Present: Professors Peter Bayers, Steve Bayne (AC Executive Secretary), Chris Bernhardt, Jocelyn Boryczka, Betsy Bowen, Joe Dennin, Johanna Garvey, Dennis Hodgson, Doug Lyon, Dawn Massey, Irene Mulvey (General Faculty Secretary), Rona Preli (AC Chair), Susan Rakowitz, Tracey Robert, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Michael Tucker, Min Xu.

Administrators: Deans Robbin Crabtree, Susan Franzosa, Jeanne Novotny, Edna Wilson, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald.

FUSA Representative: Alison MacNeill

Guest: Professor Al Benney

0. Chair Preli called the meeting to order at 3:35.

1. Presidential courtesy.

SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that, although it was early, graduate enrollments were strong, about 35% ahead in applications, and undergraduate deposits were at 292 compared to 223 last year at this time. Target is 940 undergraduates so we hope to have 1040 by May 5th. The Fairfield University awards dinner has already raised over 1.25 million this year.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Reminder that the next meeting is May 3rd. In case we do not finish the agenda, pencil in May 19th for another meeting – exact time and date to be decided on the 3rd if needed.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.


Prof. Doug Lyon was added to the list of members present and deleted from the absent list. Prof. Dennin’s name was misspelled on page 5.

MOTION [Massey/Robert] To approve the minutes of 3/29/10 as corrected.

MOTION PASSED unanimously with 3 abstentions.
4. Council Committee Reports.

a. IDEA subcommittee

After a preliminary discussion on how to proceed, it was decided to go through the motions proposed by the committee one at a time starting with motion 2. Prof. Mulvey noted there is Journal of Record language involved which would need to be drafted and voted on next time. The ACEC will work on the JoR language after seeing what motions were passed today. Prof Preli noted that motions 8, 9 and 11 in the packet are different than the original motions submitted and discussed last month.

Note: The motions from the IDEA Subcommittee are on pages 12 and 13 of the packet for today’s meeting which is reflected in the numbering below. Some of the motions were altered, as written below, before being voted on.

**MOTION 2 [Fitzgerald/Massey]** Moved, that the IDEA system be funded by the office of the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

**MOTION 2 PASSED unanimously.**

**MOTION 3 [Tucker/Bowen]** that the Fairfield University Center for Academic Excellence is requested to hold workshops for the education of Fairfield University faculty on the comprehension and use of the IDEA student-evaluation-of-teaching form, the IDEA Faculty Information form, and the IDEA Diagnostic Report form. All faculty currently familiar with these IDEA forms who volunteer to help with these workshops shall be compensated in the same amount currently paid under the Teacher’s Bureau format, with the funds for this purpose coming from the office of the SVPAA. A special workshop/session will be offered to current members of the Rank and Tenure Committee.

Prof Massey asked if the merit committees should be included in the workshops.

**MOTION 3 PASSED unanimously.**

**MOTION 4 [Massey/Garvey]** that the persons responsible for the work involved in distributing the hardcopy IDEA forms shall be the secretarial staff who currently process our existing forms.

**MOTION 4 PASSED unanimously.**

**MOTION 5 [Massey/Shea]** that all faculty members will, for the four semesters fall 2010, spring 2011, fall 2011, and spring 2012, be offered the option of administering IDEA hard-copy in class, or online. Upon commencement of the spring semester 2012, the Academic Council will investigate, by surveys and any other means deemed necessary, whether to switch to all-online, switch to all-hardcopy, or continue with both options.
Prof Mulvey pointed out this was different from the motion we discussed last month and an improvement on that earlier motion. Prof Massey wondered if the spring of 2012 was a bit late to reconsider if we were planning to go all online for the fall of 2012. Prof Tucker said we could determine then if a delay to go all online was needed. SVPAA Fitzgerald observed that there was much flexibility in the motion.

**MOTION 5 PASSED unanimously**

**MOTION 6 [Shea/Garvey]:** that the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee will send a special note to the Rank and Tenure Committee, informing them that the results from the first two years of IDEA use should be interpreted with caution, owing to faculty and student inexperience in using IDEA. The caution would also apply to consideration of IDEA results in relation to evaluation for merit increases.

