Faculty Development & Evaluation (FDEC) Meeting
Friday, February 28th, 1:30 – 3:00
CNS 8

AGENDA

Present: Michael Andreychik (Chair), Gwen Alphonso, Deborah Edelman, Cinthia Gannett, Valeria Martinez.

Regrets: Carol Ann Davis, Eileen O’Shea, Christine Seigel

Invited Guests: Larry Miners

Scribe: Gwen Alphonso

1. Approval of Minutes (1/31/14, Martinez)

2. Update on Short-form Proposal
   • Mike is scheduled to meet with the Academic Council on Monday March 3rd.

3. Update on faculty needs assessment survey
   • HERI Survey will go live on Monday, March 3rd.
   • In response to a question by Cinthia, Mike clarified that the survey assessed various “professional needs,” to allow comparison with similar institutions.
   • Larry mentioned that this is our 3rd or 4th time participating in the HERI survey.
   • Mike stated that he, Suzanna, and Christine Siegel met with Amy Bozer from Institutional research to add questions to speak to the Fairfield University context in addition to the HERI questions.
     • Mike promised to email the additional questions to FDEC members.
     • In response to Cinthia’s questions, Mike responded that the survey was never sent to adjunct faculty heretofore, but will be sent to them this year.
     • Cinthia expressed a query re: whether the survey contained questions sensitive to them and the tone would invite their engagement.
     • Gwen asked if the survey had a different track for junior faculty. Mike responded that to his knowledge, there were different tracks for full- and part-time faculty, but that all tenure track faculty, regardless of rank, would receive the same questions.
     • Gwen also asked if the survey contained questions pertinent to AHANA faculty, to which Mike responded affirmatively, in the main because HERI is very comprehensive.

4. IDEA Updates (Tracy)
Tracy mentioned that two applications have been added to my.fairfield.edu to: (a) access your IDEA portal and (b) to access your results, those two portions were updated this morning and it was sent out in an email today. The third piece (to “extract and upload”) is still being worked on, it is the internal portion to take the Banner data and submit to IDEA and it is still under construction.

Mike said he could go in and select his delivery options, so all other members should also try to do this and if they encounter any problems let Tracy know.

Tracy mentioned that anyone can change preferences from now till March 10th, but for adjunct faculty whatever preference (paper or online) they listed on their contract is already loaded for them.

Larry asked if we have a way of figuring out how many full-time faculty currently teaching did and did not fill out the FIF/use the IDEA forms?

- Tracy: Jim has that data from last semester.
- Mike: Jim is going to come and speak to the FDEC, to talk about suggestions/ideas he has from his recent IDEA conference and to hear what the FDEC itself is talking about regarding IDEA.
  - Jim would speak to some things that the IDEA system can do which most people don’t know they can do, and whether we should do it/promote it.
  - Cinthia suggested talking about having faculty from the same program choose the same research outcomes, to be able to get aggregate data for each program/data.
- Mike stated that, as discussed at the last meeting, he had obtained (and could circulate upon request) some data/research on paper v. online evaluation formats. Overall, the research suggests no meaningful differences in evaluation data as a function of whether is obtained in a paper vs. online format. BUT, differences do arise when data is collected in class vs. out of class. This suggests that if people use the online format, but administer in class and follow other best practices, the online data should be no different from the paper data.
- Tracy mentioned the compressed timeline on paper v. online choice. The window for selections right now closes on March 10th. In a week from today another notice would be sent out to remind faculty to make their selections; then on March 10th, if necessary, the deadline could be extended for another week.

