

Faculty Standards & Affairs Committee
Draft Minutes
March 23RD, 2017

Attendance:

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

Meeting Recorder – Sandra Harrison Feldman

Adopt Agenda – Adopted with additions of items #14 FSAC Chair for 2017-2018 Election, #15 Course Outline Policy & #16 Lecturer's Range Elevation Policy

Approval of Minutes – Sandra Feldman here (late) Minutes for March 15th approved

Discussion Items

1. Faculty Development Subcommittee Report on Faculty Needs Survey by Monica Lares

- Survey can be broken down by school or faculty position

- Conclusions:

* Overall, Faculty cite workload and time demands as major obstacles to professional development participation. But Faculty meetings and pre/post-semester opportunities were cited as better times by a majority of the 130 respondents.

* Generally, there was interest in both quantitative and qualitative data from a majority of respondents in both areas to provide greater support for teaching, but topics included things like assessment, activity/lesson development, and peer observation. Instructional technology was mentioned but not by a majority of respondents with some qualitative responses indicating that support for platforms like Moodle is sufficient.

* Professional Development topics in the area of teaching cited as useful/desired by a majority of respondents included: promoting student success, instructional development, measuring student learning, and class climate.

* Scholarship Professional Development opportunities cited as useful/desired by a majority of respondents included: Listing Grant Opportunities, Research Travel Opportunities, Undergrad Research Support, & Research Writing Support (grant/proposal development).

* Service Professional Development Opportunities cited as useful/desired by a majority of respondents included: Advising Best Practices

* On the question of "Where should campus invest more resources?" topics cited by a majority of respondents included: More Opportunities for Academic Speakers, Paying Faculty to Present, Faculty Travel Support, Stipends for Professional Development, and Course Release/Overload

- Recommendations for the next Faculty Survey by Mathew Paolucci-Callahan Faculty Liaison to Faculty Center: try to capture and invite more specific qualitative responses

- Next Step: Justin Lipp Director of the Faculty Center and Mathew Paolucci-Callahan are scheduled to present to Executive Committee next week on the Faculty Center, the Faculty Survey and the Toolkits. They will ask for time to present at the Academic Senate. SSU is looking at Faculty Research Associate and Community engagement person

- When we look at other campuses, the faculty center supports: Teaching, Service & Research.

- Some typical asks from faculty "Can you help me with a grant proposal" / "I'm having some challenges in a class / "I would like to do more service around this that or the others"

- What can the faculty center do? And do better: Service, Classroom Management Techniques, Research, Grants, Course Planning, Course Development, Assessment of Goals, Peer Review Help, Tools for Teaching

- Faculty Center Report: Matthew can bring to next FSAC meeting and we could decide the next step regarding a resolution of support.

- FSAC: could attach a resolution to the PDS report.

2. Faculty Center Toolkits report by Mathew Paolucci-Callahan Faculty Liaison to Faculty Center

- Toolkits: You can use any, all, none.

Many faculty have been asking for more guidance on peer observations. Each doc after is a link: Classroom observation form....how to evaluate a quiz...how to evaluate a syllabus.. to increase the credibility and reliability of the peer evaluation process.

- Other discussion occurred regarding active learning, how to create peer evaluation criteria related to how people learn (what is being done to address prior learning, contextualize linking to their learning and can students apply their learning to existing schemas) and metacognitive strategies (having students think about their thinking) and how can we use a checklist to make sure we are unbiased in our teaching practice.

Business Items

16-17:2 Office Hours Policy

- Executive Committee is taking to the Senate for a Second Reading the following:

Instructional Faculty Office Hours and Availability

In order to provide students with access to faculty, those faculty members with teaching assignments shall be available to students outside of class at a minimum rate of 15 minutes per week per instructional weighted teaching unit (WTU) or three hours per week, whichever is less.

The required availability will typically be posted, on-campus, in-person office hours (either drop-in or by appointment). An alternative mode for such availability, when appropriate to meet student or curricular needs, may be used if approved by the Department Chair.

- FSAC discussed the creation of department culture around advising and that a policy needs to be specific enough to capture the needs of students but broad enough to allow each department to fashion a policy that works for them
- FSAC discussed that not every faculty is in sync with chair; therefore, it was decided that at Academic Senate the FSAC Chair would make a motion to remove "if approved by the Department Chair" from the end of the last sentence.
- FSAC also decided that at Academic Senate the FSAC Chair would make a motion to add a sentence to the end of the policy that said: Every department is strongly encouraged to develop a more specific overall advising system that best meets the needs of the program's students and faculty.
- FSAC also decided that at Academic Senate the FSAC Chair would before making the amendment motions inform the AS

16-17:3 Revision of RTP Policy Regarding SETE's – Dept. Criteria - Advising

- Thank you to Dr. Montera for putting FSAC's previous discussions into the actual current document as track changes.
- FSAC approved the changes in section I. B. 3. b. iv. and section I. B. 3. c. iv. related to use of only 2 SETE's versus all SETE's in the Working Personal Action File for that years Periodic or Performance Review.
- Discussion ensued on section II. B. 2. b. i. regarding the stuck-out language and should something be inserted in its place. It is within a course over time not in an overview of all course that one can show effective growth. One course gives context while a table of all courses is purposely vague. We want only data submitted to the WPAF; take the analysis out. In the departmental report we can say "Let's see what you were put through and the way you improved..." by contextualizing your progress as an effective teacher based on the data.
- Still need to resolve above II. B. 2. b. i. and discuss approve sections II. B. 2. b. ii on selection process for the two courses, section II. A. 1. on departments developing criteria on promotion and section II. D. 3. On adding compensated and uncompensated advising and mentoring to University Service.

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

- AFS has rejected our second-round proposal of adding an introductory sentence: When teaching Sensitive Material, faculty should exercise their professional judgement regarding advance notice of the material to be presented that day or throughout the course and articulate the educational value to be gained by pedagogical examination of the material and topic.
- AFS reaffirmed their rational that was provided after the first FSAC suggested revisions.
- Discussion ensued regarding: What is really our role in moving this forward / can FSAC push their resolution to Executive Committee versus the one provided by AFS with academic freedom as the main issue.

- Associated Students are trying to get in writing a policy to determine procedures in teaching sensitive material. Because the term trigger warning has no formal definition, we may be on different pages as to the interpretation of such a term. However
- AFS suggests that any policy may interfere with academic freedom and has determined NOT to make a blue paper policy.
- Discussion ensued regarding student's personal responsibility for their mental health and students asking for alternative assignments. Faculty having a statement on syllabi refereeing students to sources of help. How faculty tend to over versus under accommodate.
- FSAC decided that a unilateral recommendation contrary to AFS is inappropriate at this time and will forward the AFS Statement and Rational to Executive Committee in response to the ASI Resolution on Developing a Policy on Trigger Warnings with the inclusion of the history of the two recommended revisions that FSAC proposed to AFS.

16-17:16 FSAC Chair for 2017-2018 Election

- Discussed the need to elect the FSAC for next academic year. Dr. Winter is interested in continuing to serve as Chair but is officially making the call for candidates. Will decide at March 6th meeting.

16-17:16 Lectures Range Elevation Policy

- We already have a lecturer range elevation language/policy but eligibility has changed so revisions of the document are necessary regarding Application, Time Table and Evaluation of Lecturers
- We going to have a flood of applications for range elevation. (most recent cycle just finished in early March or late Feb)
- The AVP suggested FSAC needs to make revisions to the policy to take to Academic Senate accompanied with a resolution to encourage departments to develop department specific criteria.