Prof Bernhardt asked if junior faculty should be warned that the results may not be evidence of teaching effectiveness. Prof Garvey noted that the 1\textsuperscript{st} 2 years would be a learning curve on how to use the new forms particularly for untenured faculty. Prof Bayers said that as people put together their narrative they would explain the IDEA results. Prof Mulvey noted that people make mistakes and may mess up using the forms initially and so the results would not reflect what they should. SVPAA Fitzgerald indicated that Rank and Tenure makes holistic judgments and does not overly focus on numerical data such as averages. There is much more than student evaluations involved in decisions on teaching effectiveness. He is in favor of the motion. Dean Franzosa noted that the evaluations would be part of a merit application.

**MOTION 6 PASSED unanimously.**

**MOTION 7 [Mulvey/Garvey] that there shall be continued use of the “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations for the semesters fall 2010, spring 2011, fall 2011, and spring 2012. Commencing in the fall of 2011 the Academic Council will commence investigation whether University-wide use of the yellow sheets should be continued.

Prof Hodgson asked if the yellow sheets were available online. Prof Shea noted that one can add in questions of one’s own including the ones on the yellow sheets. Prof Massey is very much in favor of the yellow sheet questions which she finds very helpful in analyzing the data. They could be mandatory online. Prof Mulvey noted that the actual hardcopy yellow sheets will continue for at least 4 semesters. Prof Rakowitz stated that some flexibility was needed in getting qualitative information. Dean Crabtree spoke in favor of the motion. Using the yellow sheets during the transition is flexible and there is a need for a standard system for 2 years for monitoring in a formal way. Prof Massey pointed out that the yellow sheets were formative not summative.
MOTION [Bayne/Robert] to CALL the QUESTION
MOTION PASSED unanimously.

MOTION 7 PASSED unanimously.

Prof Mulvey pointed out that Motions 8 and 9 on page 13 of the packet are entirely different from the motions from the IDEA Subcommittee that we discussed at our last meeting and that there were problems making the data available to all these people immediately. Prof Rakowitz agreed that it is dangerous to allow the data to be given out to so many persons. While the data can be important for mentoring, the AC should be careful authorizing data distribution particularly in the merit world we are in.

Original Motions 8 and 9 in the packet were replaced with;

MOTION [Mulvey/Dennin] The practices currently in place will become policy with regard to teaching evaluation data. Teaching evaluation data belongs to the individual faculty member. IDEA will only send data to the OCC, as the authorized contact person. The OCC will have access to the data but may not release it to anyone except the individual faculty member without the faculty member’s permission. The AC will continue to consider the question of accessibility of teaching evaluation data beyond the individual faculty member and revisit the issue after IDEA has been in use for four semesters to decide if the policy should be revised.

Prof Rakowitz spoke in favor of the motion. The IDEA results should only be counted as 30% to 40% in evaluating teaching. Until there are broader mechanisms in place, we should wait in distributing results. SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke against the motion. Many programs rely heavily on adjuncts, lecturers, and professors of the practice and these faculty members should be evaluated quickly. Colleagues of tenure track assistant professors should see the results early for mentoring purposes. He sees no problem waiting on tenured faculty. Alison MacNeill said that FUSA had worked hard on these issues and the Sophomore senators in particular were eager to publish results. They would not be happy with no access to the data. Prof Tucker was in favor of the motion. It does not preclude junior faculty from sharing the results with colleagues. This would be one way of showing teaching effectiveness but weighing it 100% would hinder the development of other methods. For the students, there is much information about teaching available but it is disorganized. Prof Mulvey spoke in favor of the motion. It’s not that the data will be unavailable, but an individual who wants the data will have to ask the faculty member; for example chairs for adjuncts. FUSA should get information about teaching but we must be cautious and this is not the appropriate information. Dean Franzosa spoke against the motion. There is the question of asking to see the forms for tenure track evaluations versus supervising obligation and caring about the nature of instruction, She commends the student representative for asking for the data. It is an openness versus secrecy question while we try to stay in the middle of the continuum. MacNeill indicated the students wanted to put 4 or 5 questions on the form and to publish the results of them. Prof Hodgson spoke in favor of the motion. He stated that adjuncts should not be renewed
without such information. He pointed out that under the current policy FUSA gets the information unless the box on the envelope is checked. MacNeill said that the students would like to get all the questions and then pick out the ones they want. Prof Massey spoke in favor of the motion and pointed out that there are other mechanisms for getting information but that it is always useful to get additional information. Prof Bowen asked MacNeill which questions the students would prefer to have. MacNeill responded that only the ones that everyone asks which would be similar to the ones on the white sheet. SVPAA Fitzgerald asked if there was a list of current practices. He suggested an amendment would be useful.

