FPPC Minutes
Meeting #4
October 14, 2021

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Leslie Andersen, Gary Hytrek, Don Haviland, Jo Brocato, Shireen Pavri, Kirsty Fleming, Rebecca Sittler, Barbara LeMaster

1. Approve Agenda (Unanimously approved.)
2. Approve minutes from meeting #3 (Unanimously approved.)
3. Announcements
   a. Al going to Senate Exec next week to give progress report
   b. Kirsty: a topic of debate has come up about why you need to be a full professor to be on FPPC. The equity argument that the FEAs are interested in is: full professors are the smaller group and don't have the diverse perspective. Shireen: Concern for so much service for everyone – we should revisit composition of all councils. Richard: I would like to hear more about original rationale. Al: the original rationale was that we work on some of the most sensitive issues; full professors can't be reviewed further. Al: don't resist Associates, but don't want untenured. Jalal: there were other assignments to the council in the past that required having a full professor, but no longer part of our responsibilities (such as award committee).
   c. Al is thinking about going to the College Councils to discuss the RTP document.
   d. Kirsty: Margie (Merryfield; equity advocate in CNSM) has an unprecedented breadth of knowledge.
   e. Leslie: It would be great if there is a way the Senate could go through this in another way than line by line for a long time.
   f. Jalal: at FPPC in the past, we asked that the chair of the senate make a presentation to FPPC.
   g. Al: Spoke again with Beach 2030 leaders. Discussed new faculty lines. That said, the issue of differential faculty assignments is going to be a large question.
4. Revision of University RTP Policy 09-10, section 2.2 RSCA Activities
   Al: As I read what's there, this is what I think we're saying:
   o Depts and college should develop their own polices. What's valued within the policies
   o --should not be limited by type of RSCA product
   o --should not limit candidates to an exclusive list of activities or accomplishments
   o --should count any contributions which create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills
   o --should evaluate contributions by the extent to which they benefit others (a professional, local, state, national, or international community)
   o --should say working with others counts as well as solo
   o --should say working across and between disciplines counts as well as within the home field
   o --should limit evaluation to products or findings that can be evaluated by peers
   o --should not limit contributions to those for professional audiences

- o --should not limit contributions to English
- o --should include contributions within the scholarship of discovery, integration, engagement, and teaching & learning
- o --should make clear that the candidate bears the ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills.
a. Richard (in chat): "must" or "are expected to" as opposed to "should." - Depts and college should develop their own polices. What's valued within the policies (Leslie supports in chat)
b. Barbara: need to work on this language --should evaluate contributions by the extent to which they benefit others (a professional, local, state, national, or international community)
c. Discussion: What does "evaluated" mean? (lines 267-270).
     i. Al: it needs to be evaluable – whatever form – and be of a certain quality.
     ii. Gary: the goal is that we change it to "experts in the field" so that we can include non-academics.
     iii. Kirsty: the appropriate people to evaluate scholarship of engagement, for instance, might not be an academic. Maybe even add specific language that it can be someone outside academe.
     iv. Leslie: What is an expert? Who decides? What does "in the field" mean? Jo: "subject matter expert?" Shireen: "expert scholars and practitioners in the field." (Concurrence that this is strong) .
     v. Barbara: my concern is that work has been evaluated by people we want to evaluate it when someone publishes. Committees should rely on those evaluations. That obviates the English-language concern as well. My concern is that someone on a committee will substitute their (less expert) view on the subject matter for those who have evaluated it for publication. Everyone should have the same evaluation experience. It is uneven: if there is someone who feels they have expertise in the area on the committee they interject their assessment of the scholarship, but if there is not then it is only reliance on external evaluators say. "Expert scholars and practitioners in the field" takes care of this.
     vi. Kirsty: Anxiety around RTP is sky-high. There are occasional negative experiences, but those are the exceptions. The number of negative decisions in a year is on average "1" (out of an average of 100 cases). Usually, it is a different issue. There is anxiety, but ultimately it doesn't impact decision-making.
     vii. Richard: Agree, Kirsty. But, that is because we either push out faculty earlier or they leave earlier. What are we signaling not at point of tenure file but through the six years?
     viii. Barbara: May not be as big an issue for tenure itself, but it does impact merit funds, etc. Not only about negative or positive outcome in tenure.
     ix. Leslie: "Evaluators should recognize that RSCA have been previously reviewed before submission and should take those reviews into consideration." Or some such.....

      x.   Kirsty: I do get it and worry about the level of anxiety people experience. Some of the negative things that do happen. It is almost always righted, but it is a negative experience. This is university level policy – how much nuance can you get into a university policy?

     xi.   Al: How will this play in COTA? Rebecca: "practitioners" helps. It is difficult to look at how this plays across all departments.

