

FPPC Minutes
Meeting #6
December 3, 2021

Present: Al Colburn, Tianjiao Qiu, Don Haviland, Jo Brocato, Frank Cardinale, Tianjiao Qiu, Leslie Andersen, Jalal Torabzadeh, Barbara Le Master, Rebecca Sittler, Kirsty Fleming

1. Agenda approved.
2. Minutes approved.
3. Announcements
 - a. Al had discussion about new faculty type lines (research faculty; alternate lecturer line types; etc.)
4. RTP Policy – Research section
 - a. Lines 302-309 (“Within the narratives candidates should...”)
 - i. Richard: Concern with “should” that it leads to inconsistent implementation by committees with some thinking that is required and others not. Al: whatever we use should be consistent between sections.
 - ii. Rebecca: Don’t like “RSCA products” – why not revert to “research, scholarly, and creative activities?” Al: just “activities.”
 - b. Lines 273-284 Scholarship of Discovery, Integration, Engagement, and Teaching and Learning
 - i. Al: Remove the labels since many don’t know them? Richard: In CLA using the language is an important signal. It is important to keep them. Al: We’ll keep and let Senate decide.
 - ii. Discussion on how to bring in the arts more clearly.
 - iii. Leslie: other words than “juried” – refereed? invited?
 - iv. Richard: leave out examples but be very clear on definitions? Then, let colleges define peer reviewed, invited, refereed, etc etc. Al: Campus wants more specificity. Jalal: Agrees on that specificity. Rebecca: Like what Richard was saying, but we are very confused about these categories. Maybe the examples help with that. Gary: I get what Richard is saying as well, but provide at least some direction. A minimal amount but, yes, with examples. Jury presentation: I would like to see “refereed” as it is a broader net. Frank: say that colleges will determine the rules of the field.
 - v. Tianjiao: the definition of discovery uses “discipline” so why not use? Don: part of the goal of the category is interdisciplinary.
 - vi. Rebecca (in chat): Appropriate examples should be defined by colleges and departments or disciplines. These could include, but are not

- limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues, or patents.
- vii. Leslie: in each one we have three parts: name of category, definition of category, and a few examples. We are getting caught up in the few examples rather than just focusing on those three things.
 - viii. Kirsty: not based on type of scholarship. Potentially multiple forms of evidence and those are not separated by type of scholarship. You can have peer-reviewed or qualitative research or etc in any of the 4 categories. Don: From Boyer differentiating. Tian: differences for engineering or business proposals. Where do proposals fit? Add to a specific category? Jo: Include in application? Leslie: Don't like intro sentence to "Scholarship of Application. Richard: To Kirsty's point. Specific forms of evidence are not separated by scholarship. A proposal could fit in any category. Jalal: create a 5th catch-all category? Leslie: We either have to decide we will have one or two or three examples or not have examples.
 - ix. Don (in chat): For Scholarship of Integration: Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.
 - x. Don: reflecting on Kirsty and Richard's point. It is not about if it is peer-reviewed or etc as that can fit in any category.
 - xi. Richard: Why are we trying to wordsmith definitions when there are established definitions? Rebecca: Boyer's definitions are older. But, are they applicable to all of our fields and values? Al: Consensus is that most people are not familiar with these things. Our goal is not to educate the campus it is to guide colleges in decided what counts. Barbara: We are getting examples. What if a department doesn't accept some of these things as legitimate for their profession but show up in the university document? Is it possible for the department to deny? Al: It is a big question. Jalal: I would like to echo mention. Question: do criteria in Boyer cover every RSCA currently?
 - xii. Richard: Agree with Barbara that is a big question, but I interpret this as making it possible for a department to include these things not a university mandate. To Al's point: My take is that CLA faculty want exactly what you say is not our job - to educate the faculty on different forms of scholarship because this is where RSCA most often marginalizes faculty.
 - xiii. Kirsty: I heard something different from Barbara. This is about what departments will or will not accept. Does there need to be an expansion that gives the flipside? Barbara: Concern from junior scholars that say they are doing emerging scholarship and they are not being accepted. Kirsty: agrees. Whether it is a problem depends partly on the college and department policies. University policy needs

to be explicit. Not every department needs to accept every form of scholarship. But, put something explicit that college and department contextualize this in detail.

