

Faculty Affairs Committee

October 6, 2016

Present: renée hoogland, Poonam Arya, Krista Brumley, Andrew Fribley, Katherine Maguire, Kypros Markou, Elizabeth Puscheck, Jeffrey Rebudal, Ellen Tisdale, Linda Beale, Rita Casey, Abdulrahman Suleiman.

Absent with notice:

Daniel Golodner

N.B. Leonard Lipovitch and John Vander Weg turned out not to have been included in the mailing list and hence did not know that the meeting was taking place.

1. The meeting was called to attention at 1:35pm.

2. Approval of minutes of April 13, 2016.

A discussion evolves about the use of Open Source Materials. AF reports on his meeting with OT, as a member of the OSM cttee. This cttee. was not appointed; it is more a "grassroots" thing: eight people willing to work on something students asked us to do. B&N currently provides three categories of materials: free, course packages, and through "OpenStax" [<https://openstax.org/>]. The cttee. has no intention of pushing the use of OSM. Rather, its aim is to locate (vetted) materials and to familiarize faculty with them. Four people applied for the \$1,000 (p.p.) incentive funds to use for exploring and setting up OSM. Representatives from OpenStax will be invited to campus to see if they are the right company to work with. Major concerns at this point: quality, gathering feedback from faculty & students. AF will send rch a memo explaining the cttee's activities and aims, and a list of its members.

LB is surprised that there are not more faculty involved. Another concern: the \$1,000 incentive funds may lead to potential problems being ignored (legal, e.g.).

KB asks after the ownership of the materials. LB adds that problems may arise when people put effort into contributing, adding matters of their own. Who owns them when they are part of OSM?

rch is worried about the integrity of written work: she does not want people to mess with her work.

The minutes were approved.

3. Approval of the Annual Report AY 2015-16

SET issue raises discussion. RC reports from her position as a member of the SET cttee. Three items are used only for faculty evaluations. These items ("beauty contest items") are actually the weakest assessment items and they are biased. They will be the focus of the cttee.'s work. The Provost's office does not want to use medians; they insist on using means. The cttee. will make recommendations to improve matters. If the Provost does not accept the recommendations, he will need to come and talk to the cttee.

KM comments that the SET issue has been around for a long time. What has been ignored is that the contract says that SETs cannot be used for Salary adjustment. Some chairs who want to move fast evaluate faculty on SETs from the previous year, if the new SETs are not yet available.

LB explains that salary cttee. has refused to use a "star" system.

RC: JvdW has provided instructions and a sample SET report. There is, however, no numerical meaning to any of these means (1, 2, 24). To use them is absurd. If a faculty member files a complaint with the union, the grievance officer might be willing to pursue. The new format is used not just for P&T, but also for salary.

rch: FAC should send a memo to Policy about this.

(Follow-up: RC suggested to rch that she contact Laura Woodward to find out about the 2016/-17 SET timeline. rch passed on the received memo to FAC on 10/11/16).

The annual report was approved.

4. Agenda Items for AY 2016-17

Determined:

Open Source Materials

SET

Mentoring

Online courses

GEOC

5 Further discussion

Faculty Mentoring

KB reports that a cttee. was formed in May. A survey, targeted at recently tenured faculty, was drafted by Abe Biswas and KB, and piloted in September. The survey, which focuses on

expectations of and the actual mentoring faculty have received, is currently out to the entire target group. KB will report on the results 5 weeks from the day the FAC met, and give a presentation to the Academic Senate. Next steps might include interviews and focus groups. In addition, Article 24 may lead to next steps that involve advanced faculty who drop back in production.

LB observes that JvdW was to provide the data on mentoring activities that are currently in place. It is not quite clear what departments are doing.

RC suggests that it might be helpful to interview people who did not get tenure as well.

Online course evaluation

RC confirms that the original 2N cttee. has been increased by JvdW to a 4N cttee. to also include graduate students and part-time faculty. The EC of the Union keeps pushing the issue. The Administration keeps stalling, suggesting that there have been "communication issues."

rch states that it is unacceptable that the cttee. has not met.

LB proposes that a strongly worded memo from FAC be sent to Police cttee.

rch & LB agree to collaborate on this.

GEOC

rch notes that is problematic that neither FAC nor CIC are represented on the this cttee.

LB suggests that we ask GEOC chairs that a member of FAC be allowed to act as a liaison.

rch & LB will collaborate on this.

Peer evaluation

rch will ask JvdW for the guidelines and for data on what is happening where.

AF notes that his department has done nothing in this respect and wonders why.

Awards

KB says that the info on awards is available, but that it still has not gone up on the appropriate websites.

LB thinks that Marketing should be doing this, and will contact them about it.

Miscellany

KB wonders where people should go in other to solve faculty / faculty conflicts.

LB suggests Marquita and her office (Marquita Chamblee, Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer).

KB brings to our attention that the program in Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies is understaffed and struggling, even if their courses are unexceptionally over-enrolled. We need joint appointments, so that full time faculty can take over some of the teaching and strengthen the program.

rch comments that it has proven very hard to cross list course: she and several of her colleagues would be happy to teach in the program. Is this a Banner issue? Or is something else making this hard?

LB says that we should check out where the Dean stands on these questions (cross-listing & joint appointments). And, furthermore, that the focus on "diversity" in the General Education Reform process should entail that additional resources are provided for LGBTQ programming.

AF brings up the issue of the de-tenuring of faculty in the Medical School. It is not quite clear what the administrators understand "unproductive" faculty to mean. The Union has made very clear statements on the developments.

LB informs the cttee. that she is going on a retreat (with LouRomano and Charlie Parrish) the following week. She will report on where things stand at the moment. It seems clear that Hefner has pushed this the way it is currently going; people are being de-tenured. President Wilson apparently supports the process.

The meeting was adjourned a 4:25pm.

Respectfully submitted,

renée c. hoogland, Chair