Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee
Minutes of Meeting, October 3, 2012

**Members Present:** Gwen Alphonso, Mike Andreychik, Jessica Davis, Cinthia Gannett, Meredith Kazer, Mary Frances Malone, Emily Smith (Chair).

**Guests Present:** Aaron Perkus, Pat Calderwood, Suzanna Klaf.

**Minutes of Previous Meeting.**

a) Minutes of September meeting were approved.
b) Thanks to Mike for taking them.

**University College (UC) slot on FDEC.**

a. At the last meeting, we agreed that Aaron would serve as the liaison for part-time students until a permanent decision is made.

   i. We assumed that C on C would make this decision. They have turned it back to us:

b. From Sue R.: On 4/30, the AC, on the recommendation of the C on C, passed the following: "For 2012-13, the decision on whether or not the UC slot on FDEC needs to be filled should be determined by the 2012-13 FDEC. The FDEC should make a recommendation to the Council on the permanent disposition of this committee membership slot."

   i. Now we need to make the permanent decision.
   ii. All agreed to keep Aaron for the 2012-2013 year in this slot
   iii. Recommendation for the disposition of the permanent slot:

   1. Discussion about this slot ensued, including a review of the current roster criteria:

      • Meredith Kazer suggested a motion to keep Aaron Perkus on for this year, as he had the best pulse on the UC transition.
      • Mary Frances Malone asked whether this would be the proper venue for deciding the question. Pat Calderwood suggested that part-time faculty, not students, is the appropriate subject for the FDEC.
      • Aaron Perkus stated that part-time students now had the same core as everybody else and that the rationale for having a UC liaison for the FDEC was that there be representation from those schools. He did not think that there was a rationale for an additional member to represent what was previously UC.
      • Meredith: Kazer suggested that the FDEC may want a part-time faculty member on the FDEC.
• Mary Frances Malone noted that one had to be a voting member of the general faculty to be on a committee and a part-time faculty member was not, also suggesting that the FDEC could make a proposal to have such an ex-officio member.

• Aaron Perkus mentioned that the Academic Council has created a sub-committee on part-time faculty and that Cinthia Gannett and Meredith Kazer were members of it, nothing that if the FDEC wanted to make a proposal for shared governance it could do that through them.

• Emily Smith said that it sounded like there is a lot of support for a representative for part-time faculty and asked if there were other recommendations, also stating that the committee did not have to go there.

• May Frances Malone asked to check the faculty handbook to determine the original configuration of what the committee was also checking for what the requirements were for a committee slot.

• Pat Calderwood read from faculty handbook.

• Mary Frances Malone opted to go back to the original motion, mentioning that the fact that every single school is mentioned and that Engineering is not was undesirable.

• Pat Calderwood agreed, stating that they were marginalized in many ways and that this would be the right venue to address that.

• Jessica Davis addressed the issue of representing engineering by putting them in with the sciences, if academic council was not going to provide the engine, suggesting more specificity of what “arts and sciences’ should mean and to have that parsed out.

• Pat Calderwood disagreed, saying that if engineering were clubbed in with Arts and Sciences, there would not be any representation.

• Meredith Kazer noted that Shah filled in for Mike Andreychik last year.

• Emily Smith responded that that was because it was a replacement slot. She asked whether the FDEC should put in for an eighth elected slot designated for engineering and propose an additional permanent, ex-officio, slot (like Mary Frances Malone’s) for part-time faculty; noting that the committee would need to flush out the criteria for the part-time slot.

• Meredith Kazer asked if the committee could hold off till they heard from the part-time subcommittee

• Pat Calderwood noted that Suzanna Klaf served as PT faculty.

• Suzanna Klaf stated that she got the same limited communication as the PT faculty.

• Gwen Alphonso asked if PT faculty would be interested in formal representation.

• Suzanna Klaf pointed to data on PT faculty, suggesting that if they have been teaching consistently then, in all likelihood, they had a long-time stake.

• Emily Smith agreed, staying that there would be a huge interest and that the committee would need to distinguish between graduate PT faculty and undergraduate PT faculty.
• Mary Frances Malone suggested that the FDEC make a suggestion to the part-time subcommittee.
• Aaron Perkus pointed out that if the FDEC waited till the end of the year, then there would be no effect on 2013-2014
• Emily Smith agreed.
• Aaron Perkus further mentioned that in the spirit of collaborating with them, the FDEC look for a report to be done by February/March.
• Emily Smith noted it took a few months for things to go through and that she would rather hold both and do both together as it also took a lot of paperwork.
• Gwen Alphonso asked what the mission/charge of the PT subcommittee was.
• Mary Frances Malone suggested that the committee could include something in their 5 yr report.
• Meredith Kazer answered that the PT subcommittee pertained to the status, roles, and conditions of PT faculty and were required to report back in Spring and that the Final report was due in September.
• Cinthia Gannett agreed that the committee should make some kind of effort to move things along and to include this issue.
• Emily Smith asked to whom the recommendation needed to be sent
  • Meredith Kazer answered: Bob Epstein.
• Emily Smith said that the FDEC could mention that we want to collaborate on it and we will keep working on it on our own, too.

