

**Minutes**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting**  
**December 15, 2009; 3:00 pm**  
**1270 FAB**

*Present:* S. Calkins (Administration liaison), W. Crossland, E. Golebiowska (AAUP-AFT liaison), P. Jarosz, J. Mateika, R. Parnell, M. Sengstock (Policy Committee liaison), R. Yamazaki.  
*Absent with notice:* A. Acsadi, K. Padmanabhan, E. Puscheck, I. Walker (Student Council liaison).  
*Absent:* M. Horn, F. Florkowski, S. Putatunda.

**Agenda**

1. *Call to order*  
Meeting was called to order at 3:05.
  
2. *Approval of minutes of 11/17/2009 meeting*  
Approved.
  
3. *Providing feedback on merit salary review at department and college level*  
Prof. Mateika cited a problem with the lack of timely feedback in the Merit Salary Review process. He related that a faculty member did not receive a score, and therefore no salary adjustment in one category of the merit review process because some of the supporting data was not duplicated for the college level review committee. The faculty member did not realize this until receiving notice of the salary revision for the year. The faculty member then had difficulty trying to find an appropriate and knowledgeable person who could resolve the problem, although after some delay, the problem was solved. This raises several issues: Ensuring accurate transmission of faculty data to merit salary committee reviewers, getting timely feedback from the salary committees, and providing a salary committee contact in the event of a faculty member's question. After some discussion the FAC decided to forward the following recommendations to the Senate President and Senate Policy Committee (ultimately to the Provost's office and to the AAUP/AFT because the salary committees are mandated in the university contract): 1) The data from the faculty should be transmitted in electronic format to the department/unit salary committee and to the college level committee to decrease the likelihood of data loss. 2) Copies of the data sent to each salary committee level should be available for the individual faculty member to view, if they wish. 3) Both departmental/unit and college level committees should notify the individual faculty members of their own scores after their respective committees meet. 4) The FAC also would like the Provost's office and AAUP/AFT to explore the possibility of providing provide the name of a committee member to contact if the faculty member has any questions about their scores when they are returned. The Chair asked Prof. Golebiowska (AAUP/AFT liaison) to verify that the FAC is making recommendations on matters not already covered by the University contract.

4. *Blackboard performance – Possible joint meeting with Facilities Support Services & Technology (FSST) Committee*

The Chair contacted Joe Artiss, Chair of FSST, and discussed the possibility of a joint meeting if the FAC thought such a meeting were necessary. Prof. Artiss was happy to comply for the month of February. Prof. Yamazaki suggested that the FSST and FAC exchange minutes of meetings in which Blackboard and Pipeline performance were discussed before making a final decision at the January FAC meeting on a joint committee meeting in February. The Chair will see to it that the minutes are exchanged. In general the FAC thinks it might be a good idea to communicate faculty frustration with Blackboard to the WSU Chief Information Officer. The FAC also would like to see how Blackboard and Pipeline perform at the beginning of 2010 winter term, prior to the January FAC meeting.

5. *Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) interpretation guidelines based on student interest in a course*

Background: A faculty member requested that the FAC find out why there is no allowance in SET score interpretation to compensate for students' lack of interest in taking a required course. One of the original charges for SET in the Academic Senate Student Evaluation of Teaching (ASSET) report in 1995 was to adjust the interpretation of the SET score based on student interest in a course prior to taking it. A method was proposed in the ASSET report (items 16 and 17) to carry this out. The compensatory interpretation scheme is not being used. The concerned faculty member thought it should be implemented and wondered why it wasn't. The Chair forwarded this request to Senate President and Senate Policy Committee who, in turn, sent it to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (CI). The CI Chair, Karen Feathers, informed the FAC Chair that CI thought the topic was a contractual issue and not appropriate for their committee.

Prof. Parnell asked if the FAC could learn why the ASSET report items 16 and 17 were not implemented along with other ASSET report recommendations. The Chair said he would ask Tom Wilhelm (Director, Testing, Evaluation and Research Services) why these items were not adopted and requested Prof. Golebiowska to ask Charles Parrish (AAUP/AFT President) the same thing. The Chair also asked Prof. Golebiowska to ask for the AAUP/AFT's opinion as to whether this issue fell under the aegis of the contract-mandated Student Evaluation of Teaching Committee (Article XXIX), as it seems to fall. One of the 1995 ASSET committee members, Prof. Richard Gallagher, could be invited to speak to the FAC about the issue.

Prof. Yamazaki noted that the Testing Office does not return the outcomes of SET evaluations in courses with enrollments of less than five because of low statistical validity. It would be useful to at least have the data. Prof. Calkins pointed out that in order to maintain confidentiality, the SET forms are analyzed by Testing Services staff members who have no contact with the students. Returning data from small numbers of student responses might compromise the anonymity of the evaluation. However, other members pointed out that some faculty hand out their own self-generated evaluation forms to their classes and ask a colleague to compile the statistics and comments for them.

6. *Mentoring – Liz Puscheck*

Prof. Puscheck was unable to attend today and will make a presentation on mentoring in the January FAC meeting.

7. *Other business*

Prof. Sengstock reported that there was a proposal to the Senate Policy Committee to put the smoking survey on the Academic Senate meeting agenda for February. The FAC looks forward to reviewing a copy of the report (the FAC, Student Affairs Committee and Elections Committees were charged by the Policy Committee to review a proposal for a smoke-free campus in 2008-2009).

8. *Next meeting: Tuesday, January 26, 2010; 3:00 pm; 1270 FAB.*

9. *Adjourn.*

Meeting adjourned at 4:03 pm.