

Faculty Affairs Committee

March 8, 2017

Present: Krista Brumley, Poonam Arya, Daniel Golodner, Leonard Lipovich, Katheryn Maguire, Kypros Markou, Elizabeth Puscheck, Jinping Xu, Linda Beale, Nourhan Hamadi, Karin Tarpenning

Absent with notice: Andrew Fribley, Ellen Tisdale, Rita Casey, John Vander Weg

Absent without notice: Ashok Kumar, Jeffrey Rebudal

Guests: David Merolla and Abe Biswas.

- 1. The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.**
- 2. Ad hoc committee on mentoring presentation (Dave Merolla, Abe Biswas and Krista Brumley)**

The committee reports on findings from the mentor survey administered in Fall 2016. The survey was the result of discussions in the Faculty Affairs Committee. It was sent to all faculty tenured between 2013 and 2016 (n=122) to understand faculty experiences of mentoring at WSU, with the goal of creating a robust mentoring program. There was a relatively weak response rate of about 28.6% (n=34). The sample was almost evenly split between women and men. The majority were white (n=25). The presentation will be posted on the Academic Senate website.

Faculty were asked about their expectation and experience of mentoring across three domains: research, teaching, and professional development. Generally across the three domains, there were higher expectations prior to coming to WSU than on reported experiences of mentoring. Teaching was slightly more muted.

Faculty were also asked about their satisfaction of mentoring in the three domains. The data were not overwhelmingly positive or negative, but rather could be characterized as tepid.

Faculty were also asked about their experiences and satisfaction with the tenure process. Results hovered between 3 and 3.5 (on scale of 5). Slightly more than 55% strongly agreed or agreed they were satisfied with the overall process. Slightly more than 20% were neutral. Another 20% strongly disagreed or disagreed that they were satisfied with the tenure process. Since these are all positive cases of earning tenure, we would have expected to see higher rates of satisfaction.

There were significant gender differences in satisfaction in all domains of mentoring. Data was collapsed into three – strongly agree/agree; neutral; and strongly disagree/disagree. Whereas 60% of men were satisfied with scholarship related mentoring, slightly less than 40% of women were. Slightly less than 50% of men were satisfied with teaching related mentoring, compared to about 30% of women. Almost 70% of men were satisfied with professional development related mentoring, compared to 30% of women.

Faculty were also asked about overall satisfaction with the tenure process: “I was satisfied with the tenure process overall.” Slightly more than 70% of men said they were, compared to slightly less than 40% of women. Most notable is that none of the men indicated that they strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement, however, slightly more than 40% of women did.

There were some gender differences in expectations. Whereas men averaged between 3 and 3.5, women averaged between 4 and 4.5 on some aspects – grant opportunities, moral support for scholarship, help with long term plan, guidance on service levels, information about development opportunities, advocacy behind closed doors, and advice of conflict resolution. Thus, it is important to drill down to why women have higher expectations.

60% of faculty did not know about formal mentoring in OVPR.

Kypros mentions it would be worth thinking about if the expectations are clarified from the onset and particularly if the chair actually does that for new faculty.

Maguire asks if data was collected on the year that faculty went up – on time, or in year 7 for example.

Beale mentions that it might matter who does the hiring and how the letter of offer is written. She states that HR is writing generic letters, so how do we make sure that new hires know the expectations.

Maguire mentions that faculty expectations might vary because of how they were mentored during their PhD.

Maguire mentions that there have been many personnel changes over time so different expectations might ensue between when faculty are hired and when they go up, such that there has been a shifting bar over time.

Arya says that the interpretation of P&T guidelines is different than how written.

Leonard says the salary review and P&T review are separate process, but sometimes committees are the same so in practice the two processes are not separate.

Arya says that faculty may be told they are great for the salary review, but then told something different in the P&T, and it is the latter that impacts the tenure.

Beale clarifies article 24 is the salary review process which is peer review. She states that article 24 was to mitigate the de-tenuring process because there would be time to deal with the faculty’s situation.

Maguire mentions there is no institutionalized third year review in the union contract, but many in her department wanted it included.

Puscheck mentions that a con to a formal third year process is that in her department faculty would be kicked out if they had not secured a grant, which is difficult to do in less than three years.

We discuss how we could communicate better when we send out future surveys. Suggestions included putting the information on the Academic Senate website, and clarifying that the survey is not the administration but has backing from the Senate and Union.

Brumley asks what FAC members would like to do given the data.

Maguire suggests a larger survey with all faculty and could include lecturers, so a general mentoring survey that would include skip patterns to guide faculty through the appropriate questions depending on position/rank.

Golodner asks about the possibility of surveying tenure track but not yet tenured faculty.

We also suggest that if we moved forward in this way, it would be a good to secure IRB. This would also give an added layer of security about confidentiality for faculty.

We agree to bring this back to our agenda for the April meeting indicating we are in favor of a broader survey and would like support from the Provost's office.

3. The minutes of February 8, 2017 were approved.

4. General Education – GEOC/GERC.

Markou met with quantitative experience committee. He states that they are developing a rubric, but have not asked for sample syllabi that could be part of the quantitative experience.

We discuss that prior to developing a rubric it is essential that the goals and objectives of the course are clarified.

We discuss that it is important for the QE committee to do a campus-wide call for syllabi that might fulfill the math literacy requirement.

We also discuss that the math requirement is the minimum for students across the university but that every department or college has the right to include other math courses for their students; courses that would be campus wide would have to be very broad.