  2. We agreed that the 8th elected slot be designated for engineering.
  3. We also agreed to continue to discuss an additional ex-officio spot for a representative for part-time faculty. We suggested sending this suggestion to the AC subcommittee (on the status, roles and conditions of part-time faculty); in the meantime, we’ll continue working on this slot.
  4. We will wait to make this recommendation until we know more about the part-time slot so that we can do them together.
    a. In the future, we need to determine language for the position for part-time students, since there are graduate part-time students, too.

IDEA

a) IDEA Timeline, etc. Tracy Immerso provided an update. She stated that: the paper option is the default for permanent and visiting faculty only; that true adjuncts would default to online, as they have in the past; and that on October 9th an email would be sent wherein faculty would be asked to opt for online or paper. She also noted that in English, adjunct faculty are required to bring their evaluations to their annual review meeting, so they have to do it. She cited data from Spring 2012: of 249 (adjuncts)
61% defaulted, and 31% of them chose paper. She stated that there were efforts underway to reach out to adjuncts, such as using their personal emails and that it might be better to have this (online option) as default, because if they do nothing the evaluations are still distributed. A question was raised as to how useful the data might be if they haven’t selected their objectives; in which she said that all objectives would be rated equally.

b) **Visit to Academic Council (issue of online default for adjunct faculty).**

Emily Smith noted that the FDEC did not recommend online forms for adjunct faculty.

Meredith Kazer stated that if provided the opportunity to visit with the Academic Council, she would be happy to do as much, as this would make it possible to get some data on adjunct and part-time faculty.

Pat Calderwood observed that although it was not her place to weigh in on the issue, she needed to observe that default paper was very lazy; instead it ought to be FDEC’s job to help the part-time faculty feel integrated into the community, to which many stated that there is a committee to deal with just that issue.

Meredith Kazer pointed out that part-time faculty are paid very poorly at the rate of $3000 or $4000 for a doctoral/nursing candidate but that this was binding as per the MOU; pointing out that expectations were very high but pay was very low. Mary Frances Malone commented that a request had been made to the salary committee to take a look at the MOU and to switch the rate between terminal degree and non-terminal.

Emily Smith invited the CAE to talk about how the FDEC could help with faculty support.

c) **CAE Workshops.** Pat Calderwood talked about two workshops: one pitched for first time users and others for faculty who’d been using it for a while but needed to use it more to improve their teaching effectiveness and for their own professional advancement.

Suzanna Klaf mentioned that the “Getting started” workshop on November 8th had only three faculty signed up so far and that getting faculty to sign up was an enduring problem as was the fact that there were still many misconceptions entertained even by those who had had the training.

Pat Calderwood observed that the training workshops feel more like a heavy-handed tool than was intended, three out of 200 faculty signing up illustrated a lot about the notion of evaluation and its rejection by the faculty. She noted that faculty appear to do what they’re required to do and then run away from it and that the persistent problem was how to get faculty to move away from this
mentality, also noting that the CAE did not have the investment in resources to effect this culture shift.

Mike Andreychik asked if the faculty were happy about the previous forms and Pat Calderwood answered in the negative.

Emily Smith congratulated the CAE on their recent newsletter and asked whether they would be able to email the chairs, announcing the workshops. She suggested that we stop fighting the process and instead try to make sure how to make it more useful, as one piece of evaluation.

d)  **FDEC IDEA subcommittee**

Emily Smith noted that the IDEA subcommittee included Tracy Immerso, Jay, MFM, and the chair of the FDEC (herself) and needed one more member. Later in the meeting the committee agreed to place Meredith Kazer as the additional member on the IDEA subcommittee.

e)  **Items from AC for FDEC to consider.** [From agenda]:

   a. maximizing response rates especially for junior faculty; evaluating summer and graduate classes; ensuring FIFs are completed; supporting adjunct faculty with IDEA; FUSA questions; course designations; evaluation for independent study courses;

   b. It was suggested that we add an IDEA tab on the portal.

   c. These items will be taken up by the IDEA subcommittee

**Streamlined Merit Process**

Emily Smith noted that at the last FDEC meeting of last year, Paul Fitzgerald attended and suggested a streamlined merit process with the goal of reducing paperwork for faculty, for example junior faculty would get standard merit automatically upon receiving contract approval. She stated that the FDEC accepted that proposal and that all that was left was to make a formal proposal to the Academic Council.

Mary Frances Malone also responded that the proposal was in the formal report but that it needed to be now sent to the Academic Council.

