

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Minutes
Meeting #12
April 16, 2021

Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Norbert Schürer, Jalal Torabzadeh, Don Haviland, Terry Ross, Jo Brocato, Robin Richesson, David Wallace, Leslie Andersen, Kirsty Fleming.

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

2. Announcements

- Al to meet with Senate Exec on behalf of FPPC
- Ongoing concerns about how SPOT is (over)used (Robin), and how biased the process can be for faculty of color.

3. RTP Policy revision

- Outside proposal to add a Dashboard – green, yellow red?
- Discuss adding “Colleges and departments, in the cases where department policies exist, are expected to create specific guidelines for faculty fulfilling...” to preamble [we added last meeting]
- Norbert: “independent programs”? (referencing A/ST) Richard: agreed. David: add “recognized independent programs” in a general statement – agreed.
- Discuss : what is effective teaching?
 - Develop: has the faculty member invested in own learning and growth around teaching (PDs, conferences, feedback from colleagues perhaps via observation)
 - Reflection: have they reflected on their teaching
 - Norbert: what is “reflection”?
 - Al: formative assessment. Robin: narrative. Jo: efforts in college to teach how to discuss teaching not successful. Al: Oregon uses a self-reflection document; maybe we need something like that? Don: tools to help learn how we evolve as a teacher. Jalal: Peer evaluation used to be part of the process; should it be brought back in policy?
 - Al: “Develop” referring to in current policy. “Reflection” is like formative assessment – here is an issue with my teaching, the data I am using, and what I am doing. Don: Agreed on focus, but then is “reflection” the right word? “Adapting” teaching?
 - Robin: Is 142-144 sufficient as we have inserted? “CSULB recognizes that excellence in teaching is as much a process as an outcome. It involves a commitment to reflection, ongoing learning, and changes to practice over

time to serve a diverse study body. Faculty must demonstrate this reflection and growth as part of the RTP process.” Or, do we add under this (and, if so, should it be 2.1.1.:

- Develop: has the faculty member invested in own learning and growth around teaching (PDs, conferences, feedback from colleagues perhaps via observation)
- Reflection: have they reflected on their teaching
- Impact/Outcomes: are students learning (student work samples, changes/evolution in materials and content, SPOT scores.)
- Don: Combine 142 (CSULB recognizes...”) to 160 (“...how candidates must include multiple data sources...”) into one section.
- Al: do candidates need to do Develop, Reflection, and Impact/Outcomes (all three) or two of three? Consensus: all.
- The intent of the detail in 142-160 is to broaden from SPOT alone while making what to include in the narrative more specific.
- Impact/Outcomes: are students learning (student work samples, changes/evolution in materials and content, SPOT scores.)
 - Al: Summative Assessment (are you actually making a difference?)
- Al: Delete 2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes? It is now both part of our culture and in other policy on syllabi. Jalal concurs. WASC was looking for compliance a decade ago. Now, we are accredited for another ten years and do have a culture of this. Others feel the reminder is necessary. For now, let’s leave it in.
- Adding “examples” of evidence for teaching effectiveness (student work samples, changes/evolution in material and content, changes to course materials, etc.)
- Discussion about limitations on Narrative (currently differs by college)
- Robin: reminder about the info in the PDS: <https://www.csulb.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-affairs/professional-data-sheet-pds-guidelines>. Discussion: changes to the PDS will follow what is required by this policy.
- Leslie: Concern with it running long, becoming muddled.
- Council concurs: the three parts to include (Reflection and Adaptation, Continuous Professional Learning, Instructional Practices that Increase Student

Learning & Engagement) – we list a loose idea but will have one to two concise sentences of expectations. The “evidence” paragraph can be worked into the three areas to avoid running long or muddled.

- Jo: There are a lot of good practices in SPOT that are ignored in favor of the one measure of teaching effectiveness. Maybe including a look at the other elements. Al: SPOT forms should be changed or eliminated according to a lot of feedback – forms and process. That is a different document from RTP, but it is FPPC and makes sense to address next year so that it is at the same time.
- Discussion: SPOT is important, but how do we not throw the baby out with the bathwater within the context of this policy. Agreement that SPOT Q5 focus is problematic. Al: Defending past FPPC that the intent has not been met. Richard: For this policy more generally discuss measures without SPOT specificity and, agreeing with Al, take up SPOT separately next year.
- Leslie: Has it ever been suggested that the colleges/departments develop their OWN evaluation forms? (In chat)
 - Al: Colleges *can* add what they want but people don’t know that. They must come from the ACE item pool (U Iowa), but otherwise
 - Leslie: maybe 1, 2, or 3 questions from the university and the rest are from the college.
 - Kirsty: concern we will make things worse in terms of bias. It takes more work than people realize that it measures what you want with out disadvantaging certain groups. Future instruments may be from ACE but no necessarily so we need to be careful.
- Al: going forward
 - Paragraph on “supporting evidence may include...” will be struck with content blended into the three areas discussed.
 - Discuss Instructional Philosophy and Practice – does it need to be there (2.1.1)
 - Norbert: what do we mean by “data sources” – can we say “evidence”? (Al, Richard, and Robin agree).
 - Goal: complete instruction section at the next meeting (the last of the year)
 - Discuss section 2.2 re: RSCA will have to wait for next year.

Next scheduled meeting is May 7, 2021.