FDEC Minutes for November 10, 2010

LOCATION: Library Conference Room

Members Present: Angela Harkins (Chair), Bill Abbott, Jessica Davis, Joel Goldfield, Meredith Kazer, Jessica Davis, Emily Smith, Vishnu Vinekar

Ex officio: Aaron Perkus, Kathy Nantz, Roben Torosyan, Mary Frances Malone

Invited Guests: Tracy Immerso (OCC), Jessica McCullough, Laura Nash

Called to order at 10:04

1. Review and approval of the minutes from October 8, 2010, submitted by Bill Abbott. With a motion to approve, the minutes were approved without discussion.

2. Raising Student awareness about IDEA (FUSA)
   i. Harkins announced that “The Mirror” interviewed her about the IDEA form. The interview consisted of explaining what was old, what is new, and how the new form is different. A survey to assess student reactions to the interview was suggested and to give “The Mirror” a copy of actual IDEA form. Malone suggested involving GSC and RA’s. Abbott pointed out that if it is printed it needs to be both sides. Perkus noted that it needs to be legible. Malone stressed that there should be an explanation of the form with the printing.
   ii. Kathy Nantz reported that a flyer on the IDEA form was distributed at CORE Unmasked and a copy of the flyer was distributed to members of the FDEC.
   iii. Harkins asked if there were any other suggestions on how to get students more familiar with the new form. Someone suggested Facebook, but Malone informed us that Facebook is not a good idea according to students, as students would not want to “friend” it. Another idea was 411 (Malone could not find it on StagWeb, but it might be on the student tab on StagWeb).
   iv. Harkins asked for suggestions on how we might entice the FUSA student representative to come. Malone recommended a student and will e-mail the name to Harkins.

3. Harkins informed us that two motions (one by Naser and the other by Behre and Tromely) were brought to the attention of the FDEC as possible motions to the Academic Council. Both of these proposed motions would restrict the usage of IDEA data for one or two years for rank and promotion decisions based on the premise that we should not permit any of the data to be used until we know how to use the data. Harkins opposed these proposed motions because the FDEC should not be gatekeepers for this form. Restricting IDEA data would create a bad situation for the faculty who are expected to “make a case” for Tenure and Promotion. It is also the case that the formative data is quite different from the yellow form. If we go with the Naser motion, faculty would not be able to use the data even if it is good. Perkus stated that he opposed the proposed motion and said that the evaluation data belongs to the faculty member and only the faculty should disclose the information as they desire. In the old system the administration had automatic access to data. Harkins mentioned that a discussion on the kind of access the administration has is agenda item 3 for spring. Abbott said that 1) we are going to have to address the Rank and Tenure Committee to let them know that there is a learning curve for this form and 2) if you mess up badly, you can still comment and the two questions “excellent teacher/excellent course” still apply. Malone mentioned that it is in the
faculty handbook that it is up to the faculty member to show teaching effectiveness and she also restated that this is not a gate keeping committee. Davis stressed that this could pose an issue for faculty going up for tenure if they are limited by what kind of data they can submit to support their case. Perkus said that it should be the faculty prerogative.

4. Harkins gave an update on IDEA Training and workshops to date. She said that we have reached a large majority of the faculty. A discussion pursed of who has and will be presenting to different departments. Harkins also mentioned the need to reach out to part-time faculty as well. Physics, politics, and nursing still need to be addressed. There will be one more workshop the last week in November. Harkins asked for the formation of a subcommittee to plan/discuss the IDEA timeline for spring 2011 and asked for volunteers. Harkins, Immerso, and Kazer will serve on the subcommittee.

5. Discussion moved to the creation of a centralized IDEA website. A website address is available from Laura Johnson. Harkins asked what materials should be posted there. Goldfield said to make sure the forms are up. Emily suggested an announcements tab for when things will be available. Malone suggested discipline codes. Torosyan informed us that some of these things are already on the CAE IDEA website. Perkus stated we need someone who in charge of this and he volunteered to take this charge with Harkins and Malone helping with suggestions for content. Perkus suggested making both faculty and student pages.

