

Faculty Standards & Affairs Committee  
Draft Minutes  
December 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2016

Attendance:	xx Sandra Feldman (A&H)	xx Armand Gilinsky (Bus & Econ Rep)
xx Emily Hinton (AS)	xx Viki Montera (Educ Rep)	xx Elaine Newman (CFA Rep)
xx Rita Premo (Library)	SSP (no rep)	xx Matthew Paolucci (Soc Sci Rep)
xx Steven Winter (Chair / Sci & Tech Rep)		Deborah Roberts (Assoc Vice Provost)

Meeting Recorder – Feldman  
Adopt Agenda – Adopted  
Approval of Minutes – 12/1/16 Approved with no changes

Standing Reports:

URTP (Gillinsky)

Concerned with low response rates of SETEs. We questioned if faculty allocate class time for students, would the response rate go up? Matt suggested we look at and consider Best Practices and try to follow those. Faculty affairs might give faculty suggestions (via an email) on steps to follow the best practices to get the greatest response rate. Hinton: Some students see SETEs as valuable while others are somewhat confused by the process. In her own experience, all of her professors mentioned the SETE surveys and in one class, the professor had students find the survey, left the room, and gave students 10 minutes to fill-in and send the SETEs.

Business Items:

16-17:2 Office Hours Policy

Discussed that the collective bargaining agreement says office hours are a part of our employment commitment. Three hours per week is the general consensus. Change in paragraph 4 quires to inquiry. Motion to send to Executive Committee with change; Passed 7-0.

16-17:3 Revision of RTP Policy Regarding SETE Data

Discussed how SETE's are used across the university. Some Schools ask for qualitative responses and some schools don't solicit any qualitative analysis. Paolucci: the kind of stuff we are asking for is not possible with the program that is used. Having SETEs on only one class across numerous classes taught is unreliable. It may be impossible to get aggregate data. Best reliability is to evaluate two of the same courses across time. FSAC also discussed the ending date for gathering SETE's because the dates are not the same by schools. There's research that shows evals are influenced by non-instructor variables and the date they are given. This is a problem. Exactly when they close is what we need to determine. When it is is not as important as that they all close consistently across campus. Four schools voted to end them on the last day of classes and three schools voted to end them on the last day of the semester one week later. FSAC will take this issue up again in spring 2017.

**16-17:5      NCAA Violations by Coaches Info. into Personnel Action File**

FSAC needs to clarify policy. NCAA wants each university to find a certain number of secondary violations because there are violations. If your athletic department does not turn in any secondary violations you are out of compliance – looking for infractions to maintain institutional integrity. When we have a violation, we turn it into the NCAA to acknowledge the situation and state the punishment to be administered; researched in an NCAA database of similar violations – punishments. If you don't administer a harsh enough punishment, the NACC can come back and decree a harder punishment. The document is signed by the Dept Intercollegiate Athletics Compliance Officer and the Faculty Athletic Representative. As a part of what we are signing it states to the NCAA we will be place the violation in the employment file of the coach. We need a policy that says in compliance with NCAA rules a violation will be placed in the coach's personnel action file. This could be clarified within the Procedures for Periodic Evaluation of Athletic Coaching Faculty Policy.

**16-17:7      Post-Tenure Review Policy (HO 10/13 agenda)**

Winter: we already DO have a PTR policy. As a committee should we drop that item, because the document already exists or are we interested in revising the policy. Moved that we accept the prior university policy for the PTR (Procedures for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Effective date Spring 1991; Passed 7-0. Communication loop: Winter will report to Assoc. Vice Provost Roberts that we have a policy on our SSU Policy Site.

**16-17:9b      Departmental RTP Policies – Philosophy Dept. (attached)**

Winter brought back to FSAC the original Philosophy Dept. RTP Criteria with additions and strike outs consistent with their new proposed criteria. Winter sent the document to the Philosophy Dept. for their approval and addition of rational for changes. FSAC decided to wait till the Philosophy Dept. returns the document with rational before further consideration.

**16-17:10      Trigger Warning (Sensitive Material) Resolution**

Winter: Exec Comm gave us "sensitive materials" issue (trigger warning). Paolucci and Lipp spoke to Associated Students. FSAC: looked at the Academic Freedom Subcommittee statement and rejected it. FSAC then discussed a version written by Winter and slightly changed the language. Paolucci: mentioned that clinical psychologists say that faculty do not have the training to predict instances of a PTSD incident or what will be distressing to students. There are a wide range of stimuli. We are not all mental health professionals. It is rational that faculty be encouraged to weigh the potential impact classroom materials and consider the affect that for example graphic violence, rape or death may have on students. Paolucci and Lipp are preparing handouts and giving workshops in the Faculty Center to encourage faculty to seek resources. One of the main concerns was not to burden the instructor with requirements of how they need to deal with certain sensitive

material in general, so as not to require the instructor to change the goals or objectives of the course. They don't want to be solely responsible for the outcomes. The concept of trigger warnings has been unexamined. This is a classroom climate issue. The instructor needs to ensure that students understand that they need to take care of their own mental health and faculty should be aware of ways to address potential issues. If there is distress students know where to go. What, exactly, a reasonable person would find distressing is not precisely clear. Motion to utilize the second paragraph in the Winter document with edits and add offer of resources to faculty; take the document back to AFS; Passed 7-0.

16-17:12     Center to Promote Faculty and Student Research and Creative Projects (attached)

Winter: FSSP has written a draft of a proposal for a Center to Promote Faculty and Student Research and Creative Projects. We had them put the rationale above the resolve and we added in that the President and Provost get back to FSAC on whatever action they advise by May. Motioned that we send to Executive Committee; Passed 7-0. Hinton: wondered where the funds will come from to support the Center. Montera: notes that the two centers are already funded and the two would merge. If there are "incidentals" those would be addressed appropriately. The staffing for sponsored programs is in flux. This is timely otherwise it is going to go away. This is the start of the conversation, not the final say.