Present: Emily Smith, Meredith Kazer, Mike Andreychik, Valeria Martinez, Cinthia Gannett
Absent: Jessica Davis, Gwen Alphonso, Mary Frances Malone
Invited Guests: Tracy Immerso, Suzanna Klaf, Pat Calderwood, and Aaron Perkus

Scribe: Kazer

1. Minutes (1/30/13 (Andreychik)) & 11/7/12 (Gannett)). Andreychik will add response from S. Rakowitz regarding committee slots. Gannett moved to approve, Andreychik seconded. 11/7/12 minutes approved with revision. Kazer moved to accept minutes, Martinez seconded. Minutes approved without revision.

   a. Update on meeting with Deans Council Feb. 13th. Smith and Calderwood met with Deans to get a sense of what was going on with mentoring. A lively discussion ensued. Deans were cognizant of their formal responsibilities for mentoring, but there was a general acknowledgement that mid-career faculty may be lacking mentoring. Annual meetings between chairs/deans and un-tenured faculty are ongoing. Some schools meet with tenured faculty. Information was shared on mentoring across schools. Smith and Calderwood were impressed and hopeful regarding the future of this endeavor (see attached meeting notes).

   b. Next Steps: Mentoring Subcommittee continues information gathering during this first year. Smith and Calderwood commented that it is important to keep mentoring on individual school agendas moving forward in partnership with the FDEC. They were particularly impressed with Sapp’s commitment to mentoring.

   c. Update on FDEC Day Plans - FDEC Day is scheduled for May 2 (first reading day), from 12:30-2:00 in the Kelly Presentation Room. The day is focused on mentoring and will include: information sharing and helping people understand mentoring/other ways of conceptualizing mentoring; highlighting successful mentoring endeavors on campus including presentations from three faculty members who were well-mentored; highlighting resources on campus and identifying a personal resource network. Martinez suggested that the PT faculty should be invited, and/or a special evening/weekend program for PT faculty. PT discussion table will be added, but PT faculty may choose to participate in any discussions they like. Perkus asked some questions about current mentoring process for faculty and suggested integration of the Jesuit mission in the process. Gannett suggested
adding discussion of challenges in moving out of disciplinary silos among the different schools. Inviting professional staff from library and service learning was also discussed.

3. IDEA -

a. Updates- Immerso shared the following changes with IDEA:
   1. Adjunct contracts this spring emphasized IDEA and asked faculty to choose online or paper evaluations. Adjuncts were also advised that all communications would go through Fairfield faculty email.
   2. New FUSA questions were also added based on discussions between David Sapp and FUSA leaders.
   3. Two new reports will be sending to deans this semester including a new summary report by subject showing averages. However if report only has one faculty member, this subject will not be in report. An additional report will be provided to schools on faculty who do not complete FIF in the prior semester and courses without paper packets returned.

Smith reported on the request from Jim Simon that the AVP’s office give a list to each college and school deans of the sections for which no FIF categories have been received. The dean can then notify the chairs and ask that they remind the professors in question. Immerso stated that this could not happen, as we do not have the data on who completed the FIF until after the reporting period is complete. However, FDEC believes that completing the FIF is part of faculty role and implementing mentoring processes to ensure completion would be beneficial to both faculty and the institution. Overall discussion ensued regarding the general attitude about IDEA in course and institutional assessment. Immerso reported that it was clear who was not completing IDEA FIF. Retroactively work with faculty who have not completed the FIF in past and making overall reminders to faculty a few days before the period closes. Finally, including IDEA discussions as part of department and institutional assessment regularly is important. Finally, discussion regarding pre-populating objectives also occurred and remains a possibility for individual departments.

Manyul queried the committee about the possibility of surveying and reporting about efforts across the university that are specifically aimed at development and/or evaluation of faculty who fall under AHANA categories. That would be helpful for us in the College of Arts and Sciences in trying to develop a plan for increasing the chances of academic success for such faculty. regarding Martinez commented regarding possible assumptions that are made and what his overall goal is in gathering this information. Kazer and Siegel questioned whether IDEA would be sensitive to these issues. Manyul will be invited to the next meeting to explore his motive and what information he believes IDEA can add to his discovery process. Immerso stated that we would need to identify faculty who self-identified as AHANA in banner and then a special report would need to be created.

Siegel reported on the need to get accurate and reliable evaluation data. Students and faculty have some concerns regarding the completion of forms. She suggests that we follow the suggestions in IDEA paper #36 that first year faculty have every course evaluated with a subsequent evaluation of at least two ratings of the same course every six years. These
evaluations should be part of a broader teaching portfolio for promotion and tenure purposes. The merit process would require likely require annual course evaluation. The other suggestion is to periodically use the short-form which was introduced at meeting. Gannett suggested that an alternate schedule might be well-accepted by faculty. Smith reported that moving to an alternate schedule may help faculty to explore alternative teaching evaluation methods. Moreover, the length of time needed to institute change makes her suggest immediate exploration of this option. The Associate Dean's assessment group will consider this and report back.

4. Reconstitution of University College (UC) slot on FDEC. This motion is slated for discussion at April AC meeting.

5. Beginning Discussion of Proposal to Amend R&T guidelines RE: mentoring and peer review of teaching language – tabled until next meeting

6. Ongoing/Future Agenda Items

a. Part-time faculty: how to include their voice in FDEC work
b. Others?

Next Meeting Date: March 20, 9:30-11
Scribe: Davis
Location: CNS 8

April Meeting: April 17, CNS 8
Scribe: Martinez