

Approved Minutes of the Faculty Affairs Meeting

November 12, 2010

(approved 11-19-10: 4, 0, 1)

Present: K. Harris, M. Lewandowski, L. Sperry, R. Guell (Exec Liaison), A. Solesky (SPF Advocate), J. West, D. Nichols, L. Behrendt

Absent: H. Ganapathy-Coleman, N. Rogers (AA Liaison)

Guests: Ed Kinley, Marcia Miller

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. in Cunningham Library room 004.

1. Approval of the minutes of 11-5-10 (4-0-2)
2. Report from Liaison to Academic Affairs (Rogers)—no report
3. Report from Liaison to Executive Committee (Guell)
 - a. Constitutional amendments sent from FAC to Exec passed except for the amendment on grieving the executive committee.
 - b. The document on faculty performance continues to be reviewed; slight adjustments have been made based on the open forum and Blackboard site inputs.
 - i. Struggling with language regarding what is “obviously obstructionist” faculty behavior
 - ii. The teaching section will now include librarianship
 - c. Next week’s senate meeting will take up constitutional issues to be voted on in late November.
4. Special Purpose Faculty Advocate (Solesky)—No report at this time
5. Report from FAC Chair (Sperry)
 - a. Referred committee to the written report of the constitutional amendments previously distributed via e-mail. All constitutional amendments have been accepted except the one about grieving the executive committee. Next up will be FAC’s sabbatical recommendations.
6. New Business
 - a. Report on SIR evaluations from Ed Kinley
 - i. Presented information on past efforts; reliance on SIRs for P&T documents has been a consideration in the decision making process.
 - ii. Ed has worked with ETS with regard to on-line evaluations. ETS has two:
 1. SIR II which is a duplicate of the paper SIR except for the delivery format
 2. E-SIR has basically the same content, however the wording is changed slightly and it includes questions about on-line delivery.
 - iii. ETS sends an e-mail to the students to take the survey, and a deadline is given. Once the deadline has passed, the data are processed. Faculty must request delivery of the data electronically.

- iv. There are several ways that electronic SIRs are superior to paper evaluation:
 - 1. There is no need for someone to be present in the class to administer the evaluation.
 - 2. The results are available to faculty much more quickly— doesn't take months to receive feedback.
 - 3. The comment are collated into one document so that they are anonymous; no need to have someone transcribe them.
- v. The data available to administration are not different from before.
- vi. A pilot distribution has been set up using 51 courses (approximately 1,700 students) from the 15th to the 26th of November. Originally only aimed for 5 classes from each college, but demand to participate was higher. This pilot will include on-line classes using E-SIR as well as the SIR II. There are some unresolved licensing issues which may get in the way of the hoped for time-frame.
- vii. The Provost will appoint a faculty task force to discuss how to go about administering the SIR-II. It has been discussed that the classes of all pre-tenure faculty will be assessed every semester; the schedule for tenured faculty must be decided by the task force.
- viii. The task force must also decide when to administer the tool. The hoped-for outcome is to disaggregate SIRs from grades. Evidence shows it's best to move SIRs up to week 10 in order to separate them from grading.
- ix. Evidence shows that the student response rate tends to be higher when SIRs are given on-line.
- x. Do students have to complete the survey before accessing their grade? Kinley responded negatively, noting that the electronic SIR-II separates the process from Banner.
- xi. The electronic SIR cost may be more expensive than the paper form; however it is faster and more accurate. Also we only pay for the forms that are actually completed; with the paper form we pay for each one whether the students actually filled it out or just messed with it.
- xii. Data are course-based, not student based. Raw data will allow comparison by departments, faculty gender, class type and specific instructor; however there is no way to look at student differences.
 - 1. Electronic SIR does not allow the addition of specific questions—there would need to be another format for that.
 - 2. Results for faculty are sent in a PDF file.
- xiii. The threshold number is set—5 or fewer responses per class won't generate a report. Would probably have to evaluate small classes using the paper SIR.
 - 1. Information from the small classes will be included in the aggregate data.
- xiv. Time frame for general use would hopefully be by spring of '11.

- xv. Question regarding student anonymity—how do students know that their instructor can't get at their specific data? Kinley replied that ETS owns the software and all interpretation data, so students should feel secure.
- xvi. Motion to table Charge #4 regarding on-line evaluation until we have reviewed the results from the pilot survey. Motion passed 6-0-0.
- b. Procedure for Annual Audit of Faculty Senate Elections (245.3.3.6)
 - i. The audit needs to address
 - 1. Did every eligible faculty member (tenure and tenure-track) receive a ballot?
 - 2. Were the results counted accurately?
 - ii. Linda Sperry will draft a motion addressing the audit of input and output data for FAC consideration at our next meeting.
 - iii. FAC also discussed drafting a motion addressing the voting procedure used to choose the executive committee.
- c. FAC will address Charge #10 next week.
- d. Linda Sperry will invite Ken Brauchle to address FAC in December.

The meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Behrendt, Secretary, '10-'11