

Minutes
Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
March 23, 2010; 3:00 pm
1270 FAB

Present: A. Acsadi, W. Crossland (Chair), E. Golebiowska (AAUP-AFT liaison), P. Jarosz, D. O'Mara (Student Senate Liaison), K. Padmanabhan (Non-Senate), J. Mateika, M. Sengstock (Policy Committee Liaison), R. Yamazaki.

Absent with notice: S. Calkins (Administration Liaison), M. Horn, R. Parnell, E. Puscheck.

Absent: F. Florkowski, S. Putatunda.

Agenda

1. *Call to order*

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

2. *Approval of minutes of 2/16/2010 meeting of the Joint Committee Meeting with the Facilities Support Services and Technology Committee*

Approved. Those attending from FSST to be added when supplied by the FSST chair.

3. *Smoking survey draft report.*

The draft report was presented by Prof. Woodyard at the March Academic Senate meeting. The FAC's concerns about position on the smoke-free campus proposal were presented to the Senate. The Senate voted overwhelmingly in favor of supporting the current smoking policy with enforcement.

There was no additional input into the survey from the FAC.

4. *Joint meeting with FSST regarding Blackboard performance.*

Chair noted that the issues brought up by the FAC were raised by Profs. Padmanabhan and Yamazaki, and the Chair provided Chief Information Officer Joe Sawasky, a list of the issues raised in previous FAC meetings. Many other points were raised by FSST members. The CIO later returned written responses to the FAC issues.

5. *Mentoring survey (Profs. Puscheck and Acsadi)*

Professors Puscheck and Acsadi prepared a draft of a mentoring survey for discussion. Professor Puscheck was out of town so Prof. Acsadi went over the

draft. The first step planned was to develop a two-step procedure: 1. Survey the faculty to assess needs for mentoring (Also send a letter to Deans and chairs) 2. Analyze survey results and provide recommendation to FAC and then to Senate. The main concern was for young faculty who have many professional and personal stressors which might be addressed through mentoring by more senior faculty. It would be desirable to know if there are special needs for mentoring among subgroups (women, minorities). Mentoring could provide advice not only for professional and collegial development but also help develop a social network, and play a role in psychological and emotional support.

An introduction will be needed to give the reason for doing the survey. The first question would ask for some basic information: Male, female, level of career, tenure or nontenure track, how long at WSU, main role seen as teaching, research, clinical service.

Profs. Padmanabhan and Sengstock suggested that many people see themselves as having a role in teaching, research and service. Better to add additional category(ies) combining research & teaching or allow for multiple responses.

There was some debate about whether mentoring should be defined in an opening paragraph or whether the responders should offer their view of what mentoring means to them. If such a view were asked, it should occur as one of the first questions after the background data.

Prof. Yamazaki suggested that some question(s) should address mentoring for teaching explicitly because faculty need mentoring for teaching as well as research and advancement.

Prof. Sengstock suggested that the results could be sorted by responses to views on mentoring.

Prof. Golebiowska had several suggestions: Make sure you get as much information as possible from the survey because it is unlikely people will respond a second time to follow up surveys. Some of the questions could be asked on a response scale (e.g., "Satisfied" to "Dissatisfied") rather than asking dichotomous questions. Avoid any questions that can't be scored by a computer.

Prof. Yamazaki suggested that some questions should ask if the responder thought that they got good mentoring.

Prof. Sengstock suggested it would be nice to know how many mentors the responder has now, how many in the past, how many do they think are best? Faculty may need many mentors, although most people think they need just "a" mentor.

Prof. Yamazaki asked: What do you want to get out of questionnaire? How will it be analyzed, how will it be used to improve mentoring? Not useful if person is past point of needing mentoring. Can the survey be designed to sort on some basis?

A number of suggestions were made on the wording of the questions.

Profs. Yamazaki and Golebiowska noted that ranking is a problem using computer analysis. It would be better to check the top two preferences from a list and rank on that basis.

Prof. Golebiowska offered to help with analysis of the data once it is in an Excel spreadsheet.

Prof. Padmanabhan suggested not going beyond two pages.

Professor Golebiowska stressed the need to think up a catchy e-mail title and a succinct introduction, otherwise we will not capture the audience.

There was some discussion of what a small return rate might mean with respect to mentoring. Prof. Golebiowska counseled that we should expect a small return rate. It doesn't mean people aren't interested; they just don't have the time to answer all the surveys they get.

Prof. Acsadi thanked the group for their feedback. The Chair asked Prof. Acsadi and Puscheck to bring a revised survey for discussion at the April meeting.

6. *Next meeting: Tuesday, April 20; 3:00 pm, 1270 FAB*

Committee agreed to change the 4/27 date to 4/20.

May meeting date: Tuesday, May 11; 3:30 pm, 1270 FAB.

7. *Adjourn*

Meeting adjourned at 4:02 pm