1. **Committee Chair**: William Abbott

2. **Committee Membership**: William Abbott, Marsha Alibrandi, Janice Dunn (replaced Aaron Perkus late Fall ’09 and Spring ’10), Paul Fitzgerald S.J., Carol Fackler, Joel Goldfield, Angela Harkins, Aaron Perkus (Fall’09) Mukesh Sud (Sp’10), Vishnu Vinekar (Fall’09), Brian Walker.

   Invited guests for entire year:
   - Larry Miners of Center for Academic Excellence
   - Roben Torosyan of Center for Academic Excellence
   - Matthew Brennan of FUSA

3. **Number of meetings attended by each committee member**: William Abbott (6), Marsha Alibrandi (5), Janice Dunn (3), Paul Fitzgerald S.J. *(4), Carol Fackler (5), Joel Goldfield* *(0), Angela Harkins (6), Aaron Perkus (2), Mukesh Sud (2), Vishnu Vinekar (3), Brian Walker (6)

   *Please note*: Joel Goldfield was a member of FDEC for the entire year. However, Chair Abbott was unaware of this, and so neglected to inform Joel of the meeting dates.

   *Please note*: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald was not informed of the October meeting, and possibly not of the September meeting either.

4. **Dates of meetings**: September 17, October 15, November 12, December 3, February 8, April 8.

5. **List of principal topics considered by the committee**

   **IDEA Implementation**

   The FDEC sent two members (Abbott and Alibrandi) to the IDEA implementation *ad hoc* committee of the Academic Council. Bill and Marsha reported regularly to the FDEC on the work of the IDEA committee, which was empowered to “consider all issues pertinent to switching to the IDEA evaluation form and system.” [AC 3/9/09].

   The FDEC discussed and gave feedback and information on the various issues surrounding this switching process, notably on the continuance of the yellow sheets, on who would control the data provided by IDEA, and on whether the forms should be administered in-class, online, or both. Questions asked by the FDEC assisted the IDEA ad hoc committee in its investigations; comments made by FDEC members similarly helped the ad hoc committee in its decisions. For the final list of the *ad hoc* committee’s motions, presented to the Academic Council on April 6th, see Appendix A.
Development Days

The FDEC planned and carried out two Faculty Development Days: one on December 11th and one on May 7th.

The topic of the December 11 Development Day was “Using Technology in the Classroom”, and featured Marice Rose and Jessica McCullough (ArtStor) Scott Lacy (The Paperless Classroom), Elizabeth Langran (Google Tools), Yasin Ozcelik (Wikis), and Jay Rozgonyi and Jeff Potocki (Programs and Services). Approximately forty people attended, and the general consensus was that this Development Day was informative and helpful.

The topic of the May 7 Development Day was “Global Citizenship”, and featured plenary-session presentations by University Chaplain Gerry Blaszczak, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, VPMC Rama Sudhakar, Roben Torosyan of CAE, and Dean of Academic Engagement Beth Boquet. Following the plenary session were breakout sessions on the application of global citizenship in the classroom; these sessions featured David McFadden (History) and Dean Edna Wilson of University College, Ashley Byun-McKay (Biology), and Winston Tellis (School of Business). Approximately 30 people attended, and despite some scheduling difficulties, the general consensus on this Development Day was also positive.

For both of these Development Days, the FDEC owes great thanks to SVPAA Fitzgerald for providing food and drink, and to Larry Miners and Roben Torosyan of CAE for many forms of logistical assistance.

Advising

At the request of Dean of Student Engagement Beth Boquet, Chair Abbott discussed advising with her and presented materials from her to the FDEC on how advising might be improved at Fairfield. The FDEC discussed this material at its meeting of November 12, and sent Dean Boquet feedback; see appendix B.

Fall 2009 Student Evaluation Form Problem

At its February meeting the FDEC discussed the incorrect stuffing of the evaluation envelopes for fall 2009; a number of envelopes had the wrong forms (different faculty member name, different course number and CRN) put into them, and some envelopes did not have enough forms. Also, the printer broke down in CN&S, and forms arrived with blocks of courses missing; some of the sheets were also out of order. Dean Joan Weiss asked the FDEC for help in avoiding these problems in the spring semester.

