

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Minutes

Meeting #7

December 4, 2020

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Rebecca Sittler, David Wallace, Praveen Sinha, ,
Jalal Torabzadeh, Leslie Andersen, David Stewart, Terry Ross, Don Haviland, Robin
Richesson, Kirsty Fleming

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

- Agenda approved without revisions.
- Minutes approved without revisions.

2. Announcements (SPOT revision follow-up)

- Concern for how heavily SPOT forms are weighted, using them in a summative fashion.
- Proposal: two or three items that would be the same for everyone, but the individual instructor could pick additional questions from a pool of questions.
- Praveen: Concern it would be unjust to rely on one (or few) numbers
- Kirsty: Seeing files from all departments, there is clearly an overreliance on a single numeric score. The issue is around how you use the SPOT, the context, and how you use other information. How to get at: don't just use - or misuse- this instrument.
- Dave: They are also used for lecturers and ETF. The purpose: The intent is that faculty are taking into account what they are getting. They are not just evaluative, they are formative. We have handicapped our using them formatively by sticking with the eight questions.
- A small number of people can pilot this - perhaps a dozen.
- Praveen: I understand how it can be narrative enhancing.

3. RTP Policy revision

- discussion about yesterday's campus RTP forum
 - Rebecca: narrow vs more open approaches. There were not a lot of surprises. Faculty struggle with department vs college vs university RTP.
 - Rebecca: departments are very different. Some are very specific, some aren't. Most comments were on the department policy. There is a place to signal more openness on how service is defined. More acknowledgement.
 - Leslie: Group 1. The more we talk about this, the more I think the problem is with the college and department policies. Like Don's suggestion that the university could use more on mission and vision statement and guiding principles, not defining. Our emphasis should be giving guidance to colleges and departments.

- Jalal: Bring me back to 20 years ago. Group 3. More of the discussion was related to college/department level issues. Concur with Leslie, the university policy can emphasize and guide to put what the faculty want. How we can implement guiding principles.
- Terry: I came away with the feeling that some felt the distribution of service is relatively limited.
- Don: With Leslie. How to update the college and department level. The university might need to update its mission and vision. It is not in line with what the provost and president are saying.
- Don: Concern that RSCA is not part of our workload. What counts for RSCA. Community based research and scholarship of engagement. Service and lack of engagement. Those might be areas where we might tinker with the standards to signal – do we define RSCA? Expected service and variation by service? There might be opportunity to pick what people were talking about.
- Al: 1. When I go through the document it is pretty limited part of the document. (Supporting Leslie). 1.1 and 1.2 we could change to reflect the mission, Beach 2030, etc. and give some direction to colleges and departments. Section 2. The only specifics. Section 3 is responsibilities. There was a discussion on equity and the public good. Perhaps this is where this is addressed. Committee membership, training of committees, etc.
- Dave: Section 8. Statement about what to do. Covers things like financial collapse and pandemics, but perhaps make it more visible. Agree with the dated mission statement.
- Dave: Research on Teaching unclear if you are not in the College of Education. Could be some fiddling to include research on teaching can be under research. Need more interplay between college and university policies?
- Dave: Service section: we could be more specific. Promotion to Full evidence of service to the university (emphasize 5.4 more). The community could be understood as the academic community. Kirsty: COTA does that by having policy presented as a table. A row is the university statement in column 1, the college-level statement in column 2, and the department-level statement in column 3. Rebecca: I can confirm that the 3 column format makes it much clearer for candidates and reviewers.
- Richard: Staying with the framing, not the nitty gritty, do we want to go further to frame or encourage the inclusion of particular activities? High Impact Practices, the URM faculty tax, etc. Community also of work space

