

FPPC Minutes
Meeting #2
September 17, 2021

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Frank Cardinale, Jo Brocato, Leslie Andersen, Don Haviland, Kirsty Fleming, Rebecca Sittler, Barbara LeMaster

1. Approve Agenda (Unanimously approved.)
2. Approve minutes from meeting #1 (Unanimously approved.)
3. Announcements
 - a. Al spoke with Senate chair. No change to priorities. Emeritus policy may return to us. If we finish RTP we will turn to Faculty Hiring policy.
 - b. How much of the RTP document should we share as we go along.
 - c. COVID Equity Impact on Faculty Evaluation Task Force. They are interested in working with us on this policy. Kirsty: Definition of RSCA, service (how do you reward mentoring, etc.), instrument bias for teaching, etc will be their concerns. Barbara: Strategic plan of the President's Equity and Change Commission. Faculty is going into that plan.
 - d. Al: Concerns raised about length of narrative and what is included.
4. Revision of University RTP Policy 09-10, section 2.1 Instructional Activities
 - a. 2.1 Introduction (lines 2-30).
 - b. How do we record mentoring or informal advising (lines 62 to 66)? Emails? Calendars/logs? Richard: Can we rely solely on attestation (Chairs letter, etc.) Jalal: Chair letter. Rebecca: Letter from mentee? Can the candidate describe in narrative (without evidence)? Barbara: A chair can write a letter, but they aren't always aware. You could make them aware. Explain in the narrative. We do take people's word for a lot of things in the narrative. Al: There are some on campus that believe committees are biased. That is where faith in the narrative comes in as a question.
 - c. Richard: Concern for obligating logs as it can be onerous. Desire to make sure the word "mentoring" is used (lines 60 to 66). Leslie: Concerned the word "advising" has been lost. Rebecca: Why are we directly referencing Honors? Problem of lists. Leslie concurs problem of lists.
 - d. Line 65 added "support letters" to the list of support evidence. Majority vote of approval. Adding "advising logs" did not receive a majority vote and was deleted.
 - e. Change all "includes but is not limited to" to "could include but is not limited to" to make clear that lists are not directive.
 - f. Don: Clarify earlier that it isn't just instruction but is a broader spectrum such as mentoring and advising. Barbara: Line 15 in 2.1. "...effective instruction is a process as well as an outcome. ...it could include but is not limited to classroom instruction , advising, and mentoring."

- g. Jalal: back to bottom of 2.1 , lines 62 to 66. Do we need to clarify list? Discussion conclusion: adding “could include but is not limited” is sufficient.
 - h. Al: When we are done with the document we may want to consider formatting – such as “bold” for some words or phrases.
 - i. Jo: Support Jalal’s idea about “other supportive documentation.”
 - j. Kirsty: I am not bothered that it repeats in multiple way that it is a list. One time or four times. We are talking about how you capture cultural taxation some people experience. But, should we speak with others who experience that taxation for this language? Al: that has been my goal. Barbara: PEEC is a good place to go. I experience that cultural taxation because I work with the deaf community.
 - k. Leslie: Start list on line 7 to include the word “advising.” Remove “honors” students and just have “advising and mentoring”. Barbara: Friendly amendment to add Honors after “internships” so that it is “research, internships, Honors, and student teaching.
 - l. Jalal: separate instructionally-related advising from other types of advising or mentoring.
 - m. Don: Get it to where we can, but before voting ask for other, more diverse input.
 - n. Jo: Are we adding “instructionally-related mentoring and advising”? (line 11) – yes, added.
 - o. Conclusion:
 - i. eliminated distinction between instruction and instructionally-related activities
 - ii. increased specificity to colleges/ department
 - iii. changed the nature of expectations for instruction to include formative not just summative assessment (to underscore the “reflective” practitioner and lower the prominence of summative (SPOT) evaluation.
 - p. Section 2.1 approved (pending inputs from parties outside FPPC)
5. Revision of University RTP Policy 09-10, section 2.2: RSCA
- a. Barbara: in CLA “scholarship of engagement” and writing in languages other than English.
 - b. Kirsty: obligation is on the candidate to document quality of the work. One way is to read the article. But not you have to do it that way or this way. Barbara: They were using Google translate to translate the articles. One committee moved an article from RSCA to service because they couldn’t move it. Richard: supported Barbara’s point and added that it is uneven where some committees find it ok and others not.
 - c. Al: CLA has responded more than any other college. Other colleges?
 - d. Don: in College of Ed. Even in education. Scholarship of engagement is more amorphous.

- e. [Richard: Scholarship of Engagement means our faculty connecting the resources of a university to social, civic, and ethical problems. It implies a more continuous and creative engagement between academic and civic culture.]
- f. Leslie: Peer-review. Do we need to define it. In applied fields, the peer-reviewed issue is a can of worms.
- g. Rebecca: If an artist applies to a juried exhibition is less prestigious than being invited to participate in a show at a prestigious gallery.
- h. Al: Adding not English. Scholarship of Engagement. Explicitly listing. We discussed “documenting” in instruction – should we here? Documenting *could be* peer reviewed but other ways as well. Using or expanding the knowledge base within your field.
- i. Jalal: RSCA activities are changing across fields, particularly with technology. Departments need the freedom to define. The university needs to appreciate the changing and evolving nature. Guiding Principles from us. How are we creating knowledge? How are we sharing it? How are we bringing it to the classroom? How are we using the results of our RSCA to enhance teaching and society?
- j. Barbara: I like “documenting” from what Kirsty was saying. What Jalal was saying can be part of showing quality of research. In CLA: some scholarship is more like arts – new media, films, podcasts, etc. Grant applications. I have practiced Scholarship of Engagement, but we did have someone denied tenure for this purpose.
- k. Richard: supporting Jalal’s point. As Barbara said, the scholarship of engagement needs to be amplified, but Jalal’s outcome-oriented approach allows us to define more carefully and create a distinction between working in a community and the scholarship of engagement.
- l. Kirsty: we don’t have these issues in our policies for the most part; what Barbara says is key. Scholarship of engagement is not new, but it is not something many understand and embrace. Same with scholarship of teaching. Richard’s point: experimenting in the classroom is not scholarship of teaching but writing up an experience of innovation in teaching is. Ref: Ernest Boyer model (1990). If we aren’t valuing the work people do we aren’t employing them.
- m. Don: Echoing Richard and Barbara. In Education we had that issue in that the scholarship for a candidate was not done. It was not clear what the definition is.
- n. Richard (in Chat): Does this mean we define in our text? Don: I think so. Like Boyer.
- o. Al: We should talk about all kinds of activities but the burden lies with the candidate to convince the committee.
- p. Kirsty: In citing this, it may be a dept or college-specific. We privilege peer-review because it is a mark of impact or quality, but in my field it is a

huge range. Jo's or Barbara's examples – such as grants. But, most people accept things that aren't peer reviewed. Peer reviewed is too simplistic.

6. Next steps: Continue work on 2.2 RSCA.

Future Meetings This Semester

All meetings are 12:30-2:30, <https://tinyurl.com/ZoomWithAl>

Oct 1

Oct 15

Nov 5

Nov 19

Dec 3