

Faculty Affairs Committee
April 22, 2014

Present: Abhijit Biswas, Lobelia Samavati, Sherylyn Briller, Ellen Tisdale, Linda Beale, renee hoogland

Absent: Derek Wildman, Judith Floyd, Delores Dungee-Anderson, Beena Sood

Absent with notice: John Vander Weg, Poonam Arya, Ewa Golebiowska, Mary Sengstock, Elizabeth Puscheck

The meeting was called to order at 1:32.

Minutes of March 18 meeting were approved with suggested amendments (hoogland, Tisdale)

1. Mentorship Survey

The FAC has not (yet) received the original mentoring survey from CUS. Beale noted that John Vander Weg and Margaret Winters were discussing the issue of mentoring, and that the Senate Policy Committee would like to get feedback on this issue from the Provost's office. Some members of the FAC thought that (broad) surveys might not be useful; instead, it might be a good idea to reach out to recently tenured/promoted faculty for feedback. Other members thought that starting out with a qualitative survey of (selected) department heads (as suggested in a prior FAC meeting) and then conducting a quantitative survey may be the optimum way to proceed on this matter. Finally the FAC thought that a mentoring program for associate professors (if it does not exist) would be a good idea to pursue.

2. Retirement Forum

Biswas updated the FAC of the proposed Retirement Forum for Fall 2014. Biswas noted that two emails were sent to Brett Green (April 4 and April 14, 2014) and there was no response from Green on this issue. FAC thought it might be a good idea to request the Senate President to contact Green.

3. Faculty Role in Aiding Student Retention and Improving Graduation Rates (ASIGR)

The FAC reviewed the ASIGR document. The FAC (is obviously) interested in AISGR; however, members of the committee expressed concern that the documents read more like "how to run a class". The FAC feels that the document needs to explain how exactly it will aid in student and increased graduation rates. The FAC feels that any guideline for ASIGR should be broad in nature and should include the "sources" from which the guidelines were established.

4. Old Business: Annual Merit Evaluations

The discussion on this topic mainly centered around the use of teaching evaluations for annual merit raises. Briller noted that the current process may be problematic, particularly for untenured faculty. One concern was there seems to be inconsistency in terms of using class sizes, response rates, going by old versus new rules, etc., across departments or colleges. Additionally, the perception is that there is inconsistent reporting and use of SET scores (one versus more than one year) and other indicators of teaching across departments and/or colleges.

FAC feels that (1) salary committees should be encouraged to consider a broader period than one year for teaching performance/evaluations, and 2) there should be consistency between teaching, research and service in terms of evaluation period.

5. New Business

FAC feels that its committee membership should have a significant overlap from one year to another.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:32.

Respectfully submitted,

Abhijit Biswas
Chair