5. Discussion of Spring FDEC Day

- Mike said he sent an email to Christine and she had questions for what we might want, in terms of logistics. As Kelley and Blackbox Theatre are both booked, he asked if the Oak Room would work.
- Larry replied yes, if we could have those rolling boards to divide it and screen it off. Other agreed.
- Mike, Valeria, Cinthia, and Gwen discussed and all agreed to serve the same menu as last year.
- Gwen also asked about furniture and stations and Mike responded that once the content was decided we could let her Christine know a bit ahead of time.
- **CONTENT:**
  - Mike summarized his conversation with Kathy Nantz, for an “ethics station” – she suggested that a way to do this might be to organize an activity around a scenario and ask people what they think. She would be happy to organize and do this as part of FDEC day.
  - Valeria asked if we wanted to have people circulate around the stations.
    - Deborah suggested rotating through stations. She mentioned also her work on social-emotional learning with Stepping Stones Museum, with a pre-and post-test to see what impact these experiences have had.
  - Mike suggested three stations around “writing,” since more would be too much for the time allocated.
  - Cinthia directed remarks at conceptualizing the event, for example, she suggested people would gather around one table do work together then eat and do more work together around another table and so on. People could also fully choose to work at only one table.
    - Larry responded that that would work really well if one of the themes/stations is overarching, it could be done in this way if it is preceded with somebody describing what each station is.
  - Deborah mentioned that the description would take 20 minutes and with 10 minutes at the end to wrap up, three stations might be a stretch within the time allotted.
  - Cinthia suggested having it more open-ended so 1.5 hours is not set in stone. Mike agreed to reserve the room for 2 hours but, in response to Gwen and Valeria, he too agreed to formally advertize the event as lasting 1.5 hours.
  - Mike asked what an **overarching event** could look like?
    - Larry suggested it could be “how do you get started on a journal article?” In order to appeal to as broad a range of faculty, from engineering etc.
  - Cinthia expressed her preference for focusing on writing across the disciplines.
  - Mike suggested the 4 Cs: “Conscience, Competence, Compassion, Creativity”
  - Cinthia suggested alternatives such as “writing into X domain,” “writing into Y domain” etc.
  - Mike mentioned that Beth Boquet emailed him about writing across the disciplines, so she could be recruited too.
  - Cinthia volunteered to frame the day, and suggested to include writing in the Jesuit tradition.
    - She mentioned that an overarching event could ask: What is “writing to learn”? Writing in the moment etc.
o Mike mentioned that he would possibly reach out to Beth, Kathy, Meredith Kazer.
o Valeria suggested something on writing and technology.
o Deborah suggested contacting Brian Crandall and Gayle Bogle, director of Education Technology.
o Tracy mentioned that to bridge the gap across disciplines, we would need to find somebody who has an MFA as well as a Science PhD. Gwen agreed and described her wariness of having a mostly “humanities” conception of writing.
o Mike asked what a station might look like and suggested prompts on each table.
o Larry said that it was first important decide who were the “experts” we wanted to recruit and then to have them come to the next meeting.

6. IDEA Discussion Points
   o Mike stated that “best practices” are really the key for people to know. He also mentioned that a lot of these came from Jim and said that we were doing well as far as IDEA goes. Moving forward a few topics were mentioned such as: can we educate Chairs? What does the faculty want? Do we have IDEA workshops going?
     o Mike asked: what else should we be thinking of re: IDEA? He mentioned that IDEA is the only available evaluation that currently offers a paper option so if we want to keep a paper option as possibility for the future we might need to build something in-house, as IDEA is definitely moving online, so what next?
     o Larry said that the CAE schedules a couple of workshops on “Getting Started with IDEA” and how to “Interpret Results” – which they run two times a semester, but that those were very lightly attended.
     o Cynthia asked if there was a workshop for Chairs and Directors who often have to read IDEA results. Larry replied no. Tracy said that the content is already there but now it would need to apply to a new audience.
     o Mike agreed that a workshop for Chairs and Deans is a good idea.

7. Discussion of IDEA evaluations for part-time faculty. AC proposal?
   o Cynthia said that she would like to propose a policy for part-time faculty access to IDEA, as well as material on “Best Practices for Supporting Adjunct Faculty Development”.

Meeting Adjorned at 3:06pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Gwendoline Alphonso