Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee
Minutes
October 27, 2016

Present: Steven Winter (Chair/Sci & Tech), Armand Gilinsky (Bus & Econ), Elaine Newman (CFA), Matthew Paolucci-Callahan (Soc Sci), Rita Premo (Library);

Guest: Justin Lipp (Faculty Center)

Absent: Jasmine Delgadillo (AS), Sandra Feldman (Eng), Viki Montera (Educ), Deborah Roberts (Assoc Vice Provost), SSP (no rep)

Meeting recorder: Premo
Adopt agenda: Adopted with addition of new item: departmental criteria from Kinesiology
Approval of minutes from 10/13/16. Approved with changes to name spelling and the name of the person who spoke to the Senate that day (From Callahan to Lipp).

Standing reports:

PDS (Callahan): Asks members to complete the survey on professional development needs, particularly regarding research, and encourage colleagues to as well.

URTP (Gilinsky): The group is meeting the next day to go through sabbatical rankings. The chair hasn't communicated yet whether the committee will need to rank everyone submitted; also, the group met with Dr. Callahan and and Lipp (Faculty Center). The CFA representative noted that it was recently discovered that if a dean delays a sabbatical for a year, the sabbatical clock is likewise delayed by a year, so that faculty in that position lose a year before they can apply again.

CFA (Newman): The Faculty Affairs office's effort to educate faculty on all manner of things has been quite impressive, and all faculty will be better off for it. She asks FSAC members to take the bargaining survey. Phone banking on the election is scheduled that night from 5-8, with dinner served. Also, free beer and pizza will be available to members at Lobo's on Halloween.

Additionally, she has been working with Dr. Roberts in Faculty Affairs on salary equity issues, which will require a "full court press" by all faculty. The Provost has asked all cabinet members to provide a list of needs by division and of departments.

Regarding asbestos issues on campus, a small working group has been created.

Note: Agenda items are listed in the order in which they were discussed.

16-17:3: SETE Aggregate Data Usage

Now with RTP people are presenting data for all classes they're teaching this year or all classes taught. Last week an example aggregated data per question over time. Do we need to go back to the Academic Senate and revisit the idea of returning to a model in which RTP language read "that candidate working with departmental committee choose 2 classes…"

The URTPS is aware that FSAC is discussing some sort of revision here. During an informal meeting, there was some disagreement about reverting back to 2 classes. One member felt strongly that it's important to have all classes included to avoid hiding bad teaching. Discussion ensues regarding past reactions to this portion of the RTP instructions. Some had no problem going back to 2 classes, but another reaction was that was we should trash the current SETE and start from scratch. However, that is a separate issue; right now, we are working with the policy we have. A prior SETE task force showed that the instrument is not irrevocably flawed. Also, it would take at least a 2-year cycle to revise.

FSAC is fine with proposing changes or reverting to the former policy, cleaning up language and offering advice. During the discussion last year, many complaints focused on using all the SETEs. However, an administrator (Dr. Barnard Assoc. AVP) noted that because all of this information had been collected, it all needed to be used or people would be confused. The Senate agreed. Now that people are seeing in practice, they're talking about the problems.

The issue of whether we are looking at the data or the analysis and where on campus the information comes from is clarified for the guest attendee using a committee members own SETE. Another question answered regards the presence in the SETE of departmental (present) or university-wide (absent) questions.

During a review of the example provided during the 10/13/16 meeting, it is noted that additional relevant data that would help evaluators would be the total N for the class. Any response rate less than 40 or 50 percent is problematic, and results must be interpreted with caution. A question about whether a power index for the statistics would be possible; the answer is no.

Another issue to be discussed is what sort of aggregate data can be used. How many courses should be used? If someone teaches many different courses, comparing them would be difficult, particularly over time.

Per the guest, issues on analysis depend on what the database looks like on the back end. How the data can be compared depends on the database. Regarding data presentation, it is definitely better to look at data within courses rather than across courses. Otherwise, many variables are confounded, which is statistically inappropriate and causes problematic validity.

Per the URTPS representative, what will help committees is first to have standardized way of presenting data. Second, based on his first 3 years on the URTPS, he is not aware of any instance in which a faculty member being allowed to choose which courses they presented for SETEs have resulted in poor tenure award decisions. He believes it would be very helpful to revert to prior language. The candidate can explain the data within their RTP packet, with presentation and comparisons over time done as clearly and concisely as possible.

