

Faculty Affairs Committee

December 9, 2015

Present: renée hoogland, Abhijit Biswas, Ellen Tisdale, Andrew Fribley, Sokol Todi, Deborah Walker, Krista Brumley, Abdulrahman Suleiman, Pramod Khosla, Linda Beale.

Absent with notice: Poonam Arya, John Vander Weg.

The meeting was called to order at 10:05am.

Approval of minutes of November 11, 2015.

Correction under Graduate Faculty Status: Abe's comment changed into "the process is odd" (rather than "silly").

Comments: the committee will pick up the SET issue in the Winter semester.

The information about the CDC is not adequate: discuss with John VanderWeg. Tabled for next meeting.

Faculty Mentoring

There has been no follow-up from JvdW on this.

Somebody (?) suggests that Helen Wilson (COSW) should be contacted: the COSW Career development cttee. has data on how mentoring (or lack thereof) impacts women.

Linda: a recommendation has been made that the provost provides a report. This has not happened. Policy should be asked to put pressure on the provost's office to produce this report.
Andrew: there is very little mentoring going on in SOM. Most people appear to be in the dark about it.

renée: recommends requesting a report from the provost on the status quo.

Informal mentoring should be incorporated into the survey.

It might be a good idea to send the Madison survey along; Policy should be asked to advise on this.

Since the data would still have to be analyzed, the provost should be urged to move forward with this.

Graduate Faculty Status

Pramod: there is a model for appeal. The Academic Standards Committee decides. This is a sub-cttee. of graduate council. They do not look solely at the number of publications per se, but also take "other scholarly activity" into account.

Andrew: since there is no graduate program in pediatrics, he cannot apply for graduate status, even if he does advise MA/PhD students. Pramod suggests that Andrew contact Andrew Feig about this, and further clarifies that providing context will usually be enough to convince the cttee.

The issue was closed at this point.

Open Source Materials

Abdul presents materials. Explains: the initiative involves both the creation of open source textbooks, and using existing ones. Faculty receive \$1,000 for writing a chapter. The Dean of Library Systems is willing to contribute \$15,000. Abdul will be meeting with people at the bookstore as well.

Lumen Learning collects open source materials and can help faculty find them—they are paid for their services. Linda finds the idea of hiring a person to find a textbook for her repulsive. Abdul claims that the materials are peer-reviewed. renée wants to know how and by whom. Abe is doubtful about the peer review process. Abdul will try to find out.

Andrew thinks that faculty should be informed and encouraged to use open source materials. Linda objects to this recommendation: we need to know more about the peer review process and the commercial interests involved. Further: Abdul wants to push this with money from the library/university.

Pramod checks the Lumen Learning site: there appear only to be a few subjects.

Abdul wonders what the problem is, if students benefit from this resource. Deborah suggests that faculty resist change.

Abdul explains that the \$1,000 is a stipend to encourage people to invest time in exploring open source materials. Once they implement it, they get the \$\$.

Linda suggests that this is a provost/academic issue. The provost should have a website with validated (annotated) bibliographies. Abe suggests that this is already being done. Linda believes that the process needs to be faculty informed.

Abe submits that WSU needs to accept the project. The bookstore need to approve/cooperate. He bellies that the books are good/work. renée wonders how he knows this.

Linda: all this should go through OTL. We should bring Matt Ouellette to our meeting, as well as Daren Hubbard.

Abe and renée will put together a package of materials and we will invite Ouellette and Hubbard to discuss possibilities and implications.

New Business

renée suggests that we look into what is going on with online courses. The evaluation cttee. appears to have met only once. Faculty are very worried about the quality of online course/teaching. Policy has also asked us to tackle the peer evaluation of teaching issue. Both topics will be on our roll for next semester.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35am.

Date for next meeting: **January 20, 2016, 10:30am.**

Respectfully submitted,

renée c. hoogland, Chair