



FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MEETING DATE: Wednesday, **October 6, 2021**, 2:00-4:00pm via Zoom

[PLEASE CLICK HERE FOR ZOOM LINK](#)

APPROVED MINUTES

Members Present: Stephanie Alexander, Chandrakala Ganesh, Marlin Halim, Linda Ivey, Pat Jennings, Shubha Kashinath, Michele Korb, Jim Murray, Gwyann Rhabyt, Lan Wu

Guests: Sarah Nielsen, Gretchen Reevy, Mark Robinson, Christian Roessler, Stephanie Seitz

Members Absent: none

1. Appoint Secretary - Thanks Jim!
2. Approval of the agenda
 - a. M/S Murray/Halim, approved unanimous
3. Approval of [9/15/21](#) minutes
 - a. M/S Alexander/Murray, Revise to confirm Marlin's presence, approved unanimously
4. **Reports:**
 - a. Report of the Chair
 - i. Last week RTP subcommittee met to address makeup of UTP committee in light of feedback from faculty about racial makeup and proposing changes this AY
 - ii. Wrote to Provost and Senate Chair to address these concerns before RTP subcommittee meeting
 - iii. Emeritus revisions sent to president and provost for review & feedback
 - iv. Prof. Seitz here to represent RTP subcommittee
 - v. Prof. Roessler here to represent SET subcommittee
 - vi. Chair Ivey received some negative feedback about RTP policy & will encourage rational engagement
 - vii. Will be revising Bylaws and requires $\frac{2}{3}$ approval of Senate to send out to faculty vote. Feel free to seek input from other faculty.
 - b. Report of the Presidential Appointee
 - i. Sabbatical Nov 2 and range elevation Nov 15 applications deadlines approaching.
 - ii. New nominations for the Wang awards due Oct 10
 - iii. Searches for cabinet positions ongoing for: CFO, Provost, VP advancement
 - iv. Welcome & honoring Faculty Tues 4pm in MPR
5. **Appointments/Approvals**

- a. Regular [FAC subcommittee](#) interest
 - i. Awards- need 1 more?
 - ii. Lecturers - Gretchen is spearheading meetings
 - iii. Most subcommittees are full

6. Old Business:

- a. [20-21 FAC 2 amended](#): Rights and Responsibilities of Department Chairs
 - i. Separate out process from duties in Senate → need new (updated) process document
 - ii. [16-17 FAC 5](#) will be revised for appointment and removal
 - iii. Prof. Rhabyt suggests the duties, responsibilities, and compensation should be related to each other. Chair Ivey says we may need to refine the rights and responsibilities document. Admin may choose to act on policy on responsibilities as required, but not required to act on recommendations about compensation. Prof. Jennings says admin notes the recommendations not in form of MOU, but admin is required to do annual review instead of every 3 years. Admin does not interpret the new policy and adding duties to chairs.
- b. [President response](#) to [20-21 FAC 6](#)
 - i. Draft [21-22 FAC x](#): Proposed updates to Emeritus Policy (*will discuss at Oct 21 meeting*)
 - ii. [Article I, Section 4](#) of the by-laws must also be revised and voted upon by the faculty (see New Business, section 7a. of the agenda)
- c. RTP document edits, 2021-22, redux (*time certain 2:20pm; w/ 8. c.*)
 - i. SET subcommittee with Prof. Roessler. Developing new tool questions; less biased. Believes Pres. Sandeen wants the process to be less-biased. Highlight some issues: focus on bias in student evaluations, as established empirically. Cross-check questions for consistency of student answers. Peers might misinterpret the numerical scores, so report them in an improved way? Harsh comments in particular for BIPOC and women. Murray suggests Assoc. Dean might be able to remove harsh comments. Low response rates of concern; who is responsible? Incentives appropriate? What is the goal of student evaluation? Assessment? Feedback? Customize the questions? Prof. Korb says they are doing research on evals. Chair Ivey, can they be weaponized and used against us? Prof. Wu pre-test your instrument before implementing. Must not be too long for students. Prof. Ganesh problems with comparing to dept avg; what is the definition of “good”? Prof. Roessler they are testing and will test more in the future. Murray suggests using formative and not summative and that might help against bias. Dr. Reevey concerns about aggregating answers as an average score; internal consistency? Prof. Roessler, should answers be weighted? Prof. Ganesh suggests evaluation committees need training on how to interpret teaching evaluations, and best practices for writing the output letter. Example letters? Prof. Seitz say new RTP has requirements for the letters. Perhaps put questions about students' investment in course before questions about faculty? Prof. Kasinath perhaps peer evaluators summarize the student evaluations, and these are formative, to avoid unfair consumer satisfaction poll. Murray says peer observation guidelines being considered by RTP.
 - ii. UTP appointments with Prof. Seitz. Short-term changes this AY to add DELO. Used feedback from Town Hall. Long-term solutions might be more controversial. Address contingencies in the process (resignations?)
 - iii. Language for achievement (change from “meets or exceeds expectations”?). Prof. Seitz “Meeting expectations” might be not ideal language. Chair Ivey shares suggested language from a faculty

member. “Growth, achievement, promise?” Change from 3 levels to 4 or 5? Prof. Korb suggests addressing “evidence” and “RTP guidelines”? “Expectations” are subjective. Perhaps “standards”. Murray says maybe remove language that might be interpreted as subjective. Chair Ivey say send input to Prof. Seitz, but can’t be vague, be specific.

- iv. Years 1, 3, 5 comprehensive review, what is process in those years? Let subcomm proceed.
- v. DEI language. Pres. Sandeen says it was vague. Let subcomm proceed.
- vi. Open access policy. CR asked about open access publishing policies. Add this to the professional achievement list. Prof. Wu notes that OA can vary a lot in quality. Maybe it could be under Service, enabling access to larger community. Prof. Ganesh asks if this might in turn require changes in dept standards?

7. New Business:

- a. 21-22 FAC xx and 21-22 FAC xxx -- change in bylaws
 - i. Implications for language across the board
 - ii. [Article XVII, Section 3C](#)
 - iii. [Article I, Section 4](#)
- b. [21-22 FAC yy Policy on Peer Observation](#) - *in progress*
- c. 21-22 FAC zz Comprehensive Review of Probationary Faculty - *in progress -- RTP?*

8. Information:

- a. [FAC Chair Ivey’s letter](#) to the Provost and Senate Chair
- b. Training for UTP committee
- c. [DELO role on UTP committee for 2021-22](#) -- RTP subcommittee document (*time certain 2:20 - part of 6.c.*)
 - i. Chair Ivey asks Prof. Seitz about the new policy on UTP. How much time compensation is appropriate? Senate Chair Nielsen has input on release time. Prof. Jennings says if 2 WTU added could release her from another course. Murray suggests we could specify time required. Senate Chair Nielsen maybe shift WTU in time if the pot of WTU is finite. Prof. Jennings asks if she will be reading all of the dossiers, or only listening to meetings. Chair Ivey maybe FAC/FDEC joint meeting to discuss this. Prof. Ganesh suggests using Exceptional Levels of Service units? Prof. Rhabyt on Workload Taskforce increased DELO from 3 to 6 WTUs. Prof. Seitz agrees to work with FDEC longer-term, and add 3 WTUs for this AY. Discussion of whether we should move now to an action item to send out sooner than later.

9. Discussion:

- a. Syllabus language updates and the need for an updated syllabus policy
 - i. platform
- b. Interfolio?

10. Adjournment