

Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee Minutes 12/13/18

Members Attending:

Rita Premo (Chair), LIB
Angelo Camillo, B&E
Andy Collinsworth, A&H
Paula Lane, ED
Richard Whitkus, SST

Absent:

Deborah A. Roberts, Faculty Affairs
Elaine Newman, CFA

Guest: Laurel Holmstrom-Keyes, Senate Analyst

Call to order: 1:00

Agenda: Approved

Minutes from 11/29/18:

- Not present yet.

Reports:

Chair, Premo:

- Recent ExComm/Senate discussions on name-reading at graduation
- Faculty Retreat in January will focus on shared governance models
- GE documents are coming out for review.

Faculty Affairs, Roberts

- Absent, no report

AFS Collinsworth:

- Worked further on informal reporting procedure for AF concerns.
- Tested this procedure via a discussion of a uniform syllabus to ensure that it wasn't infringing on AF. Met with Alvin and Karen Moranski and came to an amicable resolution: Will change syllabus to allow teachers to be individualistic.
- Big picture = hearing cases informally is clearly a way to go.
- Still formulating the flow chart for process.

FSP Whitkus:

- Tammy Kenber and Dr. Roberts were there requesting input on university-wide awards event that will include Excellence in Teaching, RSCA, Staff Excellence

and Outstanding Service awards to be coordinated by HR, and Strategic Plan Core Values champions from faculty and staff.

- Steve Karp: Koret = 25 awards to hire up to 4 students; \$10K. This is the last of the Koret funds; currently negotiating for more.
- Advancement wants to start inviting potential donors to the RSCA symposia.
- Calibrating the RSCA criteria
- Had the first reading of changes to the committee name and charge; chair will bring to FSAC.

PDS Lane:

- Worked on resolution re: creation of ombudsperson office.
- Discussion of money and need to better broadcast the funding available, such as the monies available from the Faculty Center.
- Discussion of Teaching and Learning Symposium and how it could look in the future.
- Need to advocate asking others for funding.
- Lecturer outreach: Needs to be a concerted effort, such as a joint welcome email, Canvas training, social gathering. Need a package to support lecturers.
- Instructional Innovation Grants: deadline is February 15. Only 3 are being funded this year.

URTP (N/A):

ASI (no rep at this time):

CFA Newman:

- Absent, no report.

Business

1. Excellence in Teaching Award
 - PL relates what has occurred so far in terms of charge, meeting with DR and previous recipient.
 - Chart provided at previous meeting has since been edited to reflect FSAC conversation.
 - Discussion over whether to create a new call or edit something that exists already.
 - Nomination process: involves much paperwork
 - LHK: Administered award for 18 years. Whatever the process is, there need to be clear criteria. She put a document together about EITA. Suggests a rubric be created that outlines what makes an excellent teacher, and put that through the Senate. There is no voting on awardees: 3 people on the committee come to consensus. Supporting documentation is not being ridiculous: only 5 pages of supporting letters, and not necessarily letters from students or colleagues.
 - Can put examples of documentation in the announcement.
 - Once the nominees are announced, anyone can provide supporting documents.

- Emphasizes that there should be no administration on the committee that chooses the awardees.
 - Award was originally funded by community donors and is now coming from internal source. Is the same amount as the RSCA award.
 - Suggestion to make the criteria measurable.
 - We could go to the RTP criteria for the criteria of teaching excellence: Guidance already exists.
 - Functional questions: problems with the February timing in relation to new awarding period in April, the nomination timeframe.
 - Questions: should it be a surprise or advance notice?
2. PDS rough draft of ombudsperson request resolution
- Goal is to have a neutral person faculty and staff can go to before legal entities are involved.
 - Need a cover letter to convince administration.
 - Document needs to be specific, but not legally binding?
 - PDS thinks they're done with the document. The next time FSAC sees it will be our first reading. After we vote on it in a second reading, FSAC owns it.
 - Comments: page numbers need to be added. Some materials should be put in a separate appendix. Also the language is very informal.
 - First reading is our changes, second reading is to accept it or not.

Meeting adjourned: 3:00 pm