- Don: Concurs with Richard. If we don't take a strong stand, some will pick this up and some won't. We need strong signaling. The second group talked about all of the extra advising faculty of color are doing and it has to be recognized, honored, and rewarded.
- Al: We will be going to our Faculty Councils next term to discuss.
- Kirsty: I agree with Richard. I have been listening to it with that lens but the SPOT instruments (for instance) are themselves a biased instruments. Yes in service, but also in RSCA. The kind of RSCA for faculty of color in innovative areas often isn't consistent with the traditional formats we are replicating. How is this going to help us be more equitable. Richard is right to make it more explicit.
- Al: Concerns were raised about conduct on committees.
- Rebecca: In Group 3. People thought it was a good idea that we need guidelines for RTP Committees and more interpretation. Some colleges have this in place and some do not.
- Praveen: Question for Kirsty: What do you mean replicating ourselves? In accounting we do similar things and expect to be replicating. Academic research requires replication of ourselves. Kirsty: No, it doesn't require representation of ourselves. Disciplines are evolving. A vacant faculty position does not need to be the same. Maybe look at the new fields. In so doing, need new RSCA. Praveen: Understood.
- Al: We will not be looking at hiring decisions, but after a department hires, what kind of scholarly activity is something we need to look at.
- Jalal: Modifying mission and vision will change focus across levels. We need clarification of definitions at the university level. Guidelines. Important to consider the change of demography of our faculty and their expectations. That is a college/dept level, but there is room to signal at the university document level.
- Kirsty: Al, that was my point. If our rtp only rewards "traditional" research then it goes against certain types of hiring. Plus the criteria used for hiring should be aligned with the rep criteria.
- Jalal: 3.3 discusses the criteria of the department, but what if the department doesn't include this or is unclear?
- Al: We are discussing Breadth, but a third of the items were about being more specific. Kirsty: I don't think it is a conundrum. It is the levels. A university policy can't be specific, but it can be about how you put in language that the principles are clearer. We can make a statement that all of these types of scholarship count. The college and department can indicate that specificity.

- Don: <https://www.csulb.edu/about-csulb/about-csulb/our-mission-vision-values> match of “superior” and excellent.
- Dave: Is the outcome of 2030 process a new mission statement? Passed by Senate? Kirsty: if so, whatever actions need to be taken need to be taken.
- Al: we are unsure of our mission. Our vision is clouded.
- <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/about-the-csu/Pages/mission.aspx>
- Kirsty: I would take this further. WE are charged with this policy, but not most impacted and not the most diverse group. Where can we get the input from those who are most impacted?
- Al: Something from FC and CFA? Don: Affinity groups (Latinx Faculty Affinity Association, etc). There must be institutions that are doing this more comprehensively. Can we identify them?
- Rebecca: feedback from TT Faculty who are afraid. Al: Through FC? Rebecca: maybe FC could conduct a survey?
- Jalal: The University policy for a very diverse institution like CSULB cannot be very specific. However, it can require the department and college policies to be specific and provide specificity for various areas of evaluation and criteria in the policy and in its implementation.
- Kirsty: We are collecting from the first year faculty learning communities. 2 sessions in January. Chairs will be there, but you will be able to write with anonymity. Don is an advisory member on these learning communities.
- Praveen: We are having college level problems, but this might not be the right place. Foreign journals that are junk but are making the case they are good.
- Discussion: how to handle “junk journals” vs “open access” etc. Difficult to separate out often. Don: In Group 1 the question of paying for publication. ORSP has funds to pay for a journal to get published. Al to ask Tracey Mayfield.
- Al will meet with Executive Committee and report back to the Council.
- initial discussion about next steps
 - New Faculty learning communities in January will give feedback.
 - Al: Are we ok returning in January to start working on some sections? Richard: Concerned that we should wait for more input from FCs, learning communities, and affinity groups. Terry: It is focused on a start.
 -
 - Discussion: how to handle “junk journals” vs “open access” etc. Difficult to separate out often. Don: In Group 1 the question of paying for

publication. ORSP has funds to pay for a journal to get published. AI to ask Tracey Mayfield.

- Work with FC to gain more input from junior faculty who may be unwilling to speak with senior faculty around.
- AI will meet with Executive Committee and report back to the Council.

Next scheduled meeting is Feb 5, 2021 (or Jan 22, 2021).