 1.3.4

for adjustments in the balance between instruction, RSCA, and service based upon faculty strengths as well as department, college, and university needs.

- “construed as supporting innovation or workload adjustments”. It is in the current policy, but it gets lost and we want to emphasize (AI). Discussion to remove “innovation or”. It is a buzzword without meaning (Norbert). Kirsty and Richard agree. Concurrence: remove “innovation”.
- Kirsty: It isn’t workload being adjusted. It is the assignment, not the load, being adjusted. Norbert: “...in the balance between teaching, research, and service.” Praveen: “adjustments”? Concurrence with this change.
- AI: Can we delete everything after “service”? Most want to leave in the specificity.
- AI: Add a section to generally lay out the goals of RTP. Concurrence.
- AI: Should I share this with the President’s Equity and Change Commission? Kirsty: What led to you going to this group? AI: I want to be as transparent as possible. Getting feedback from this commission would be a good way to either get substantive feedback and minimally demonstrate an effort to gain substantive feedback. Agreement: yes, but with a lot of caveats that the language is preliminary/draft.
- Discussion: Should we have details such as who is on the committees be in the policy or in practice? (Kirsty). It can be in policy but doesn’t have to be. Jo: RTP is a heavy lift, getting it right at the college and dept level. Kirsty: FA doesn’t have policies; it is not a policymaking unit. We have procedures and we can change them when we want. Kirsty: Faculty Equity Advocates. Perhaps AI should visit?
- 2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities
 - AI took a first look at some changes. Don added some.
 - AI (in text suggestions): *I’m unsure it’s clear, but what I am trying to do is (a) move the narrative from defining good teaching in terms of something summative like student outcomes (sometimes hard to assess) to something more formative, i.e., you’re good if you keep trying to be good, (b) insert phrases mentioning issues like advising, mentoring, international education, diversity and equity, (c) mention how colleges and departments can be more specific if they want, and (d) minimize the use of SPOTs. - Maybe some wording around best practices, high impact, active learning.*
 - Jo: “Faculty are expected to teach using best practices”
 - Norbert: “Faculty are expected to teach”: Remove teaching in favor of student learning? Kirsty: Given the preceding paragraph, can’t we cut

“teaching” in the second paragraph making it “Faculty are expected to maintain currency...” ? Concurrence.

- Al: people think about defining teaching summatively (eg high ratings on SPOT, student high grades, etc.); I am trying to define excellence as being a person who is constantly working to do a better job. Praveen: Concerned that someone who keeps working at improving best practices without success. Norbert: If faculty can demonstrate they are improving? (though whatever means). Al: “Continuous improvement” is going to be clear for COB and CNSM. It is difficult to document effective instruction.
- Discussion of proposed text. Appears there needs to be more discussion on the *intent* of the text.