Faculty Research

At its April meeting, the FDEC discussed ways in which it might be involved in the SVPAA’s and the CAE’s efforts to continue and support faculty research and writing. We could, perhaps, help update the research activity/funding website, which would include successful grant applications; we could ask Curt Naser to use EIDOS resources to set up a live link; we could encourage CAE to set up a Research Bureau, similar to the Teacher’s Bureau.
6. **List of the decisions taken by the committee**

- On September 17, the FDEC sent Aaron Perkus as its representative to Ann Stehney’s Assessment Coordinating Team. (After Aaron left the FDEC, four months elapsed, and in May Ann asked Bill Abbott to serve in Aaron’s place. Bill agreed).

- On September 17, the FDEC decided to hold a Faculty Development Day on December 11th. On October 15, the FDEC decided that the topic of that Development Day should be “Using Technology in the Classroom”.

- On February 8, the FDEC decided that its chairman will write a letter to all faculty, giving clear instructions to check the evaluation envelopes before distributing them to the class. The Committee also decided to have a second copy of the letter stapled to the outside of the evaluation envelopes to remind faculty to check for the correct number of sheets and the correct course and section.

- On February 8, the FDEC decided to hold a Faculty Development Day on global citizenship.

- On April 8 the FDEC decided that the Global Citizenship Faculty Development Day would be held on May 7th, 1:00 to 3:30.

7 **Anticipated effects of these decisions**

- The anticipated effects of the Development Day decisions were that faculty would become more aware of, and better able to implement in their teaching, cutting-edge classroom technology and the concept of global citizenship.

- It was anticipated that the FDEC chair’s letter advising faculty check their evaluation forms and envelopes would help prevent problems such as occurred with the fall 2009 forms.

- It is anticipated that having an FDEC representative on Ann Stehney’s Assessment Coordinating Team will facilitate the capacity of both Committee and Team to help carry out assessment more effectively at Fairfield.

8 **Unfinished business:** None.

9 **Future agenda items**

   a) Organizing, in conjunction with CAE, the administration, and other faculty members, the education of the entire student body, the entire faculty, and the administration on the nature of the IDEA form and system. This will involve workshops, classroom visits, and a media campaign.
b) Developing, in collaboration with CAE, a set of University-wide practices for peer review of teaching, so that peer review, as a part of overall teaching evaluation, will have as prominent and measurable a role as student evaluation currently does.

c) Possible topics for future Faculty Development Days:
   1. Academic Advising (strongly suggested for our fall DevDay, and we might want to have it in late October)
   2. Changes to the First-Year Experience (related to advising)
   3. Academic Integrity (Plagiarism, etc.)

APPENDIX A

IDEA Subcommittee Fairfield University

MOTIONS FOR THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL, April 6, 2010

1. Moved, 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.

2. Moved, that the IDEA system be funded by the office of the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

3. Moved, that the Fairfield University Center for Academic Excellence be charged with holding 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.

4. Moved, 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. The procedure for collecting hardcopy forms shall be the same as with our current forms, viz. the instructor designates a student to distribute and collect the forms from the students in the class, while the instructor leaves the class. The designated student then takes the forms to the office of the appropriate dean. There the same secretarial staff who distributed the forms will receive the forms, and will arrange each course section’s stack with each form
facing up and forward, with the blue faculty form on top, also facing up and forward. The staff will then box and mail the forms to IDEA. When the results (i.e. the Diagnostic Report Forms) come back, they shall be sent to the On-Campus Coordinator in the SVPAA’s office. The OCC will be responsible for distributing the Diagnostic Reports to all faculty.

5. Moved, 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.

6. Moved, 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.

7. Moved, 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, by means of an AC subcommittee or of a charge to the FDEC, commence investigation whether University-wide use of the yellow sheets should be discontinued at the end of spring semester 2012.

