CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Amended Minutes of the Meeting of February 20, 2013

Present: Jeanette Bicais, Linda Dobb, Kelly Fan, Liz Ginno (chair), Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc (secretary), Bijan Mashaw, Carlos Solomon, Carl Stempel

Absent: Vish Hegde

Guests: Tom Bickley, Endre Branstad, Sharon Green, Julie Marty-Peason, Sophie Rollins, Mitch Watnik, Jessica Weiss

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Bicais/Fan)
   Ginno introduced agenda topics to potentially be added.
   1) Question about requirement for search committees for interim positions with the specific issue of the Executive Director of the Concord campus.
   2) Julie Marty-Peason has received requests to change SET questions from several departments volunteering to administer online evaluations for all their courses in Winter quarter. Does changing questions at this point, i.e. without FAC approval, match current policy?
   Amended agenda approved unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of February 6, 2013
   M/S/P (Larson/Bicais)
   Approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair
   At ExCom, two different versions of drafted emeritus policy were sent. Dobb and Ginno will ensure that one final version will be sent forward.
   There was also a question about faculty being allowed to use student work as examples to other students. Dobb said the answer is yes, but you need to ask the student's permission. Fan asks if we have to take the student's name off since the student might consider it an honor. Dobb responded that the student should be consulted that his/her name can be removed and that copyright remains. Ginno says it begs the bigger question, i.e. do we need a policy? Cal Poly Pomona has such a policy. She recommended that we add language about this in the CSUEB Intellectual Property Policy or the CSUEB Ethics Policy. Dobb volunteered to help craft language.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Dobb reported that the online evaluation discussion went well. Many departments have volunteered for doing all online evaluations this quarter. It will serve as an initial test that all components of the system work. Then, in the Spring quarter, all

classes will be evaluated online. Our job is to get word out to students to complete evaluations.

The Chancellor will be here next week visiting the Senate. Watnik confirmed that the meeting will be at 2 p.m. in UU102.

5. New Business:

a. Creation of Policy for alternate ASCSU Senator; See Article VI Section 7 of CSUEB Bylaws

Watnik explained that over the past 3 or 4 years, 3 statewide senators have resigned. For example, at the first meeting of the statewide senate, there was a resignation. A suggestion was made that there be an alternate to have a substitute ready in the case of another resignation or absence with advance notice (i.e. illness, sabbatical). ExCom considered ideas of having chair and/or vice-chair as back-ups, especially considering conflicts with teaching load. It was noted that the vice-chair gets no course release so travel to Long Beach for meetings may be too much to ask. Other campus senates do have such a back-up plan in place. Watnik pointed out that most campuses with such a plan are near Long Beach. As such, it is easier for them to make the trip. Bicais asked if state senators receive release time. Watnik replied that they do beginning in their second year. The first year they go to plenaries where they meet and vote. In their second year, they are also in committees which meet the day before. There used to be more release time associated with the position, but it was decreased under Chancellor Reed. Stempel asked what ideas ExCom had to deal with the problem? The short-term solution has been to ask the chair of the academic senate. ExCom could continue to just ask around for a representative. Another suggestion was to have a system akin to that of University RTP, with an appointee and an alternate. Ginno said that there is no easy way to do it unless a member of ExCom is identified. Larson pointed out the advantage of having someone from ExCom is that they are much more plugged in, whereas someone serving in a "permanent on-deck circle" may not be as aware of what is going on. Bicais and LeDuc asked about the possibility of having a representative Skype in rather than physically traveling to Long Beach. Ginno mentioned current policy allows for ExCom to appoint representation outside ExCom, allowing for someone else with experience. Stempel felt that the first sentence of the policy implies that a quarter must be waited before doing anything. Bicais read it differently that it deals with both vacancy (such as resignation) and other possibilities that are just temporary situations. Mashaw said that the problem with the policy as written is that it tries to deal with long-term and short-term situations in the same policy. He suggested splitting it into sub-sections. Ginno asked the committee if different formatting was desired. Bicais thought it is clear as is and that rewriting section by section may lead to a disjointed document. Bicais says that maybe arranging for Skyping should be part of a memo to the statewide senate from CSUEB. Stempel said that we should also push to restore funding for assigned time to serve. LeDuc suggested that maybe no policy change was needed by FAC, but ExCom may want to establish its own "chain of command" to ensure an available replacement can be found as quickly as possible. Fan said she thinks the policy is clear as is and that it is indeed ExCom's duty to appoint a replacement if needed. Larson moved that FAC take no further action. Bicais seconded. Passed unaminously.

