

Minutes
Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
April 20, 2010; 3:00 pm
1270 FAB

Present: S. Calkins (Administration Liaison), W. Crossland (Chair), E. Golebiowska (AAUP-AFT liaison), D. O'Mara (Student Senate Liaison), K. Padmanabhan (Non-Senate), J. Mateika, R. Parnell, E. Puscheck, M. Sengstock (Policy Committee Liaison), R. Yamazaki.

Absent with notice: A. Acsadi, M. Horn, P. Jarosz.

Absent: F. Florkowski, S. Putatunda.

Agenda

1. *Call to order*

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 pm.

2. *Approval of minutes of 3/23/2010 meeting*

Approved.

3. *Revised mentoring survey (Profs. Puscheck and Acsadi)*

Prof. Puscheck: Prof. Acsadi could not attend; Prof. Puscheck presented the second draft of the mentoring survey [changes made at the meeting are in *italics*]. There was a detailed discussion of each question with suggestions for wording and organizational changes. The introduction was modified to emphasize the focus on faculty-faculty mentorship, not faculty-student mentorship. Question 3 was modified to read: "*Within your department/unit how sufficient or insufficient is the mentoring you are receiving?*" The response scale was modified to read: "*None, insufficient, somewhat insufficient, somewhat sufficient, and sufficient*". Question 4 had an addition: "*f. Other (please write in)*". Question 5 was modified to emphasize that its subject was mentoring outside the department: "*If you are receiving mentoring beyond the department level, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the mentoring you are getting?*" Possible answers: "*Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat satisfied, satisfied.*" For Question 7, the second sentence was modified to read, "*Please rank a-d in order of importance to you.*" The committee made several editorial suggestions on questions 7 and 8 to be incorporated into the next version of the survey.

For question 10 it was decided to rank responses 1-3 instead of circling the area of primary responsibility for mentoring.

Prof. Puscheck thought that question 11 should be put at the end, after the biographical data, because it is an open-ended question and time consuming to complete. Ms. O'Mara suggested that the text of the question be condensed.

Prof. Puscheck suggested that a statement be added to the introductory paragraph saying how many minutes the survey will take to fill out.

Related to the biographical question on "How long have you been at WSU?": Prof. Calkins asked if the meaning were, "how long has the person been at WSU" or "how long has the person been in their current role?" (e.g., came as part-time but currently tenure-track)? Prof. Sengstock thought that even if people have been at another school for many years, the policies and procedures at WSU may be different than what they previously experienced. Prof. Puscheck noted that by looking at this question and comparing with the question "What is your rank at Wayne State?" you could infer previous roles of more senior faculty (e.g., a professor here for two years has likely been at another institution for several.)

Prof. Padmanabhan emphasized that the survey needs to be as brief as possible in order to get as many people to respond to it as possible.

Prof. Golebiowska suggested asking about race or ethnicity because the survey already asked about gender and offered to supply some standard ways of listing the possibilities.

Professors Puscheck and Acsadi will present the revised survey at the May meeting. The survey will be sent out in the Fall Semester.

4. *Other business*

Prof. Mateika noted that the School of Medicine (SOM) e-mail accounts have very small memory unless people pay for the increased memory.

Prof. Yamazaki suggested bringing the issue up to the SOM Information Technology Committee. Right now the SOM Medical School Information System (MSIS) says that they cannot assure data backup if the e-mail accounts memory is expanded.

Prof. Sengstock pointed out that the main campus e-mail accounts have a large memory capacity.

Prof. Calkins asked why SOM faculty members do not use the main campus e-mail accounts.

Prof. Yamazaki responded that the SOM wants all research and clinical faculty using the medical school e-mail system so that MSIS can check for HIPPA violations. Therefore, the SOM will not forward e-mail to the main campus. The SOM

administration and faculty can use the SOM Outlook server “all users” list-serve to contact all the research and clinical faculty in the med school by using their med school e-mail accounts. If the Provost’s office uses an “access id” list serve, the e-mail does not reach the entire SOM faculty because some of them never forwarded their “access id” accounts to the SOM server.

The Chair asked why MSIS is not under the control of the university C&IT CIO.

Prof. Yamazaki informed the FAC that the medical school e-mail system servers were purchased and accounts set up by the SOM. Until recently, the SOM e-mail system was superior to that of the main campus.

Prof. Calkins remarked that many of the main campus units that had their own e-mail servers are now adopting the WSU server because of its power and convenience.

5. *Next meeting: Tuesday, May 11; 3:30 pm, 1270 FAB*

Prof. Puscheck requested the meeting start at 3:30 pm because she has a prior meeting that day. Although there is a Provost candidate at the same time (3:00 – 4:00), the FAC agreed to meet at the suggested time.

6. *Adjourn*

Meeting adjourned at 4:02 pm.