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Rakowitz] to amend the pending motion by deleting the first sentence.

**MOTION to amend PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

MacNeill felt the process still felt closed and that the students will object to not getting the data. Dean Crabtree spoke against the motion. She felt that the distribution in the originally proposed motion 8 was appropriate; that access to aggregate data for other uses was extremely helpful; that the current system is strange and works against the faculty.

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Dennin] Teaching evaluation data belongs to the individual faculty member. IDEA will only send data to the OCC, as the authorized contact person. The OCC will have access to the data but may not release it to anyone except the individual faculty member without the faculty member’s permission. The AC will continue to consider the question of accessibility of teaching evaluation data beyond the individual faculty member and revisit the issue after IDEA has been in use for four semesters to decide if the policy should be revised.

**MOTION PASSED** 12 in favor, 4 opposed, 2 abstentions

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Massey] The ACEC will meet with representatives from FUSA before the next AC meeting to discuss ways to get meaningful teaching evaluation data to students.

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously with 1 abstension.

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Strauss] that the On-Campus Coordinator for IDEA will be a non-faculty employee reporting to the SVPAA’s Office. This person shall be responsible for receiving all data from IDEA and coordinating the storage of it. A member of the FDEC will be appointed as a formal liaison officer to the OCC. The OCC will release individual faculty members’ results to those faculty members.

This motion is a reworking of motion 10 in the packet. Prof Hodgson noted that the point about aggregate data was not addressed. It is produced now and is useful for faculty. We must protect individual data. SVPAA Fitzgerald commented that aggregate data is useful.
for R&T and helps faculty see where they fit. Prof Tucker said that it gives comparisons to other courses. SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that evaluations can be lower in tougher courses and it is useful to document that. Prof Rakowitz spoke in favor of the motion. She pointed out that the idea behind the IDEA form is to make appropriate comparisons with other courses and added that many interesting questions about aggregate data have been raised.

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

MOTION 1 [Rakowitz/Garvey] that the change from our existing opscan-sheet student-evaluation-of-teaching form and system to the IDEA form and system commence in the fall semester of 2010.

MOTION 1 PASSED unanimously.

Prof Mulvey expressed the thanks of the AC to the committee especially Prof Abbott, which announcement received a non-standing ovation.

f. Subcommittee on Guiding Principles for Phased Retirement Plan.

Prof Benney gave a brief report for the subcommittee. Currently a faculty member can retire cold turkey or take a buyout in a given age range. A phased retirement has some significant issues among them the effect early retirement would have on Social Security.

Prof Tucker asked if the health care benefits would continue. Prof Benney replied that the benefit package would continue through the phased retirement period. Prof Mulvey asked if there was talk about the buyout plan continuing. Prof Benney replied that the buyout plan was not part of their charge. He added that private institutions versus public institutions were very different and that there were significant differences among the private institutions.

MOTION [Fitzgerald/Bayne] to reorder the agenda putting 6b next.

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

6. Old Business

b. Report from the EPC on proposed change of schools policy

Prof Bayers, Chair of the EPC, reported that the EPC was aware of the AC members concerns about the policy but felt it was in the best interest of how we educate our students. The goal was appropriate in terms of what we want to do with our students. Prof Bowen suggested we should grandfather in the current students. SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that the catalog gives degree requirements and they can not be changed for current students but that policies can change. We have a track record of meeting financial need. The idea some students have of cruising through their senior year is opposed to what we
want. Prof Boryczka replied that students are not necessarily cruising through their senior year. Prof Mulvey pointed out there were a number of aspects to the policy – a memo to the AC from January, the EPC report and language for the Journal of Record. She suggested we focus on policy. Prof Hodgson had a problem with the change in policy and felt the only rationale was financial. We already have degree requirements; why are we adding to them? Why can’t the School of Business and A&S have part time students?

As time was late, the discussion and any action will be finished at a future meeting.

**MOTION [Tucker/Dennin] to adjourn.**

**MOTION PASSED unanimously.**

Respectfully Submitted,
Professor Joe Dennin