

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Minutes

Meeting #8

February 5, 2021

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Robin Richesson, David Wallace, Praveen Sinha, Jalal Torabzadeh, Leslie Andersen, Norbert Schurer, Terry Ross, Don Haviland, Kirsty Fleming, Jo Brocato

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

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

2. Announcements

- Awards policy – probably splitting off advising and mentoring into separate award for one person.
- Faculty Council should soon be sending out survey re: RTP.

3. RTP Policy revision

- Discuss 1.1 University Mission and Vision
 - Current: "California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world."
 - Here are some possible alternative we could consider.
 - If we simply replace with the equivalent mission and vision text (from the link above), 1.1 would be:
"CSULB enriches the lives of its students and its surrounding community through globally informed, high impact educational experiences with superior teaching, research, creative activity, and action for the public good. California State University, Long Beach will be a force for good at the forefront of public education in California and the world."
 - If that sounds a little stilted, one alternative could be:
"California State University, Long Beach strives to be a force for good by enriching the lives of our students and surrounding community through globally informed, high impact educational experiences, superior teaching, research, creative activity, and action for the public good."
 - A different approach, still from the link above, would be something like:
 - "California State University, Long Beach and this policy both reflect these values:
 - Teaching and learning are at the center of who we are and all we do.
 - Compassion, creativity, and innovation characterize our culture.
 - Diversity is our strength.
 - The public good is our responsibility."

- Discussion:
 - Move to table until policy parameters are clearer
- Discuss place of mentoring and advising (2.1, 2.2, 2.3)
 - Types of mentoring and advising:
 - Mentoring/advising leading to faculty or shared RSCA product (RSCA)
 - Mentoring/advising *not* leading to faculty or shared RSCA product (Instruction)
 - Non-thesis RSCA mentoring/training of students
 - Personal advising/mentoring of students
 - Academic advising of students
 - Professional advising/mentoring other faculty
 - Informal advising/mentoring other faculty
 - (opt) chair advising, alumni advising, professional organization advising
 - Advising faculty, students on other campuses
 - [getting assigned time for any of these activities]
 - Norbert: advising as part of a class vs independent of a class
 - David W: People will put graduate students in instructionally-related activities, others in labs, others in service. We should create the opportunities for college policies to clarify. Eg In CLA we treat Honors theses mentoring as Instructionally-Related Activity. (Others agreed)
 - Kirsty: Some of this conversation about advising and mentoring comes from the cultural taxation on some faculty members, so if we can get language in there to allow colleges to credit for what is sometimes a significant load. That might need to be explicit or else it can be dismissed by committee because it is not a formal mentee. (Others agreed.)
 - Leslie (in chat): Yes, we tell all of our candidates; no double dipping! (Others agreed.) However, we do counsel them that they can put different ASPECTS of the same activity in different places, if appropriate -
 - Richard (in chat): Agreeing. More clarity on where it fits to avoid double dipping is important, but affording colleges the space to formally define these different forms. Though, if we are explicit about cultural taxation and informal advising it obligates colleges to include it SOMEWHERE.
 - Norbert: Perhaps we can add instruction on how to document that.
 - Jo: Logging advising times. That would be a way of documenting it.
 - Don: Somewhere we want to speak to: a lot of our faculty of color are doing off campus work. On informal advising: maybe if you have workload assigned?

- Kirsty: Mentoring vs Advising. Do we need to define the difference or let others use their own definition?
- Norbert: Is advising a formal set-up and mentoring informal? Response: Since we have formal mentoring problems that might make that muddier.
- David: there is diminishing value in making this a comprehensive list. The university document should kick this down to the college documents. Give a general statement about each, clear examples that likely do apply across the university, and then add an invitation to specify other sorts of things.
- Leslie: it is a difficult balance between increasing guidance and allowing for differences between departments/colleges.
- Jo: Some of this needs to be department level as it is too varied.
- Jalal: It needs to be decided at the local level. We should add that it must be in the document, but not dictate how that is decided on in the university policy
- Norbert: add a paragraph in 2.0 or to add a 2.4 to say we recognize the importance of mentoring and advising and recognizes that it is distinguished where it fits into these categories, college and department policies are required to give these parameters (and we give the “such as” list or a table)
- Leslie: 2.0. More effusive paragraph, more emphasis on dept / college responsibility on this
 - Proposal to add: The work of advising and mentoring is often discipline-specific, cutting across multiple areas of evaluations. Colleges and departments shall articulate expectations and possibilities for advising and mentorship as appropriate to each area of evaluation.
- Norbert: add a sentence “advising and mentorship may fall into any of these categories so each college must specify...”
- David W (supported by Don): “as appropriate to each area of evaluation.”
- Kirsty: Do we throw it out and ask: what would an RTP document for the future look like? (Not a lot of support)
- Kirsty: why would we have such a strong statement for mentoring and advising when we don’t for other things?
- Jo: in that first sentence perhaps change to “discipline – specific”
- Leslie: It is clear what people want, but maybe at the college and department level. The university level less proscribed. Bigger, overarching statements and ideals.
- Richard: as a middle ground. Create more *obligations* for departments and colleges but not the specific language or placement.

- Robin: Concur with Richard. We can't solve that problem given the differences between disciplines.
- Kirsty: I agree. It is making those statements that guide or even prescribe what departments must delve into. For instance: do we value different forms of scholarship such as "teaching" scholarship. The university values it and we name it in the university document, but the department can say what that looks like in our world.
- Jo. Agreed. The obligation to do that at the department level clear.
- Richard (in chat): if we were to actually start categorizing the list we created into RSCA, Instruction and similar specificity it will never pass its way out of Senate.
- Leslie: Let AS Exec know it is the feeling of this committee that we should make the university policy less specific. Maybe the examples for departments and universities to use are in the table form that Kirsty suggested.
- Richard and Kirsty: We make the (higher order) statement that mentoring and advising (and all the other areas) are valued and give examples, but *how* it is valued and where it counts are up to the colleges and departments.
- Leslie. Concur. Give guiding principles, concepts to emphasize, etc. This is consistent with the open forum seeking clarity.
- Al: I agree that most of the feedback are things to address at the college or department level, but equity and diversity needs to be mentioned even if in guiding principles. There is concern about committees, who is on them, how they are trained, etc.
- Al: To do next meeting?
 - Robin: there are overarching themes for the guiding principles: not recognized areas of RSCA, cultural taxation, etc. Do we have that list? If not, we need to create one.
 - Kirsty: What are the big ideas? where do these guiding principles take us, what is the language? It is often true that scholarship is different and are not very friendly of that; can we make a more inclusive statement for the community-based or etc. forms of RSCA? You could infuse equity and diversity, e.g., do we reward people who are knowledgeable about equity and diversity and its contribution to campus?
 - Richard: Can we end next time with a list of guiding principles and draft language / sentences for them?
 - **Conclusion: guiding principles or "big ideas" that are missing from or needing revision in the current document.**