

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Minutes

Meeting #13

May 7, 2021

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Norbert Schürer, Jalal Torabzadeh, Don Haviland, Terry Ross, Jo Brocato, Leslie Andersen, Kirsty Fleming.

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes. Both approved unanimously.

2. Announcements

- FPPC 2021-2 organizational meeting – we will meet Friday May 14 to select leadership.
- Council meeting day & time, 2022-3. Proposal to meet 2-4 alternate Thursdays to Academic Senate.

3. RTP Policy revision

- Section 2.1.3: “Candidates must include and discuss two or more evidence sources supporting the effectiveness of their instructional practices.” Discussion about how to clarify. Moved to 2.1.0 and changed to “Neither candidates nor committees may rely entirely on Student Perceptions on Teaching (SPOT) forms as evidence to document effective teaching.”
- 2.1.3. Discussion about allowing video or audio for support.
 - Norbert: Concern for workload.
 - Richard: “College or department committees may allow candidates to submit short audio or video in support of their teaching. “ ?
 - Jalal: Possible differences between departments not fair so we should focus at college level?
 - Richard: Isn’t that already a difference we have in RSCA?
 - Kirsty: There is a difference: “what” you have done vs “how you document” what you have done.
 - Leslie: What about a more general statement to get across the idea that video or audio may be used? Something like: examples in whatever appropriate format ie audio, video. Include the thought that something other than written on paper is permitted or encouraged as evidence, but not a long description. As Kirsty suggests, the candidate needs to decide what is appropriate.
 - Alan: Not just about the video (summative) but about the accompanying narrative description of the video (Formative). A tool to support.
 - Kirsty: add it to the list in the previous sentence so it is there but not given additional weight?
 - Richard: Does that mean a college cannot prohibit videos?

- Kirsty: In being more focused, a college *could* limit the suggested evidence. However, if we have a sentence that a committee *must* include more than SPOT forms then they would not be able to limit that.
- Al : Parallel in each section: what you have to do then what you may do. Eg Have to look beyond spot forms but may include video.
- Agreement that we want to require more than SPOTS but allow colleges and departments to make specific requests such as video
- Norbert: 2.1. is defining what is good teaching vs what is going in an RTP file. Do we need to completely separate (into a new section)? Consensus to be mindful about conflating, and being more intentional, but maybe not separate.
- Norbert: how about two paragraphs in each sub-section - the first as the requirement, the second how to handle it in the narrative (making the language parallel between subsections). All agree.
- Richard: “Or believe they are learning” in 2.1.3
- Don: Within their narratives and file, candidates should document and committees should consider their use of effective teaching strategies, students’ responses to those strategies, and student learning.
- Kirsty: Are there any effective teaching strategy that don’t provide student learning?
- Richard: Do we want language that acknowledges the ways in which the evidence may vary by instructional delivery (eg asynchronous vs traditional)?
 - Norbert: In 2.1 add: “outcome and available strategies may affected by mode, level, and type, of instruction”? Or just “mode” of instruction?
 - Kirsty: Concerns that it isn’t just mode, it is also level and type.
 - Al: Agree. Important to include about modes of delivery or it will come up in Senate.

Next scheduled meeting is May 14 (organizational meeting with the 2021-22 Council only)