Present: Bill Abbott, Jessica Davis, Joel Goldfield, Angela Harkins (chair), Kathy Nantz, Aaron Perkus, Emily Smith (scribe)
Ex Officio: Mary Frances Malone
Invited Guest: Gisela Gil-Egui
Regrets: Tracy Immerso, Meredith Kazer, Roben Torosyan (all attending IDEA workshop); Vishnu Vinekar

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

2. Discussion of the Minutes from Jan 19, 2011

A few minor changes were noted. Goldfield moved to approve. All in favor.

3. New Business: Gisela Gil-Egui

Faculty Development Topic on Open Source Research

- Gil-Egui distributed a handout on Open Access (OA) Scholarly Publishing and provided a rationale for bringing greater faculty attention to OA Journals, including the increasing cost of more “mainstream” journals to the library.
- Suggestion was made that FDEC explore the idea of offering a session dedicated to publishing in open access journals.
- Discussion of this topic included the following ideas and suggestions:
  - Host a broader discussion about outlets for publishing (academia.com was suggested, for example) and the relative prestige of different journals
  - Need to acknowledge changing conceptions of scholarly publication
  - Need to involve library and other players in this conversation, including CAE, and the Research Committee.

- Motion: Abbott moved that a collaborative conference bridging all of the groups mentioned (CAE, FDEC, Research Committee, Library) be recommended to next year’s FDEC [perhaps] in lieu of a Faculty Development Day.

- Seconded and voted for approval.

4. Update on IDEA Meetings on Jan 26, called by Tracy Immerso, OCC
Updates from Harkins:

- IDEA forms were sent out for processing on Monday. Timeline for IDEA form reports is end of February.
  
  o There was some discussion of potential problems for faculty who may need the IDEA DRF in order to submit an appeal to R&T.

- **Motion:** Abbott: In the event that the IDEA DRF do not arrive until after March 1st, the FDEC strongly recommends to R&T that they extend the deadline for submitting evidence of teaching effectiveness for the appeals process beyond March 1st.

  Perkus seconded the motion.
  Vote: All in favor except 1 opposed.

- Timeline for Spring registration for IDEA will happen on Week 7.

- OCC did a great job with facilitating IDEA for the Fall. Despite their hard work, there were a number of issues with using the forms.

5. **Report on CAE collaborator’s meeting held on Jan 31** (Kathy, Emily, Roben)

- Smith shared the FDEC priorities for CAE workshops, including providing workshops on IDEA—both initial workshops and data analysis training.

- Harkins stressed the need to have conversations about interdisciplinary local codes. She will list this on the agenda for the March meeting.

5. **Report from Sub-committee on Peer Review of Teaching** (Bill, Emily, Vishnu)

- Abbott distributed and summarized a handout prepared by the Subcommittee on Peer Review. The handout provided a summary of the work of the subcommittee, including the identified charge and rationale, as well as sample rubrics and some general guidelines for conducting peer review.

- Abbott asked FDEC several questions on behalf of the subcommittee: Is the subcommittee headed in right direction? What do we want to send to AC? What do departments need?

- Discussion of the subcommittee’s work included the following topics/issues:
  
  o The specificity of the forms for each department
  o A summary of CAE’s grant-supported work on peer review, including campus-wide workshops and individual work with departments.
  o Making guidelines or standards about who visits classes and how often.
  o Importance of supporting all departments in this work so that every faculty member has access to effective/educative peer review.
o Value of everyone knowing the importance of peer review as part of the bigger picture of teaching development and effectiveness (it is recommended that teaching evaluations represent only 30-50% of total evidence for teaching, but it is up to the faculty member to decide how to make their case for teaching effectiveness)
o Distinction between faculty development and demonstration of teaching effectiveness.
o Suggestion that the FDEC present a broad vision of teaching evaluation and situate peer review in it (other components would be IDEA, portfolios)
o CAE is considering Peter Seldin for workshops in August on Portfolio Assessment.

- Summary Outcome: FDEC moves to make a recommendation that each department is expected to have a transparent system/procedure in place that allows each faculty member access to a peer review process. The Subcommittee will put together a packet of resources to support departments in putting together such a system.

- Harkins thanked the subcommittee for their work on this topic.

6. **Report from Sub-committee on Administrator’s IDEA form** (Angela, Meredith, Aaron, Mary Frances)

- Harkins summarized meeting. She reported that the subcommittee decided that the implementation of the IDEA form for administrators (chairs, deans, and administrators) was not in the purview of FDEC. While the administrators are also faculty, their evaluation is not in the area of teaching. Harkins presented a motion which states that the FDEC moves that the AC appoint a subcommittee to plan an implementation process that will take effect in May 2012.

7. **Discussion and Vote on proposed motions** (handout distributed via email 2-9-11)

- Harkins briefly summarized the motions and asked that everyone carefully read them and come prepared to discuss them at our next meeting. This will be our first agenda item at our next meeting.

8. **Spring Faculty Development Day date:** May 5, 2011, speaker: Rebecca Howard

- Jessica Davis will serve as the FDEC liaison to Cinthia Gannett for the organizing of this co-sponsored event.

9. Next scheduled meeting is **March 2, 11:00-12:00 in DMH 330.**

Respectfully submitted,
Emily Smith