**FDEC Focus on Mentoring.**

Emily Smith noted that in the last meeting the committee had spoken about expanding its initiative beyond evaluation to professional development and asked for suggestions regarding the specific purposes of what that might entail.
Mary Frances Malone asked if the committee had hard data on what was being done by each school in terms of mentoring and what the CAE does in terms of offering new faculty a mentor.

Emily Smith mentioned that several schools have formal things, such as English, asking if there was a master list of what the schools do. To which others said no. She also noted that this dovetailed well with what they did this summer, in terms of highlighting successful models of what goes on in various schools/departments, for people to see.

Pat Calderwood asked how diverse were the models in play and whether it was only a dyadic model or triadic model?

Cinthia Gannett asked to define ‘mentoring’; also asking about the scope of faculty development and faculty evaluation and where mentoring fits in; and finally, whether the FDEC was primarily responsible for mentoring.

Emily Smith said she saw mentoring as one piece of faculty development; that it was not the only way but only one piece.

Pat Calderwood pursued the Cinthia Gannett’s line of questioning, stating that there are several ways to think about mentoring; that mentoring is part of development or mentoring could be seen as facilitating something and that she wasn’t sure which.

Mike Andreychik suggested that it would be worthwhile for the FDEC to get feedback on faculty’s experience with mentoring, not just from new faculty, but also mid-career and senior faculty, as a way to gain information on what the pulses and minuses have been.

Pat Calderwood asked if Mike Andreychik was thinking of reaching out to certain focus groups or through a broader survey --- such as through survey monkey.

Mike Andreychik responded that that meant that the discussion had already progressed to the collection aspect and that he did not know how useful either would be or how representative the data would be but that as wide as possible a sample would perhaps be desirable. A combination of both might be useful.

Meredith Kazer added that newly-minted associate professors did not know how to mentor.

Cinthia Gannett asked how peer-review was progressing.

Aaron Perkus asked whether there was a strategic plan of faculty development and how mentoring could fit into that, also asking how mentoring was going to
feed and connect into development and what this could be used towards, as a general vision; or else as a way to provide information on what hasn’t been looked at.

Cinthia Gannett spoke about other projects undertaken such as the initiative on facilitating a community of writers. From the 1st one, she suggested that it looked like there was a lot of co-mentoring going on, mentioning that she wasn’t sure whether that activity was in the scope of what the committee was thinking about mentoring. She stated that she would like the FDEC to be a part of these large initiatives, as part of fact development.

Pat Calderwood addressed the larger goals by stating that she had a ‘stealth plan’ of how to increase mentoring and that the community of writers program was part of that. She said that the initiative for this came from the work that Emily Smith and she did on GSEAP that led us scholarship on this work, to be presented by Emily Smith at an upcoming mentoring conference in Albuquerque, New Mexico, noting that Mary Deane Sorcinelli will be the key note speaker on the mentoring conference at FU in Spring, providing a wonderful opportunity.

Suzanna Klaf expressed a hope that there could be a broader conversation on incentives to mentor, noting that senior faculty committed a huge amount of time, so the question was how to increase effectiveness.

Mary Frances Malone added that it was not necessary to reinvent the wheel and that best practices at other institutions should be determined and followed.

**Subcommittee on Mentoring**

Emily Smith added Mike Andreychik to the subcommittee on mentoring, along with Pat Calderwood and Suzanna Klaf.

**Additional Discussion**

Suzanna Klaf asked to return to IDEA as the IDEA workshops weren’t the best attended, suggesting the development of a portal/mini webinars to send people to and to highlight the workshop/resources there.

Cinthia Gannett asked if it was possible to do workshops for adjuncts.

Suzanna Klaf stated that the CAE tried to target part-timers and, to this extend, had a separate list for adjuncts; they also do one-on-one consults and hoped to continue doing that.

Pat Calderwood mentioned that the events were from 9:00 am to 4:30pm but that she was willing to do workshops in the evenings or on Saturday for those who could make the day hours.
Suzanna Klaf noted that eve workshops also have been tried and these too are not well attended, stating that portals were better able to suit the convenience of people’s variable schedules.

Emily Smith suggested that the adjuncts be introduced at orientation, if possible.

Suzanna Klaf mentioned that that was already being done, as part of CAE’s ‘back to school’ events IDEA is discussed there, but that an accurate list for adjunct’s contact information, before the class begins, was often lacking.

Tracy Immerso stated that it the process started with the schools who hire, then going through to HR and payroll, but that CNS needed to be involved as well.

Meredith Kazer concurred that this year the problem with obtaining adjuncts information was not with CNS but with HR and Payroll.

**Motion to Adjourn** Meredith Kazer moved to adjourn.

Emily Smith seconded.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gwendoline Alphonso