6. Harkins gave a report on online implementations with CNS. The total number of online registrants is 20; email with instructions were sent out to them on Oct 28 (45 courses). Harkins reported that to-date two faculty have expressed interest on the online workshop. Harkins reported that the test pilot group for online IDEA for Blackboard are Vishnu Vinekar, Angela Harkins, Meredith Kazer. The University is stressing going online as the cost for is $20K less for online forms. Immerso gave a breakdown of the cost of the paper forms. Abbott mentioned that a study on implementation of the IDEA paper form was completed, looking at finances, and found that the cost of switching from IDEA from existing forms was the same, but is now about two times the estimated cost. Malone clarified that the study did not include the actual cost of printing each piece of paper. Torosyan said that we need to look at average return rate of online return. Abbott said that IDEA reports it only gets 60% average as the highest return rate. Kazer suggested that we should discuss strategies on how to increase rates after we do this first run. Harkins said that it is good that online was not pushed too much in the fall because of the information flow between FDEC and CNS. Perkus suggested we explore requiring students to fill out the forms to increase the return rates. Torosyan suggested that we ask IDEA what strategies work. Harkins suggested we revisit this issue in the Spring when we have more information. Nantz mentioned that there is an IDEA training session Feb 8-9 in Florida and the CAE will sponsor people to go.

7. Harkins reported that the directions for the FIF and the “opt-out” of FUSA survey which will go out on Nov. 15. FUSA questions for online forms will be added by the OCC and will appear automatically on a separate page. Faculty have the option of reporting/not reporting this information by checking a box for opting out.

8. Faculty Development Day discussion, Laura Nash and Jessica McCullough were invited to join us. Harkins informed us that Malone has reserved the Library multimedia room and 2 other breakout rooms. The first save-the-date was sent out on Oct 20th and another will be sent out. Beth Boquet has been confirmed as the Plenary Speaker. Laura Nash will lead a break out session on advising. Betsy
Bowen will lead a breakout session of graduate research and writing. Jessica McCullough will lead a break out session on undergraduate library research and writing. Harkins asked what kind of equipment we need to order in advance. The CAE representatives assured us that all the equipment is there, but if someone needs to get it up and working the CAE will order for that. Harkins will send out for confirmations from speakers by November 15. Malone will order food for 45 people. Kazer volunteered to write evaluation forms but asked that the speakers provide her with objectives.

Discussion on the subject of Faculty Development Day. Abbott said that the idea revolves around issues of student issues in advising. Dealing with student conceptions about advising: those who just want their pin number, those with have no idea what advising is about, and those who need a lot of guidance. Nash has talked with Boquet and the new method implemented this summer during orientation did not work because the students were not assigned advisors in the summer. Students did not like it then and do not like it now. Smith asked if we are talking about only undergraduates, or graduate students as well. Nash said that she deals only with undergraduates. Emily asked that we make it clear that the session will be about undergraduate advising. Perkus asked what was the purpose of having these information sessions if we are going to change how we do advising again. Malone stressed that we want to address the development of the student over the four years they are here. Davis asked about the sudden switch in undergraduate advising to advisors with little to no experience with undeclared majors. Nash suggested putting together a blurb for advisors. She emphasized that faculty need to accumulate knowledge about what is available in the school and where to send students with interests. Harkins suggested 30 minute breakout sessions offered multiple times so that faculty can go to multiple sessions. Abbott noted that history students might want to know how to get the paper to write itself and need to understand the various reliability of sources. Harkins said that we need to educate faculty about what is available in the library for research. Perkus suggested that half could be databases and half would be all faculty can do for their classes.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 1 from 10:00-11:00 AM (Joel Goldfield takes minutes). Location is the Library Conference Room.

11:02 adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jessica Davis