Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee (FDEC)
Minutes of May 4, 2011
Library Conference Room

Members present: Bill Abbott, Jessica Davis, Joel Goldfield (Scribe), Angela Harkins (Chair), Meredith Kazer, Mary Frances Malone (ex officio), Emily Smith, Vishnu Vinekar
Invited guest: Roben Torosyan and Kathy Nantz

1) The meeting was called to order by Chair Angela Harkins at 11:00 a.m.
2) Bill Abbott moved to accept the minutes of April 13, 2011. Vishnu seconded. All in favor.
3) Angela moved to change the agenda so that item #6 would be discussed after agenda item #1. Bill seconded. All in favor. We then discussed agenda item #6, the formal thank-you to the FDEC, particularly the subcommittee work done by Vishnu and Bill and all other members.
4) We discussed the draft of the FDEC Annual Report, including the “tireless…collaborators,” Tracy, Roben, Suzanna Klaf, Jay Rozgonyi and his supporting group, C&NS. We had 11 meetings. Angela also reviewed IDEA work, outreach, and other highlights.
5) Agenda item #4 concerned the distributed Local Codes materials for the IDEA form in conjunction with the review of the draft of the annual report. Bill noted IDEA procedures and errors. OCC is in charge of IDEA and reports. FDEC takes responsibility for advising. Angela noted that the Religious Studies code, for example, in the packet was incorrect.

Mary Frances: Do the State of CT Higher Education codes have more scanned codes than IDEA?
AH: We should double check the codes.
RT: People are not implementing local codes this semester.
AH: Correct. Also, in Fall 2011 there will not be as many paper items to process. P. 5, iii.a., Banner is being relied on more and more. We need to code more information and in a less cumbersome way, especially timecodes and dates. Page 6: paper is an option. There have been lost data because of damaged forms. Paul Fitzgerald excused faculty affected by these lost data. The DSB needs special attention because of issues of damaged and incomplete forms. Page 6, #5, vi. Yellow sheets: The process shouldn’t change until after Spring 2012. Faculty have expressed strong views about keeping them. Bill and Angela will look into the evaluation of the yellow forms.

Angela then reviewed Faculty Development Days and Open Source Records. Regarding p. 8 of the report, she noted that FD days will be devoted to peer review.

Mary Frances and Roben announced that additional people have preregistered for the upcoming workshop, at least 25 total at this point. Bill commented that the program could involve quantitative data. He would prefer that the wording “student produced” be changed to “student evaluations.” Discussion ensued. The substitution was made.

Regarding page 9, it was noted that the Journal of Record contains a discrepancy in wording concerning “viewing data” in the aggregate. Faculty in a dean’s review should be able to benchmark their work against others’. Jessica was concerned that this approach could generate competition. Chairs advise but then do not compare. Angela thought that from these aggregate data, nobody would know how a particular faculty member had performed. Mary Frances wondered if the Academic Council had approved this motion, which Angela affirmed. Meredith thought that in small departments like Nursing, it would be easier to attribute certain
performances to individuals, despite the aggregate approach. Angela thought that faculty would not want to be “blindsided” in a Dean’s review. Regarding bullet #2, we need a formal procedure.

Page 8 concerned on-going business: the improvement of Banner, damaged data, help for Rank and Tenure candidates. Mary Frances expressed that the University is in a minority in its relying on the IDEA form and that peer review is the “way to go.” Roben distributed an FDEC checklist and complemented the Committee on several qualities and achievements, particularly on its devotion to travel and training. (At this point Joel had to leave to teach a class and Emily graciously volunteered to take minutes from 11:47 a.m. until the end of the meeting.)

Report on Peer Review of Teaching Subcommittee
- KN provided a summary of the Peer Review of Teaching Pilot Initiative
- Happy to present that 4 teams will be funded and supported during the 2011-2012 year
- A good array of teams across the university with representation from Graduate, undergraduate schools, and interdisciplinary teams.
- A letter will be sent to the teams to inform them that they will be funded and to clarify their commitment, particularly for August.
  - We may need to poll the teams about their availability in August.

Summer Dossier Workshop
- CAE will be funding Stephanie Burrell to attend a dossier preparation workshop in Windsor, Ontario in June.
  - Would love to have another
- MFM will reach out to DSB and SoE to see if anyone would be interested in going.

Bill moved that we thank Vishnu and Angela for their three years of commitment to the FDEC. Unanimously approved!

Bill moved to adjourn. Vishnu seconded.
We voted to adjourn the meeting at 11:58 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joel Goldfield (with Emily Smith)