Angela Kim Harkins called the meeting to order at 11:01.

Angela started the meeting by thanking everyone for the emergency meeting on Feb 23rd.

1. Discussion of the Minutes from Feb 23rd, 2011 (Angela)
   a. Minutes were approved with minor corrections.
   b. Vishnu moved to approve; Bill seconded. All were in favor.

2. Update on Academic Council Motions submitted Feb 24, 2011 (Harkins)
   Angela said that she received an email today that stated that we have been slotted with the last possible timeslot for the March 7th AC meeting 3:30 to 5:00 pm. Aaron said that Motion 2 should be changed to read “subcommittee to consider adoption”, instead of “subcommittee for the adoption”.

3. Update on Peer Review of Teaching (Bill, Vishnu, Emily)
   Bill handed out a report of what was decided by the subcommittee on peer-review and the CAE in their meetings (attached). He said that the subcommittee met with the CAE and decided to slow down. It took 5-6 years to adopt IDEA. For us to come up with a peer-review in one semester will be improbable. Instead, we should go to individual departments, especially the ones who have already started on peer-review. The CAE can also give grant money to departments to put into place a system of peer-review. These departments will report their process and outcomes to the CAE/FDEC; and this will be the equivalent to the IDEA pilots. Kathy suggested we come up with a FLC on peer-review.
   Mary Frances suggested that the subcommittee should first get a sample of four or five processes from other Universities that have implemented peer-review. Roben and Kathy clarified that the CAE already have collected much more than that. The CAE/subcommittee are using a lot of material from other schools. However, they have to be tailored specifically to each department as departments have different needs depending on the number of part-time faculty, junior faculty, etc.
   Aaron stated that he had a meeting recently that spoke about guidelines. He stated that we should have a model before we go into the departments. At minimum, we should have a framework. For example, each junior faculty is
assigned a mentor; there should be classroom observations, as well as pre and post meetings. Emily said that these are not exclusive; we can have both. However, a top down approach is not feasible. Bill said that the way we will approach the departments is by suggesting some of the best practices; however, we will not be enforcing guidelines. Emily stated that while we will be mentoring some departments on peer-review, a few departments might already have a formalized practice of peer-review already. Angela said that we need to recommend that peer-review should be on the forefront. Although specific departments are already doing intensive peer-review, the College should put it on the table for all departments. Roben stated that we should reconsider calling it peer-review; instead, we should call it peer-development or peer-reflection. Mary Frances said that peer-review is evaluative while the mentoring that CAE is doing is clearly formative. Peer-review is more analogous to the wider guidelines of Rank & Tenure. These guidelines are currently being interpreted differently between departments. Peer-review should open the processes of Rank & Tenure to more than just student evaluations.

Angela asked if we are willing to support initiative number 5; having a Faculty and Professional Learning Community (FPLC) on Peer Review. Bill said that he would support it, and asked if we should make a motion this meeting. Angela suggested that we could talk more about proposing a FPLC on the March 30th meeting. Aaron stated that items 4 and 5 seem very different. Item 4, about giving grant money to departments to implement a peer-review system seems like incremental spreading. However, item 5 on the FPLC on peer-review seems very different, and it does not seem like items 4 and 5 should be simultaneous. Kathy clarified that while the departments are putting together guidelines, the FPLC will be putting together portfolios, as well as conducting peer-review across department lines. Mary Frances asked about the tasks the FLC would be assigned. Kathy clarified that the FPLC decides on their own tasks; it’s not a task force. Roben added that the FPLC has no external charge; it’s about people learning from each other. It does not have institutional-level deliverables.

Emily stated that we need more time to discuss these initiatives. Angela asked if there was interest in proposing a Peer-Review FPLC for 2011-2012 because if so, we should be aware that there is a deadline for that. Mary Frances said that we should have one meeting on peer-review, as a sole agenda item. Angela said that we will dedicate the next meeting to Peer Review.

4. Update on IDEA (Tracy Immerso)
Tracy said that we have the packets delivered to the University. We have to reorganize the packets for distribution to faculty. The aim is for delivery of the DRFs (Diagnostic report Forms) on Friday the 11th of March. The group summary reports will be distributed today. In addition, Blackboard will not be used for IDEA anymore. CNS and the OCC are working on sending out communication about Spring 2011 evaluations today.
Roben asked that the OCC send out Bill’s DRF interpretation guide at the same time as DRFs. Tracy also clarified that the DRFs will be distributed as paper copies for everyone; regardless of whether they took IDEA on paper or online. Vishnu asked for the reason Blackboard will not be used anymore. Tracy said that Blackboard doesn’t support everything we need, including local codes. Aaron suggested that maybe we can put it into the new Fairfield University portal instead. Emily asked which email will be used to send students the link for IDEA online, and Tracy answered that the preferred email in Banner would be used. IDEA online supports only a single email address for each student.

3. Update on Collaboration with Cinthia Gannett and Faculty Development Day? (Jessica Davis)
Jessica said that they are meeting on Friday. Jessica will not be here on the 30th, so the agenda item needs to be moved to April 13th.

4. Bill made a motion to adjourn; Aaron seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 11:47 am.
FDEC Subcommittee on Peer Review

Report, March 2, 2011

We met with Kathy Nantz, Roben Torosyan, and Suzanna Klaf on March 1st. Items on which we came to general consensus are as follows:

1. Inasmuch as the IDEA project took several years of pilot projects and informational meetings to get faculty buy-in, our Peer Review project should be equally deliberate.

2. Rather than coming up with a template/rubric for Peer Review and proposing it to AC for implementation on all departments, we should work from the bottom up, finding out what individual departments are already doing on Peer Review. We could send out a survey asking every department what procedures they have in place.

3. It was suggested that we request, possibly via AC that every department come up with a plan for peer review. This, however, was declined in favor of:

4. Having the CAE offer to fund, out of its grant money, two or three departments that would be willing to create and implement plans for Peer Review. The funding would support a summer meeting, an entire academic year during which the Peer Review plan was created and put into place, and a following summer meeting at which future plans could be developed. At the summer meetings experts could be brought in to address the department. At the end of the funded academic year, the departments would be required to share what they have done with the FDEC, CAE, and the rest of the faculty.

5. Having a Faculty Learning Circle on Peer Review.

6. It was also suggested that we invite Peter Seldin to address the faculty. This, however, was generally declined in favor of #4.

7. Roben suggested that, in implementing #5, departments be encouraged to begin simply with formative reflection rather than summative evaluation.