    xii.   This is pretty close to working – all vote yes:

> In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings, ~~in ways appropriate to the form of scholarship or creative activity,~~ which have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not restricted to professional ences nor limited to English-only contributions.

d.   Return to colleges and department "must" vs "should" develop policies. All vote for "must."

e.   Line 260: Al: Do we need a sentence that says specifically: things other than articles and publications apply?

      i.   Barbara: leave it to colleges or department.

     ii.   Richard: concern that using very broad language will limit department rights to narrow the form of RSCA based on the discipline.

    iii.   Shireen: are we prompting them to think more broadly?

    iv.   Gary: I agree. In the end it is up to the department.

     v.   Kirsty: Agreeing with Shireen. To prompt thinking.

    vi.   Rebecca: Yes - quality/reputation of venue can be very similar to quality/reputation of journals.

   vii.   Kirsty: Plus there is what Leslie said, it will be changed on the senate floor…

  viii.   We moved on without adding additional language.

f.   Bullets on Scholarship of Discovery, Integration, Engagement, and Teaching and Learning

      i.   Jalal: a reason for order? Al: it is Boyer's order. Shireen: This is per Boyer's model. You could cite him here.

     ii.   Shireen on Scholarship of Discovery: Inventions, patents, etc. (we want to be broad). Have more varied examples.

    iii.   Leslie: to look at recent scholarship on the topic.

- Scholarship of Discovery: RSCA advancing knowledge through original [scholarship]. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, or patents.

- Scholarship of Integration: RSCA synthesizing information across disciplines, across time, or across topics within a discipline, bringing new insights to empirical research through informing the understanding of the meanings of the findings or providing new understandings and paradigms. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to …

- Scholarship of Engagement: RSCA involving the rigorous application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to …

- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge though systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to …

~~These scholarly and creative activities benefit professional, local, state, national, and international communities, when the work is disseminated in English or languages other than English, with fellow scholars or other audiences.~~

iv. Richard: This is part of why some of our faculty suggested a white paper. A few people who are well read in this area and could write recommended CSULB-specific language. We could work on language next meeting but then make some revisions on the last pass when we have that white paper language.

v. Shireen: Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: language around understanding our students. Getting to know who your students are and bringing their life contexts into their teaching and learning.
1. Al: is this a return to the Teaching section?
2. Jalal: We are going to go back through the whole document.
3. Rebecca: Shireen's point is a good one. Sometimes it is hard to look at the whole. Maybe we could take our section based approach then look at the whole document and see what is missing overall.

vi. Al: Suggesting some "guidelines" for candidates in 2.2 just like 2.1. Lines 303-304. In the previous section we had a template : "The subsections are to guide candidates, their evaluators, and those revising college and department committee…". The burden of demonstration remains with the candidate.
1. Kirsty: we will ask a teaching philosophy, but in RSCA there is nothing like that. We don't always know the theme or scholarly agenda. Recommend candidates provide their scholarly agenda.
   a. Leslie supports. Richard supports but with a different word than "agenda." Gary: point on the word "agenda" is well taken. Richard: "vision" "program" or "plan"?
2. Do we include RSCA that includes students?
   a. Shireen: in addition to that which involves mission and vision of university. Al: here or stressed in narrative?
   b. Richard: is the intention to encourage or reify or require? Kirsty: it is valued. Let departments determine the scope

      c. Gary: our teaching, research, and service should serve the mission and vision so maybe that belongs at the to then refer back to in each section? Shireen: yes, section 1.3.

      d. Jalal: Including in line 304 – mission, vision, and *values*. Values are as important to include as mission and vision.

3. Kirsty: we are looking for something akin to a teaching philosophy for RSCA. Al: the goal is to avoid an annotated list.

      a. Jalal: how do we expect the faculty to diversify their RSCA if they want to just continue their PhD reseach area?

      b. Gary: If they do lay out their research philosophy …going forward. A philosophy and narrative of how their work fits in not just an itemized list.

      c. Kirsty: we definitely want a philosophy in mini-reviews, but tenure as well if you have the promise to continue. Works in progress would be an example.

      d. Shireen: There is a difference between research agenda and plans for the future. When speaking about your research you have a body of work and driving questions. You need to outline that. I would let the college or department speak to future plans, but we do need candidates to outline their area of scholarship or body of work that provides context for one's work.

      e. Kirsty: The current policy says: *The awarding of tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is granted when the candidate has demonstrated the ability to make ongoing and increasingly distinguished professional contributions to the university and to the profession.* Typically, tenure is partially evaluation of future plans. That may be he difference between promotion and tenure. Promotion is a standard. Tenure is a lifetime commitment. Are you going to keep contributing?

      f. Al: supports language that asks colleges and departments to address this.