

FPPC Minutes
Meeting #1
September 3, 2021

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Don Haviland, Jo Brocato, Leslie Andersen, Shireen Pavri, Barbara LeMaster, Jalal Torabzadeh, Rebecca Sittler

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda. Unanimous
3. Election of Vice-Chair and Secretary
 - a. Vice Chair Nominations: Don Haviland. Unanimous consent.
 - b. Recording Secretary: Richard Marcus. Unanimous consent.
4. Announcements
 - a. We may look at Emeritus Policy again. We looked at it in 2020-21.
 - b. If we finish RTP we may start work on a Faculty Hiring Policy.
 - c. Don: Possibly look at Lecturer Evaluation process.
5. Approval of 2020-2021 FPPC revisions to University RTP Policy 09-10
6. Revision of University RTP Policy 09-10, section 2.1 Instructional Activities
 - a. Al: Recap of 2020-21
 - i. Shireen: How much freedom do we have to open up Reimagining Faculty Roles? <https://www.csulb.edu/beach-2030/reimagine-faculty>
 1. Al: We have freedom, but it does go to Senate and we have to think about representation and broad support.
 2. Richard: Differentiating structural changes (such as removing one of the three pillars) vs changing the definitions (such as accepting other activities for RSCA).
 3. Al: We discussed adjusting the levels of the pillars, e.g., 20% as a floor for a pillar.
 4. Don: As we dive into the bigger picture more opportunity. This question is not out of step with our discussion last year.
 5. Al: We can't be as specific as some people might like in a university-level document. We did agree we need greater direction to colleges for their specificity.
 - ii. Al: We have been discussing more radical changes to teaching evaluation.
 - iii. Al met with the President's Equity and Change Commission (PEEC) <https://www.csulb.edu/presidents-equity-change-commission/presidents-equity-change-commission> and will meet with COVID Equity Task Force https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/u69781/covid_equity_task_force_final_3-26-21.pdf
 - b. 2.1 Instructional Activities

- i. Discussion of lines 9-11 "instructional activities range so widely between colleges...". Should we include a "list" of teaching activities as an example? On the one hand it sends a signal that the college can be broad and creative in reimagining the role of faculty. On the other, lists sometimes are read as restrictive even when it says "for example."
 1. Al, Richard, Don, Jalal: More language gives more framework, more guidance, more encouragement to develop innovative policies.
 2. Leslie: the problem is more commonly with the college and department policies. We need a university policy enough for a framework but the specificity up to them. (Agreement on the sentiment but not necessarily how to execute that.)
 3. Barbara: Are we also suggesting that these can only go under this category, not other categories? "Formal mentoring" "cultural taxation." Do we need to define some terms? These examples, such as mentoring and advising, do not in our college count towards instructional activities if you are receiving units for it but do if not.
 4. Leslie: should colleges "are encouraged" be changed to "colleges must"?
 5. Shireen: We used to talk about "instruction" and "instructionally related activities." Now we are proposing just the latter. If the distinction is going away then examples are critically important. Faculty need to be able to explain both how they did things instructionally and related activities.
 6. Barbara: Those receiving units vs not for the same activity? We have a form that faculty have to fill out about the instructional load so the evaluators can make the distinction.
 7. Vote on Change vs Not Change of the last sentence of paragraph one of 2.1. If so, editing needed. 8 to 1 in favor of changing it for the more descriptive text.
 - a. Richard suggests: "Colleges and department are required to provide examples of teaching activities." (and then the list of examples that follow)
 - b. Vote taken and the first sentence replaced - pending revisions.
 - c. Praveen: Include specific language about receiving units or not?
 - d. Don: amendment: "instructional" rather than "teaching" in Richard's language. Richard says that is a friendly amendment.

- e. Leslie: Examples of instructional activities “in their own policies” eg “Colleges and department are required to provide examples of instructional activities in their own policies.”
 - f. Al and Don: Discussion to soften “required” to “encouraged.”
8. For next meeting: Look over all of 2.1 to agree so we can move forward.

Next meeting: September 17, 12:30-2:30.