Beale says policy took the previous competency test and many were unable to do the exam. She emphasizes that what we want in math competency is everyday math rather than basic math for students who might major in the subject. Further, she says there were structural constraints on timing of the courses and sequencing because students couldn't get it scheduled at the right time to graduate. Advisers were sending students to community colleges because it was easier to get the math competency transferred in to WSU.

Markou says that his understanding is that the math competency is being suspended until find something more sensible. He understands from the QE committee that the goal is to develop a math course that fits the needs of all that go to the university, not something necessarily taught by someone in the math department.

Brumley mentions that sociology would be open to submitting a syllabi to propose a course that would qualify for math competency.

Beale says that ideally we should know what would be the learning objectives, skills, order to cover the material, so there is a clear process in deciding what courses count for the QE requirement.

Markou raises the concern that if anyone can teach the math course, then it will be too broad and not address the needs of the math competency.

Beale says it is an argument between bifurcation versus unilateral – all students take the course versus those that have disciplines that have math/stats don't need math competency.

Maguire says that course proposals that outline what a math competency would look like should be called for. Beale agrees.

We suggest that Markou report back to the QE committee that FAC recommends that the course should (1) make math accessible in a way that is meaningful in the everyday life of students, and (2) be open to other departments to teach a course that fits the criteria. We also suggest that it is GEOC that should be thinking about what the skills should be for such a course, encouraging them to put out a call for proposals. Only upon ascertaining what the goals and objectives are for the math competency, can a rubric be developed. We also stress that the process for testing out cannot be done how it has been done in the past.

Brumley indicates that Fribley will report on the outcome of the engagement committee at the next FAC meeting.

Brumley reports on the diversity committee. She states that unfortunately by the time she was appointed there were no more in-person meetings. However, she reviewed the committee's proposal and had a conversation with Lisa Alexander, the committee chair. The proposal recommends two diversity courses – one on inequalities in the U.S and one on global inequalities. To ensure that courses meet the diversity criteria, syllabi would have to contain 80% of the readings on inequality. Prior to the phone conversation, Brumley inquired about two points, one substantive and one procedural.

Substantive: Brumley indicated to the committee chair that it is imperative for our students to have these kinds of courses. However, that the proposal as written read too narrow, asking the subcommittee for clarification on what was meant by diversity, social groups, and historical legacies. She stated that because the description on diversity seemed very general, it masked the very real differences in inequalities and disparities by race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, religion, etc., shaped by historical, social, political, and economic legacies.

Procedural: Brumley raised concerns that the proposal did not get at some of the questions raised by the policy committee (point five in policy memo). She asked for clarity on how a course would be deemed a diversity course, and how the 80% threshold would determine if a course met the diversity criteria. She asked about how a course focused solely on gender/sexuality for example versus a course that also covered race, ethnicity, class, etc. might both be considered diversity courses, suggesting that they are but that one course is more comprehensive than the other. Brumley also asked how existing courses that may or may not already be general education would be included/assessed, as well as possible new courses, and how diversity courses are related to signature courses.

Brumley summaries conversation with chair of diversity committee:

The committee kept language broad on purpose so that the requirement could cover a variety of different issues and that they did not want to provide a list of what protected classes were included (i.e. race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) because the text became unwieldy very quickly. By adding the requirement that 80% of the course content be directly related to diversity issues, the committee hopes to avoid courses that do not address inequalities in a substantive way. They also recognized that some faculty do not see the value of a diversity requirement so broader language would be useful to address different perspectives.

The committee created a list of existing courses – one for courses on U.S. inequalities and one on global. They came up with four pages of courses that could fulfill this requirement so they do not anticipate needing to add courses unless there are faculty that simply want to propose new courses. The committee chair indicated that it is up to departments to decide who teaches their courses; that it not something the GERC or the GEOC has any control over. The committee chair further indicated that the diversity courses span almost every department in CLAS and some departments outside the college. She clarified that a GSW course, for example, that was not intersectional in nature would still count for the requirement. A course that focuses on intersectional identities may be more comprehensive in nature but both courses could fulfill the learning outcomes without any problems. She further clarified that it would be up to the faculty to make the argument as to why their course should count toward the diversity requirement and it would be up to the GEOC to look at the materials provided (syllabus, lecture notes, etc.) and make a final determination. Since that is how the current Gen Ed system works, they did not anticipate the GERC recommending changes to that system. Once the Gen Ed is approved, departments would have to evaluate how their existing courses fit into the new rubric. The committee understood that departments that do not currently have courses in the Gen Ed curriculum would have an opportunity to make their case.

The chair stated that the current proposal does not have a direct link between diversity courses and signature courses. She explained that originally, Signature courses were supposed to include some aspect of diversity; however, if there are two diversity courses, the committee did not think the signature course would still be required to have a diversity component. If the GERC proposes that diversity courses can be double-counted, then a decision must be made about how that would work. Again, she believed that determination would likely be made by the instructor of record and the GEOC. As it stands, the signature course fulfills a breadth requirement. If the instructor of record wanted their signature course to fulfill the diversity requirement I am not

sure how the GEOC would handle that. She stated that the committee didn't think we would want courses counting for three requirements. The Instructor would probably be asked to make a choice: signature/breadth or signature/diversity.

And finally, she said the committee could not speak to whether the student body is currently interested in diversity courses. However, many of our peer institutions have diversity as part of their Gen Ed curriculum.

5. Online courses

We have no further discussion.

6. SET

We have no further discussion.

7. New Business

Puscheck asks about the Higher Learning Commission site visit. We have brief discussion on turnout at the meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50.

The next meeting is Wednesday, April 12th from 1:00 to 3:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista M. Brumley, Interim Chair