8. Moved, the first two pages of every faculty member’s IDEA Diagnostic Report Form be accessible by the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs, by that faculty member’s dean, by that faculty member’s department chairperson, and by the Academic Division of the Fairfield University Student Association.

9. Moved, that any Fairfield University faculty member who does not wish the first two pages of her or his IDEA Diagnostic Report Form released to the Academic Division of the Fairfield University Student Association, must inform the Fairfield University IDEA On-Campus Coordinator (OCC) of that preference, whereupon the OCC shall not release this information to FUSA. The results of the first two pages of the Diagnostic Report Form for every faculty member who does not so inform the OCC of her/his preference not to release this information shall be accessible to FUSA.

10. Moved, that the On-Campus Coordinator for IDEA will be an employee in 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, and to other university officials in accordance with the policy stated in motion 8, above.

11. Moved, that the Academic Division of the Fairfield University Student Association be requested, if and when they publish results of faculty Diagnostic Report Forms, to group faculty results by level of representation, viz,

- If fewer than 50 percent of the students respond, the faculty member’s results shall be placed in the category “inadequate to assure representativeness”.
- If this figure is 50-64%, the results must be placed under “may not be representative”.
- If this figure is 65-74%, the results must be placed under “are probably representative”.
- If this figure is 75% or over, the results must be placed under “are representative”.

If FUSA does not accede to and carry out every part of the Academic Council’s request as stated above, the OCC shall not release any faculty member’s Diagnostic Report Form data to FUSA or to any other student organization.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

APPENDIX B

Advice

Feedback from the FDEC at its meeting of November 12, 2009

Problems:
I. Inadequate advising
   a) Faculty advisors know about their own field and major, but little about other fields
   b) Faculty advisors often can’t help with overseas programs
   c) Faculty don’t know about which summer/off-campus courses can receive transfer credit, and what requirements they can fulfill.
   d) Freshmen used to have help with how to go onto the computer and register; they’d meet in the library computer room and have computer-savvy advisors walking up and down helping them out. This isn’t happening any more.
   e) Freshmen don’t have hard copy of the course offerings booklet. This is an inconvenience when he/she is in the advisor’s office.
   f) Advisees don’t have much information about the various courses.
II. Lack of training for advisors
   a) In the Business School, new faculty are put into advising roles with no knowledge of the core requirements or anything else outside of Business.
   b) Dawn Quintiliani and Sue Peterson offer workshops to CAS faculty; apparently such workshops are not offered the Schools faculty.

Suggestions:
1) Workshops are needed for all Schools, not just CAS.
2) Advisors need to meet and exchange information.
3) Perhaps advisors could specialize. Why should every advisor have to know everything? Different departments have different needs, since some departments teach a much higher percentage of core courses than others.
   a) Major Field advisors, who can do deep mentoring based on thorough knowledge of the subject matter
   b) Administrative/Registration advisors, who know all about core requirements, registration, etc.
   c) Study Abroad advisors, who know all about every study-abroad program and how to sign up for them.
4) Perhaps a brief advising video, which explains all the basics of course registration, and which students can look at again and again if they wish, and which advisors can also look at.
5) Perhaps have advising blogs, where students can exchange information.
6) Put professors’ syllabi online or in hardcopy outside their doors, so that students can find out more about the courses.
7) Whatever happened to the Media Center’s two-minute video clips of professors introducing their courses? Are these clips generally available to students?
8) There needs to be greater coordination between Student Affairs and the Academic Division.
9) Perhaps let students look at course evaluations. The new IDEA form will give a much better picture of what students learn in various courses. It is to be hoped that IDEA will be put into practice next fall.
Add to the sample Academic Advising Syllabus:

- Advice on how to find out more about courses: LIST the various ways to access information:
  a) The Course Catalogue; how do you find it online?
  b) The professors’ video clips of their courses; how do you get at them?
  c) The Core Unmasked presentations in late October.