- xiv. Don (in chat): For Scholarship of Integration: Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses. Elaborating: Comes back to Boyer – what does this mean?
- xv. Al: What is an example of “Engagement”? Don – also concerned with boundary with service. Kirsty: The scholarship that leads to the engagement? Barbara: Writing articles about what you are doing – eg developing a center.
- xvi. Jalal: Some of what you do in engineering that might be engagement might not be able to be published because, for instance, you did a report for Boeing but it must remain confidential. Separate point – you might be engaging students in research, so is that also teaching and learning? We should provide guidance to help others.
- xvii. Rebecca: Kristy has good way of talking about impact
- xviii. Gary in Chat: scholarship of engagement includes community/ non-university
 - 1. mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.
- xix. Leslie in chat: An operative word in the Scholarship of Application is "practice." Wouldn't documenting it for RSCA just involve describing what you're doing it in your narrative and documenting it?
- xx. Gary: engagement is about partnership and reciprocity, co-learning – do we need to name this more specifically or can we be more squishy with the language.
- xxi. Barbara in chat: Part of what Don provided in the URL: “The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/ or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact.”
- xxii. Leslie in chat: Examples of evidence might include: communications (written, oral or electronic) with demonstrated positive impact on the university, discipline, government, industry and/or the public sector; consultations to external practitioners, organizations or governments
- xxiii. Boyer is huge in nursing and in health fields – but Scholarship of Engagement doesn't necessarily produce a product. Lot of the examples have to do with service. You may not be writing a book or something. It's about your practice – you explain in your narrative how you are using your expertise in addressing a need.
- xxiv. Barbara: Just doing something with the community is not RSCA. It's the publications that go with it.

- xxv. Jalal in chat: RSCA that engage colleagues, students, and community and have impact in enhancing scholarship in the discipline.
- xxvi. Kirsty in chat: Engaged scholarship is more than a report on your project or an Excel spreadsheet of hours logged. Engaged scholarship makes links to disciplinary knowledge and methods while honoring community-based knowledge. This research explores questions of mutual interest and impact with a community partner. Participating in this type of scholarship not only broadens the sorts of questions faculty routinely ask in their work, it also increases the means of measuring, mapping and reporting the answers. This results in a synthesis of expertise and contributions made by faculty, staff, students and community partners.

Carole Beere has written a whole book on this. It's more than volunteering, it must have a scholarly product.'

- xxvii. Don: Evidence needs to include both the mode (e.g., peer reviewed article) as well as the process (e.g., action research done in a school).
- xxviii. Gary: we need to include too that this is a reciprocal relationship.
- xxix. Leslie: Is it really about *successful* grant proposal – because univ recognizes you whether or not the grant is funded.
- xxx. Jalal in chat on Scholarship of Engagement: RSCA that engage colleagues, students, and community and have impact in enhancing scholarship in the discipline. For instance, in engineering, they are working on building better rockets with local Long Beach businesses – and this benefits both the benefit and our research. And the evidence of this might be a technical report.
- xxxi. Kirsty: Have mixed feelings about the grant proposals. Leans toward expecting that they be successful. If someone submits an article that is not accepted, we do not count that right?
- xxxii. Barbara: does size of the grant matter?
- xxxiii. Al: I don't think so.
- xxxiv. Gary: would like to include program evaluation – lots of folks are doing this.
- xxxv. Al: Are we ok with Scholarship of Engagement?
- xxxvi. Rebecca: we might benefit from someone with more expertise in scholarship of engagement. We might be a little conservative with our examples and might not be really clarifying enough of the questions that have been happening on campus.
- xxxvii. Al: in spring, finish RSCA and on to service. We then can turn to Section 3, which might often be where issues of bias surface. If we get Sections 1-3 done, we might send it to the senate so they can begin looking at that.

Submitted: December 3, 2021 by Richard Marcus and Don Haviland