Fairfield University
FDEC MEETING FINAL
Wednesday, February 4, 2015
CNS 8
1:30-3:00pm

Present: Gwendoline Alphonso, Carol Ann Davis, Cinthia Gannett, Tracy Immerso, Suzanna Klaf, Eileen O’Shea (Chair), Amalia Rusu, Ying, Zhang

Regrets: Christine Siegel

AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Approval of November Meeting Minutes

II. Report out of December FDEC Workshop

III. FDEC Spring Workshop

IV. ONLINE IDEA Evaluations
   a. Best Practice Additions & Dissemination
   b. Wifi Connectivity in DSB & Canisus
   c. Use of Yellow Narrative Forms: Online vs Hard copy

V. Taskforce to support FUSA Question Revisions

VI. Review of ongoing agenda items from 2014

VII. Other

Meeting called to order at 1:37pm by the chair.

I. Amalia made a motion to approve minutes. Cinthia seconded. Motion approved with 5 in favor and 1 abstention.

II. Report out of December FDEC Workshop

Based on the feedback received from participant evaluations, Eileen reported that the fall FDEC workshop was well received and thanked the committee members for their contribution. As this group discussed previously, the Spring workshop will be on a topic other than the IDEA form.

Cinthia urged the committee to think about evaluation more broadly, not IDEA only. She mentioned that there is also research on online writing that might need to be investigated related to the yellow narrative form that is yet to be decided if/how would move online.
III. FDEC Spring Workshop
Suzanna provided an idea for the Spring Workshop that emerged from faculty surveys. The report generated by Kathy Nantz shows that integration of technology in the classroom is an area that faculty is interested in. So the plan for the Spring workshop might be to have a presentation followed by showcase on how various faculty use technology in the classroom, i.e. iPads; this would also include flipped classroom pedagogical model. The Dean of GSEAP could help facilitate the discussion, as he has the proper background on educational technologies.

Carol Ann expressed concerns that this might put pressure on the faculty to use these technologies and wondered if this is not an advertisement for going technical. For some disciplines these might not be a good fit.

Gwen suggested we should go more general, and questioned, what is that the faculty really want? There could be a broader discussion around faculty development and classroom experiences and not just about technology.

Suzanna did not think that the subject was too restrictive or specific. The topic would be about how we could use technology for what we/faculty are doing. The faculty will decide how they can use the things presented and that does not require use of technology only.

Cinthia wanted to make sure that in the title of the workshop we are using the “integration” word. Integrating technology is useful for collaboration and takes out some pressure.

Eileen proposed that if we utilized stations, we could highlight different teaching strategies. For instance, the use of electronic medical records in the field of nursing is highly technical, but may not be of any interest to anyone outside of the nursing profession. Perhaps, at another station we could offer creative writing.

Gwen suggested focusing more on the 21st century challenges as a broader topic. Technology will be included, but there are some other additional things.

Cinthia proposed an idea to better align the workshop with the University wide theme – Water. We have the year long theme of Water and there are already resources devoted to these initiatives, can we blend them together? Do we want something to bring faculty together to support the institution wide initiative?

Suzanna encouraged the committee to partner with CAE for resources. It is not important only to have these workshops but also discuss and come up with solutions on how we can continue the work after these workshops. The 2 hour workshops are not enough if we do them in isolation. FDEC days are about sharing ideas but the conversations need to continue after those days.
In the interest of time, Eileen urged the committee to continue the discussion by email and requested to send her ideas for topics for the FDEC Spring Workshop.

**IV. ONLINE IDEA Evaluations**

Eileen stated that Fall FDEC workshop provided best practices for the move to online IDEA evaluation, but the workshop had only a small percentage of the faculty attending. How do we disseminate to the masses?

Tracy mentioned that neon yellow labels will be put out to faculty mailboxes and asked for other ideas.

Eileen mentioned that a faculty member from sent a concerned email regarding the move to IDEA online. He was stated that the Wi-Fi connection in the CNS building was faulty and asked to go back to IDEA paper form in the spring. Eileen said that we clearly do not want to go back to paper copies as that was already well discussed and moved forward by AC, but we need to be able to disseminate best practices and to be proactive to address faculty concerns.

Tracy specified that emails will go out soon regarding IDEA online for Spring and options for short/long versions.

Cinthia raised the question about 400+ adjuncts reach out as she was still concerned about communication to them.

Eileen proposed as a best practice that we contact Deans to work with Chairs of departments so that Chairs reserve time in the faculty meetings to explain best practices for use of the online evaluation form. FDEC would need to be available to attend departmental meetings to provide support.

Carol Ann volunteered to draft the details on this communication.

Eileen will follow up with the concerned faculty member. Also as a committee, we will gather feedback related to the present online evaluation process change (with the continued use of the yellow forms in hard copy), before proposing a change to adding narrative questions onto the IDEA form. Moving the qualitative data from yellow forms to the online format will need to be approved by AC.

Tracy mentioned that IDEA will change the form (i.e., questions wise) in Fall 2016. There may be concern on the part of the faculty if there are a new set of different questions. Faculty will want to compare evaluation data before and after the changes. FDEC needs to be prepared to address that soon. IDEA just started to pilot the new format of the evaluation.

**V. Taskforce to support FUSA Question Revisions**
Eileen informed the group that FUSA students reached out to her again via email and they want to pursue bringing revised FUSA questions to AC. The committee decided that a taskforce should assist this group of students to revise the existing FUSA questions. Eileen was in contact with Mike Andreychik to learn about the prior work done by FDEC on this issue. David Sapp was the faculty member that worked with FUSA previously. FDEC members proposed that Eileen reach out to GSEAP faculty for assistance on survey development. Cinthia is also willing to represent FDEC and work with the FUSA students on question revision. Eileen will continue to seek out members to assist Cinthia and the FUSA students.

Meeting adjourned at 3:03pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Amalia Rusu