The meeting was called to order at 11:01 by Harkins.

1. Discussion of the Minutes from Feb 9, 2011 (Emily Smith)
   a. Minutes were approved with minor corrections.
   b. Mary Frances Malone moved to approve; Joel Goldfield seconded. All were in favor.

2. Discussion and approval of the Memo to Dennis Keenan, (R&T) dated February 23.
   One correction was recommended for paragraph 2, to change the wording from:

   “Because it is likely that the IDEA Diagnostic Report Forms will not arrive until after March 1st, the FDEC requests that the Rank and Tenure Committee extend the deadline for submitting additional evidence of teaching effectiveness for faculty who may wish to file an appeal.”

   This statement was amended to read:

   “Because it is likely that the IDEA Diagnostic Report Forms will not be available to faculty until after March 1st, the FDEC requests that the Rank and Tenure Committee extend the deadline for submitting additional evidence of teaching effectiveness for faculty who may wish to file an appeal.

3. Discussion and Vote on 3 proposed motions.

   A. Viewing Data in Aggregate Format
      1. Motion: The FDEC requests that the Academic Council allow the faculty and administration to view student survey data in the aggregate. Data must only be available in such a way that individual faculty are not identified.

      2. Rationale: In practice, chairs, deans, and other administrators have had access to the viewing of summative teaching data in the aggregate form for the purpose of meta-analysis of student learning patterns and teaching effectiveness. The viewing of data in the aggregate would formalize a procedure that is already in practice. The restriction that no individual faculty be identified is a change in the procedure that is currently in place in some schools.
3. Discussion of the Motion: Jess Davis noted that currently, data from individual faculty are identifiable by the dean of CAS, and so it should be clearly stated that this motion contains a change in the current practices for some schools. Aaron and Bill also noted that the term “administration” is not entirely clear and this term was clarified further in the rationale. They recommended that this motion be expanded from just the “administration” to include all faculty and administration. This is because individual faculty may find such comparative data useful in the preparation of their tenure and promotion case.

4. VOTE: 7 in favor, 1 opposed

B. IDEA for Administrators
   1. Motion: The FDEC requests that the Academic Council appoint a subcommittee to consider the adoption of the Administrators’ IDEA form.

   2. Rationale: The new student evaluation of teaching that Fairfield University formally adopted beginning in fall 2010, known as IDEA, also produces a survey to measure the effectiveness of chairs, deans, and administrators (hereafter IDEA for Administrators). Like the IDEA student rating form which allows the faculty person to choose the specific learning objectives that will be measured, the IDEA form for administrators allows the chair, dean, or administrator to choose in advance the goals by which he or she wishes to be evaluated.
      a. It was decided by the FDEC that such a task technically lies outside the purview of the FDEC, whose charge is the ongoing evaluation and development of faculty performance. While department chairs, deans, and many administrators are also faculty members, this IDEA Administrator’s Evaluation system evaluates their performance as administrators.
      b. Adopting IDEA for Administrators is consistent with the recent conversations about shared governance on campus.
      c. This motion is also consistent with the University’s goal to adopt open and transparent practices of assessment.

   3. Discussion of the Motion: Joel raised a concern that this motion is not in the purview of the committee and so should not be presented by the FDEC. The concern is that the FDEC does not want to be perceived as the “IDEA” committee. Harkins stated that the IDEA form for Administrators is something that the faculty has expressed a strong interest in and that it is within the purview of the FDEC to ask the Academic Council to appoint a subcommittee for the adoption of the Administrator’s IDEA form—the FDEC would not be involved in the work of this subcommittee.

4. VOTE: 7 in favor, 1 opposed
C. The FDEC wishes to put forward one motion to change the language in the Journal of Record concerning IDEA Committee led by the On-Campus Coordinator (OCC)

A. Motion: The FDEC requests a change in the Journal of Record which currently specifies only that there should be “one” dedicated member of the FDEC on this committee. This should be revised to specify “two” faculty from the FDEC; the FDEC chair and a faculty member from a different school.

B. Rationale: At the present time, only one dedicated FDEC liaison is specified in the Journal of Record; the FDEC moves that the Academic Council revise this detail to specify “two” dedicated FDEC members. Ideally, one of these individuals should be the FDEC chair. Since different programs have different practices and norms for the end-of-course teaching evaluations, it is recommended that the other FDEC member is from a school different from the FDEC chair.

C. Discussion of the Motion: A concern was expressed by Aaron Perkus that the role of the FDEC in the IDEA meetings should be restricted so that the members of the FDEC are not overly burdened with the task of managing both service commitments. All present agreed that it was important to have strategic representative faculty voices involved in the development and improvement of the IDEA procedures. Two faculty members from the FDEC should be sufficient to collaborate in the process as the procedures about IDEA are unfolding. An alternative to this motion was made, that there should be a standing agenda item at each FDEC meeting to discuss IDEA issues. It was agreed that using the FDEC meetings to discuss IDEA issues is not a productive use of the FDEC time since not all of the FDEC members have deep knowledge of the IDEA form and its current procedures.

D. VOTE: 7 in favor, 1 opposed

4. The meeting was adjourned at 11:48 AM.

5. The next scheduled meeting is March 2, 11:00-11:45 in 3rd floor seminar Room, DMH 330

Respectfully Submitted by Angela Kim Harkins (chair)