

FPPC Minutes  
Meeting #3  
October 1, 2021

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Frank Cardinale, Jo Brocato, Leslie Andersen, Don Haviland, Kirsty Fleming, Rebecca Sittler, Gary Hytrek, Jalal Torabzadeh, Shireen Pavri

1. Approve Agenda (Unanimously approved.)
2. Approve minutes from meeting #1 (Unanimously approved.)
3. Announcements
  - a. Position Paper about Scholarship of Engagement (Richard)
    - i. Richard: presentation of idea
    - ii. Broad support
    - iii. Kirsty: concern that we are calling out one important thing but then ignoring other areas of scholarship (Scholarship of teaching and instruction, scholarship of engagement, scholarship of discovery, scholarship of application)
    - iv. Al: I appreciate the idea of all of the above, but recognize engagement issue is drawing the most attention.
    - v. Kirsty: It is a difficult balance. Is it for the time we are in right now or for the next 3 years. Can we be broader?
    - vi. Jalal: creating another area of evaluation? Part of RSCA?
    - vii. Agreement that yes we support it. The idea of situating scholarship of engagement within the wider world of scholarship questions (scholarship of instruction, etc.).
  - b. Beach2030 Reimagining Faculty action plan
    - i. There will be opportunities to participate substantively and less substantively.
    - ii. How have other campuses changing faculty work evaluation and reward? (Call for us to look at scholarship and case studies.)
4. Revision of University RTP Policy 09-10, section 2.2 RSCA
  - a. Kirsty: Minor general comments. Conversation of how the bullets at beginning of 2.2 would change with different kinds of scholarships. That list is supposed to be artifacts or outcomes.
  - b. Richard: Doesn't feel ready to comment on bullets about scholarship; also, concerned about the use of "should" vs "must" or "are expected". The issue is in relation to "Departments and colleges "should" develop their own definitions..." but needs review throughout 2.2.
    - i. Jalal: we need to rethink culture re scholarship of teaching, scholarship of engagement, scholarship of discovery Al: Do your colleagues know these terms/ideas? Jalal: no. Polling all FPPC

Members: all college representatives are concerned about knowledge level for these.

- ii. Rebecca (in chat): But there seems to be an opportunity to see the model as a way to expand how we talk about RSCA. (Kirsty concerns)
- c. Is the draft language a good framework (understanding wordsmithing is necessary) – all support.
- d. Kirsty: other forms of scholarship aren't always about "discipline." The scholarship of engagement paragraph, for instance, will therefore need some change once we know more.
- e. Rebecca: "Medium"? Is this trying to get at the arts? Al: you don't judge based on what it is; you judge based on basis of how you document its impact. Leslie: "Form" instead of "Media?"
- f. Leslie: Take "traditional" out 262 and 263.
- g. Gary: suggested language for "defined by..."
- h. Rebecca: What about..."CSULB recognizes the value of a scholarly contribution is defined by the extent to which it uses or expands disciplinary..."
- i. Frank: remove "CSULB recognizes..." because that is what this is published for. Start with "The value of a ..."
- j. Richard: "Disciplinary knowledge of skills within or across fields." If it is across fields then it is not disciplinary it is interdisciplinary. Rebecca: "within or across fields or disciplines"?
- k. After discussion of additional language changes, Jalal: "create, use, or expand" in line 259. Kirsty friendly ammendment "create, apply, or expand."
- l. Al: Looking to address bullets:
  - i. Do we want to just get rid of the word traditional in the bullets?
- m. Leslie: In the bullets – why is scholarly and creative activity separated from RSCA in that last bullet
  - i. Maybe we just use RSCA throughout so that we're not separating different parts of RSCA
- n. Rebecca – maybe just talk about RSCA in each bullet and that would be inclusive
  - i. Idea of "humane"? Al – meant to reflect using expertise to benefit the community, serve the community
- o. Don – dissemination is core to Boyer's scholarship; if we're not going to use his terms, then somewhere we have to be clear that scholarship of engagement means work is *disseminated*, not merely that you use your expertise to help society
- p. Al – maybe we need to reflect on this some more, people with more familiarity with Boyer take a stab at writing

- q. Gary: agree; also there are different kinds of dissemination. Peer review is important – but really good work gets done and shared in less formal ways, like reports to community boards, etc.
- r. Al: I hear you about dissemination, but we then need to think about how the candidate can provide evidence that would be acceptable to an RTP committee
- s. Kirsty: newer forms of scholarship are about *impact*
  - i. Traditional definition is peer review
  - ii. But in engaged research, you might not break intellectual boundaries; but imagine you help address homelessness or you produce something that changes practice.
  - iii. These products are not peer reviewed but they can impact a community
  - iv. Maybe it's a report to a board.
- t. Al: agree; our challenge is to create an RTP document that will let departments value this kind of work
- u. Jalal: modifications to third bullet in Section 2.2 currently lines 264-5
- v. Shireen: lines 270-273 – reads like we are requiring peer review by peers; but not everything will be reviewed by scholarly peers. Think about blogs, reports. Other ways to disseminate.
- w. Al – yes definitely we need to give some examples but it can't be exhaustive either; want to signal to departments that we want them to value newer types of scholarship. So what do we say?
- x. Kirsty: this might be misinterpreted – but “experts in the field”? Not intellectually, but in practice, like the Water Board if I solve a problem with water for the city.
- y. Leslie – in the list we are making of dissemination, maybe we order it in an unexpected way, to signal that peer review isn't the most important; could make it random, maybe alphabetically
- z. Jalal – we do need to be clear there are different ways to disseminate, but peer review does have great significance and we want to be carefully not to dilute
- aa. Leslie – but isn't it up to the department and college to decide what counts
- bb. Jalal – yes, but want to be sure we are being clear that peer review is important
- cc. Al: our task is to provide specificity but also give space to colleges and departments
  - i. Also – I'm thinking part of what makes RSCA what it is, is that it's been reviewed and accepted by others
- dd. Gary – I like Kirsty's language “reviewed by experts”
- ee. Shireen – Beach 2030 talks about importance of collaborative research; we want to give a nod to this here, make it more normalized and desirable; doing research together in groups has value

ff. AI:

- i. Asks Shireen to draft statement we can put in about collaborative RSCA
- ii. Don and Gary: work on the bullets to reflect Boyer
- iii. What's next? Should we work on using Instruction section as a model?

gg. Shireen suggested: Second sentence in this section on line 252 could read:  
Faculty engage in individual and collaborative research at CSULB, within their disciplines and in inter and transdisciplinary areas.

hh. Adjourned

Future Meetings This Semester

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

Oct 15

Nov 5

Nov 19

Dec 3