

Faculty Affairs Committee

November 3, 2016

Present: renée hoogland, Krista Brumley, Andrew Fribley, Ashok Kumar, Leonard Lipovich, Katheryn Maguire, Kypros Markou, Jeffrey Rebudal, Ellen Tisdale, Jinping Xu, Linda Beale, Rita Casey, Karin Tarpenning

Absent with notice: Poonam Arya, John Vander Weg

1. The meeting was called to attention at 1:37pm.

2. Approval of the minutes of October 6, 2016

Three minor corrections were suggested and applied [see attached file].

The minutes were approved.

3. SET—Memo Laura Woodward

rch is under the impression that the minor adjustments outlined in this document is the best we can expect for now. LB and Lou Romano concur.

RC posits that we need more people on the SET cttee. Two admin. members have not attended the cttee. meetings. The major problem remains the “beauty contest” questions on the form. Numbers drawn from these (non-valid) questions produce results that are even less valid. Matt Ouellett is going to urge JvdW to talk about this problem. The literature on the non-validity of these questions is increasing. Gender, age, race, etc. make enormous differences. The cttee. meetings have been set up. Two administrators will be added to the cttee.

4. GEOC/GERC

LB provides some background. The current proposal was lifted from the University of Wisconsin in Oshkosh, and presented by M. Brockmeyer. Policy had serious concerns, and identified hurdles, e.g., re: the math competency requirement. M. Brockmeyer and M. Winters subsequently dropped the math requirement altogether. This course of action is similar to the GEOC itself as it is moving forward with the proposal. The BOG was taken unawares by the math competency issue. [KM asks why the math requirement was dropped in the first place. LB explains that the test is wrong: it is a placement exam, not a competency test. AF thinks it may have been 40 years old.]

The (new) Provost came to Policy with a new charge that essentially meant accepting the proposal without much attention being paid to all the problem issues. GERC had not yet

received the stamp of approval from GEOC. M. Brockmeyer and M. Winters decided the GEOC could not do anything for 18 months. Policy presented its memo of October 21, 2016. The Provost was asked to respond, but turns out to be out of town for several weeks. The memo has been widely distributed among the WSU community.

Policy will invite M. Brockmeyer and Tom Fischer to attend its meeting of November 28, 2016. Meanwhile, the subcommittees are all in place and meeting. Policy feels that LB, Lou Romano, rch, and the chair of the CIC should all be on the GERC.

KB: are UG students going to take the place of GTA's? (#3 on memo). How are the UGs going to be trained and paid? We need to talk about the content of these new courses about who is going to teach them and how.

LB: "Capstones" make no sense in a gen. ed. program. We better start with what we have, and explore what needs to be added. A list of courses was requested. The list that was received included any course with words such as "diverse" and "broad" in the title. Both the Provost and the President like the diversity aspect. No distinction was made between proposed "signature" courses and existing ones that could function as such. Apparently, the BOG had a secret meeting about all this with the administration in Macomb county.

ET asks how the gen. ed reform is going to affect the accreditation process. If all of this is "on the books," can anything be changed anymore?

rch: it is currently unclear whether the 18-month moratorium is still in place or not. Will send a note to Darin Ellis and ask for clarification. [did but rather late]

LB: it is important for all of us to talk to colleagues about all of the aspects of the gen. ed. reform, especially to people who serve on the subcommittees (appointed by the GEOC).

KCM: We should further ask the Provost, by way of JvdW, for a presentation on the status quo and the process. [rch sent note/request, but rather late]

5. Online courses

It is not quite clear who the members of the online courses cttee. are. rch: We will ask JvdW to clarify at the next meeting. Where do we go to make clear that we are concerned about the ongoing obscure developments re: online teaching?

LB suggests that we (i.e., rch) speak/s up at the BOG meeting.

RC: we have people making complaints about online courses that may go into grievance.

6. New business

rch reads JvdW's brief (and last-minute—rch did not ask for this in time) memo on mentoring. He appears to answer only one question: the Provost's office continues to enforce the requirement of a mentoring plan for the individual being recommended for appointment to the tenure-track faculty.

LB: JvdW was supposed to provide info/data last year.

rch: will get back to JvdW and ask him to respond to the 2nd question (what is happening in the various departments with the mentoring of (junior) faculty). [did not: hopefully, we can discuss this on December 1].

ET: what happened at the retreat about the medical school.

LB: the expectation is that it will take three years to bring the situation into some balance. Hefner did not share his prepared slides because he claimed that information had been leaked prior to the presentation. Some medical faculty have accepted retirement packages. Some are not finalized. Some are planning to litigate—a costly process for the WSU and the faculty member involved. It seems as if the admin. wanted to show that they can successfully de-tenure a faculty member. There was an implicit threat that this process can be used elsewhere in the university as well. As of now, 40-60 individuals have been targeted as un(der) productive faculty. The future of the DMC was also discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,

renée c. hoogland, Chair