**Committee Name: Faculty affairs policy committee**

**Meeting Date & Time: Friday, January 7, 2022 2:00 p.m.**

**Meeting Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting Room**

**Attendance**:

|  |
| --- |
| **Members “P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets** |
| P | Justin Adeyemi (Secretary) | P | Julian Knox |
| P | Guy Biyogmam | P | Christina Smith |
| R | Robert Blumenthal  | P | John Swinton |
| R | Hank Edmondson | P | Sheryl Winn |
| P | Sabrina Hom (Chair) | P | Gennady Rudkevich |
| P | Katie Stumpf (Vice Chair) | P | Nancy Mizelle |
| P | Christopher Clark (Provost Representative) |  |  |
| Guests: Kevin hunt (irb chair) |
|  | *Italicized text denotes information from a previous meeting.* |  |   |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Agenda Topic (Committees should feel free to customize this template to make it as functional for them as possible. Other categories of topics might include Reports, Information Items, Unfinished Business, etc.) | Discussions & Conclusions  | Action or Recommendations | Follow-Up{including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)} |
| **I. Call to order** | Meeting called to order at 2:02pm. The meeting was hosted by Sabrina Hom via Zoom. |  |  |
| **II. Approval of Agenda** | The agenda was approved prior to the start of our meeting via e-mail communication.  |  |  |
| **III. Approval of Minutes** | Approval of minutes approved concurrently with start of the meeting. |  |  |
| **IV. Old Business/Review of****Actions/Recommendations** |  |  |  |
| **1.** Student Response of Instruction Survey |  |  |  |
|  | * We began the meeting by discussing alternative options to the SRIS, and faculty members had an opportunity to voice their concerns regarding the use of the SRIS.
* Through group discussion, It was suggested that we Implement a regular program that includes a peer-evaluation, to supplement the use of the SRIS.
* The objective here, as mentioned within previous proposals is for each college to train two dedicated experts responsible for conducting these evaluations. But to date, there has been no mention of how these individuals would be trained, nor the procedures to compensate these individuals. As it stands, a pilot program was launched to initiate the aforementioned program or something similar to it, but over the years no action had been taken.
* Further Discussion
	+ Concern was noted regarding whether or not faculty actually know how to utilize the SRIS, to select the appropriate course objectives. Also, it was suggested that faculty promote the use of the mid-term evaluation assessment to improve the end of the semester SRIS results.
	+ Concern noted regarding the use/application of SRIS results to make decisions regarding tenure results, etc.
	+ Discussion continued regarding a recent study that demonstrates that offering things to students (i.e. cookies) significantly improved their end of course survey-scores. Additionally, there are other studies within the literature that suggest the end of course surveys are not valid/reliable.
	+ Discussion continued and it is the decision of the committee to urge the senate to consider implementing or conducting the pilot study.
	+ And as noted by a committee member, it may be that elements of the pilot study are already being conducted by various programs such as the college of education, psychology, etc. And if so, we may just need to ask these departments to provide us with their information/data anonymously.
	+ A question was posed regarding the implementation of the pilot study: Is it to compare student survey and peer evaluations? Answer: The general impression is that these components is to include both.
 | * The committee will discuss drafting language at the next meeting to encourage senate to re-launch pilot study.
 |  |
| **2. Chairperson Providing Assessment of Faculty** | * A great deal of flexibility occurs at the department level. The impetus for this conversation is because a faculty member believed their chair overstepped his/her boundaries in terms of utilizing/gathering information to assess the faculty members.
* It may be helpful to have an ombudsman to navigate these challenges. However, as included in your discussions, this would need to come from academic affairs to avoid the potential for biases.
 | * Our chair, Sabrina Hom will bring this issue to ECUS.
 |  |
| **3. Misconduct Policy**  | * This policy will be disseminated throughout the college campus, including in and during faculty orientation, etc.
	+ Discussion:
		- Changes will be evident in the student code of conduct, which will now become the Bobcat Code of Conduct.
		- Additionally, the provost will no longer be ORI, it will now be the Associate Provost. It is the individual in this role that will assign faculty/staff to a taskforce/committee as needed.
		- The policy will have a 2022 update and is consistent with federal policy. The need or request is for FAPC to grant/approval to these changes.
		- Regarding the scope of this policy- the question was posed, “Does this policy cover hazards (i.e. harm) to subjects and research animals? Answer: In the IRB policy and procedures, if a graduate student is working with you and he/she feels like something is taking place that shouldn’t, they may contact the IRB directly. The board would then contact the ORI.
		- Question- If someone failed to secure personal/sensitive information, of participants, what would be the course of action. Answer: Similar course of action. The instance is initially brought up to IRB, and the IRB would be able to communicate with the ORI. However, it is possible to bypass the senate and bring a concern directly to the ORI.
 | * The next review cycle for this policy is April 26th. The committee will work on crafting language around this motion at the next subsequent meeting.
 |  |
| **V. New Business**Actions/Recommendations | * No new business to discuss.
 |  |  |
| VI. Next Meeting | * Per university calendar
 |  |  |
| VII. Adjournment | Meeting adjourned at 3:15pm. |  |  |

**Distribution (as determined in committee operating procedure – one possibility given):**

First; To Committee Membership for Review

Second: Posted to the Minutes Website

**Approved by:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

 Committee Chairperson (Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)

**Guidance**

**Committee Name: Faculty affairs policy committee**

**Committee Officers: Sabrina hom, Katie Stumpf, Justin Adeyemi**

**Academic Year: 2020-2021**

**Aggregate Member Attendance at Committee Meetings for the Academic Year:**

**“P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Meeting Dates | 9/3/21 | 10/1/21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Justin Adeyemi | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guy Biyogmam | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Robert Blumenthal  | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hank Edmondson | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sabrina Hom | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Katie Stumpf | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Christopher Clark | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hank Edmondson | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Julian Knox | P | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Christina Smith | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jessie Folk | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sheryl Winn | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gennady Rudkevich | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nancy Mizelle | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAIRPERSON SIGNATURE DATE \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_-

(Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)