

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes
May 19, 2009**

In Attendance: Jim Nechols, Ellen Urton, Rebecca Gould, Stacey Warner, Amy Schultz, Kaleen Knopp, Judy Hughey, Jennifer Askey
Guests: Jamene Brooks-Kiefer (KSU Libraries)

Veteran members thanked, new members welcomed, cake eaten

- I. agenda approved
- II. minutes for 5-9-09 approved
- III. e-portfolios (Hale Library—Brooks-Kiefer and Urton)

--questions the committee sent back to the Libraries after the first discussion: flexibility of software, adherence to protocols of software.

--B-K: KSU Libraries investigated e-portfolios for tenure and promotion, given the high percentage of electronic output in one's professional life.

The Library's committee determined that it was feasible for the library to do, with either open-source or self-created software. However, the available platforms rather dictate that, for efficacy's sake, the system be college-wide or university-wide. The proposal came to FSCOT after we saw it in January.

FSCOT does not view e-portfolios as a technology issue, as there is no demand currently coming from faculty/Faculty Senate. If there were a demand, a resolution, or a mandate coming from faculty, then software development or shopping around would begin. FSCOT is not responsible for answering the questions that will arise in further discussions of an e-portfolio. The Libraries would like to hear from Faculty Affairs whether we would like to pursue e-portfolios further, less on technical merits than on the idea itself.

--Nechols mentioned that Fac Sen would like to see a joint resolution from Fac Aff and FSCOT on this issue, since the FSCOT people represent the "technology" side of thing

--Hughey noticed that e-portfolios are really taking off (see Univ of Missouri) and that she welcomes moving forward on this. Her question was about uniformity of platform, which B-K doesn't see as a huge impediment, given that faculty portfolios contain more similarities (teaching, research, service) than they do differences. (B-K then described meta-data and how easy it would be to categorize any creative, teaching, scholarly, or service activity)

--Nechols admitted to not understanding the criticism of e-portfolios, since most, if not all, of our output is performed using computers

--Knopp asked about costs. B-K said that no comparisons have yet been made on pricing of the various types of systems.

--B-K and the Libraries would like to see a resolution passed by Fac Sen asking the Provost to put together a task force to examine the feasibility of moving this forward, system-wide standards and policies and procedures, etc.

--Askey and Knopp moved to pass a resolution in favor of establishing a task force to examine the feasibility of implementing a university-wide e-portfolio system for faculty evaluations

(included, but not limited to: annual evaluations, promotion and tenure, post-tenure review, etc.)

IV. Melody LeHew presented on: Appendix V/FS role in grad student grievance policies

--there was a meeting between President LeHew and University administration regarding the dialog between the Grad School and Faculty Senate.

--the question at the moment is one of precedence: at what point/s during the past decade has the Fac Sen been given the role of approving Grad School policy and use that as a guideline for determining what our role is currently in the future.

--the UH states that the Grad Council is charged with developing and implementing policy for the Grad School, the UH intimates that this authority was delegated by Faculty Senate

--Fac Aff did not find the plan to use the past as a precedent to be 100% satisfactory. In the opinion of this body, Fac Senate has the role to approve policy changes university-wide.

--Nechols pointed out that, regardless of precedent or wording in the UH, we need to pay attention to what makes sense for doing business in the university today. The emotional undercurrent of the discussion isn't helping anyone.

--Nechols suggestion was to remove the Fac Sen version of the grievance policy and do away with the conflict by simply removing the offending document/appendix. The discussion about authority and channels of communication would continue without unduly impeding on current policies.

--Fac Aff should act on removing appx v at the next meeting.

--Knopp moves to amend UH Appx V to remove language relating to Vet Med and Grad School grievance policies. (leave A and remove B and C); Judy Hughey will continue working with Grad School on modifying their current policy (the one under contention). (motion carries— moves forward to Fac Sen Executive Committee next week)

LeHew will do the research on previous policy changes for Grad School in Fac Senate AND examine the Grad Council approval process.

--Fac Aff would like, pursuant to new Provost hire and new President, to fight the ideological battle of why the Graduate School is a separate entity and question the current division in the university.

V. Faculty Teaching Evaluation: Amy Schultz talked with VP for Acad Aff at the BOR level. BOR opinion on our policy is: they have no provision against what we are proposing to do. BOR is interested in assessment of teaching materials and syllabi, which isn't interfered with by our policy suggestions.

--Nechols: a suggestion had come up as to how requiring evaluations from each class would affect cost, but TEVALs are built into the system.

--moving forward with this, we should put forth a resolution in Fac Sen to support systemic improvement/implementation of universal evaluations. The plan is that requiring everyone to be evaluated every time will lead to questions about the utility of the instrument and the feedback loop created by the evaluations. (will there be pedagogical workshops or research mentoring that come into being with “low” scores or lack of satisfaction with performance on the part of the faculty.) Recommendation to the Council of Deans: even on low-enrollment classes it is worth it to look at the comments.

VI. (Knopp) Administrative Evaluation Revision

--subcommittee gathered input from various Fac Senators on the policy. The newest revision is out on second reading in Fac Senate and will be picked up as an agenda item in the fall. (Urton and

Gould as subcommittee members with Knopp for the next academic year)

--current task is to take a step back and look at the whole administrative evaluation procedure and bring it all into line. Subcommittee should sit down with incoming Interim Provost to run a fine-tooth comb through the whole thing.

--Schultz reminded the committee that the IDEA forum has an instrument for administrative evaluations—are we going to examine that? Currently it is too expensive for university-wide use.

Its big advantage (the IDEA forum) is that it is standardized and not individualized for each job, which is the current scenario that leads to comparing apples to oranges.

--Gould will check with the office of Planning and Analysis and see what sort of standard forms they use for admin evaluation, or have on hand for us to use.

--LeHew mentioned that Ruth Dwyer wants to meet with the subcommittee over the summer to work on administrative evaluation policy.

VII. Flow Chart/Tracking Sheet

Hughey/Knopp will be sending each of us the updated tracking sheet for action items to be dealt with in Fac Aff in the next academic year. Make sure everyone has a job to do, a committee to sit on.