Considerations of the end product of data are discussed, such as getting a graphic format of retrospective data. According to the guest, reporting capabilities will be defined by the database product and configuration. He volunteers to sit down with the SETE data person (Sean) and look at the possibilities. He also could report on reporting capabilities in the class climate.

It is noted that total enrollment for each class as well as the response number must be provided.

Options for qualitative responses are discussed, such as data analytics that do word clouds, word counts, or quantitative thematic analysis. Perhaps cross-tabbing with demographic data could happen on the back end.

Question raised about whether the SETE system can these be hacked. Answer: it depends on the hosting model, but it probably is not easily hackable because it is tied to the campus authentication system. Guidelines for best practices for getting SETE responses are hosted within the Faculty Center.

The guest will do fact-finding for FSAC on the SETE capabilities issue over the next 2-4 weeks and will be prepared to present at December 1 meeting.

In the meantime, FSAC we will work on modifying the RTP policy. It is noted that the word aggregate does not appear in the RTP policy. The policy is only for tenure and promotion; FSAC should be careful about talking about usage or review of the SETEs overall.

The group agrees that the policy should specify 2 class SETEs per review cycle. The title of the agenda item is to be changed to Revision of RTP Policy Regarding SETE Data. In 2 weeks FSAC will look at the language within the policy; in the meantime E. Newman volunteers to try to find the old language and replace it with the new. It is suggested that once FSAC has finished changing the policy, FSAC can ask for URTPS's feedback.

16-17:9 Kinesiology Departmental Criteria

The department had no criteria before; this text was largely borrowed from the math department. FSAC is a stop in the approval process, to ensure that it doesn't violate RTP policy or the collective bargaining agreement.

One concern about the criteria: having cutoff scores for SETEs (because of validity concerns). Instead, it could look at reliability and consistency as an indicator of growth. Probably peer evaluation shouldn't have a strict cutoff either. Instead, the faculty should be expected to either maintain or grow toward a range of effective to very effective, based on a constellation of indicators including qualitative aspects. Tangentially, FSAC will not need to go back to all other departments with hard figures and tell them to change, but perhaps could make a general statement to departments about looking at hard cutoffs.

16-17:4 Periodic Evaluation of Unit 3 Coaches

The first workshop had a good turnout, with 7 out of 14 coaches attending. The FSAC representatives presented that there was a need for policy for evaluation and reappointment. There was general agreement about who should be evaluating and the role of peer input as well as the athletic equivalent of SETEs. The importance of timing and emotion regarding the evaluations was noted (e.g., right after an athletic loss). Four coaches volunteered to serve on the writing committee; they realized the evaluation process could be a good thing. The FSAC representatives will work out the logistics of getting everyone together and reviewing documents.

16-17:2 Guidance Regarding Faculty Availability for Student Advising and Office Hours

The new version as developed during the last meeting is just one paragraph. This effort stems from a request from the Provost.

During the discussions last year, some people didn't like vagueness of office hours being proportionate to teaching load, while others didn't like that the policy had no requirements for a specific number of hours. Ultimately, what FSAC is saying is that each department needs to develop its own set of guidelines (because the Academic Senate will likely never reach consensus on the issue).

A question is raised about response times to student communication and the need for a general statement about responding to emails. One member notes agreement in principle but concern about the expectations of students who don't come to office hours and then expect an immediate email response. Also, it is noted that because this statement is not a policy, students cannot file grievances.

Changes: The last sentence of the paragraph becomes the first sentence. Then, the rest of the text becomes the rationale. Another recommended change is to "Our guidance to departments… an advising system and office hour guidelines. "

16-17:7: Post-Tenure Review Policy

How does FSAC start working on a post-tenure review policy, or does it? One option is to look at the examples and then rank them, or we can pick and choose the parts we like the best and cross out things we don't want. The whole purpose of post-tenure review is for faculty to feel like they're not being put out to pasture, to keep them engaged. This policy is more for formative than summative reasons, to encourage faculty to continue to grow and deepen.

Perhaps as part of this effort, FSAC can look at the program review process.

It is suggested that the issue be tabled or to invite the interim provost to a meeting to identify the driving force behind this effort. Also, there is the question of what resources are available for this. Issues of collegiality are noted, as well as trying to change culture.