c. Search committee for Concord Director
Several important positions in the University are in long-term "interim" status. No position should be interim for more than 1 year. The committee could look at ways of possibly seating a search committee quickly. For example, the current search committee rules could be amended. Of particular interest is the position of Executive Director of the Concord Campus. The search committee requirements for this position are: one tenured faculty from each college and library, appointed by ExCom, 1 presidential appointee, 1 staff, and solicit input from students.
The current appointment document implies that everything will be nationally advertised, although some positions, such as Director of Faculty Development, always end up being internal. Ginno says that the bottom line is transparency. LeDuc mentioned that hiring administrative assistants and technicians requires a search committee. Ginno wondered if the administration wants to appoint an interim as permanent and is afraid of reaction. With respect to the Concord campus position, she suggested asking CCAC for its opinion. She also suggested that inserting the term "if needed" in the policy would provide the administration with leeway for internal vs widely advertised positions. Stempel thought that after putting out a call for a search committee, it could be considered full after a time limit, even if not all spots were filled. Ginno will review document with Watnik. Although the above discussion was around "interim," the policy discusses "acting." Stempel asked what prevents the President from simply reappointing. Watnik said that there is a clause that prevents that.

d. Student evaluation policy and additional questions
Marty-Peason said 13 departments have volunteered to do online evaluations for all their courses in Winter quarter. The new policy didn't say anything about adding questions. As of right now, the Testing office will only use the questions already approved for paper evaluations. Marty-Peason came to FAC for policy judgment and advice. LeDuc and Stempel felt that changing questions will affect the evaluation of the process and shouldn't be done. Bicais agreed and said not accepting new questions at this time is in line with the policy in place.
M/S/P (Bicais/Stempel)
Unanimously passed to not allow new questions at this time.

a. SET Recommended Student Evaluation questions.
     i. On-Ground CSUEB SET form
     ii. Revised CSUEB SET form February 2013
Green came to give FAC a sneak-preview to give feedback on first cut of student evaluations. SET sub-committee dealt with questions about whether the modifications in the existing form needed more attention. Earlier versions of SET sub-committee made changes in wording and policy but did not modify questions in any substantive way. Green reported that a review of what previous committees had considered before the current committee made changes. These changes were made in the context of changing university policies (e.g. syllabus and office hours, ILO's, RTP, CBA, etc.)

SET forms serve as an accountability mechanism in relationship to students. The SET did a thorough review of the literature. Previous FAC end-of-year reports questioned the usefulness of student evaluations, including best practices of teaching effectiveness. However, it could be potentially useful as a statement of our commitment to effective teaching.

The SET sub-committee worked with Eileen Barrett when she was Director of the Office of Faculty Development, and chair of FAC. Meanwhile, a taskforce of CSU campuses pulled together student evaluation of teaching forms across many CSU campuses. Ours was too short to make the final cut. SET sub-committee looked at the work of the Idea Center started at Kansas State, which does empirical research necessary to determine what is a valid evaluation of teaching. It is now a non-profit focused on higher education teaching effectiveness and considered the gold standard. SET sub-committee set up a video conference with Idea Center and thought why don't we just do this. The initial reaction was that the SET form was very long. They are able to do weighted evaluations having learned that certain factors bias student evaluations. Faculty members fill out form with information about the class. The report then provides raw and weighted data. As a member of the sub-committee, Strayer suggested we start by getting our "good enough" analysis.

Working with the Idea Center costs money, so it requires a cost-benefit analysis. So, the SET sub-committee has put together and taken through multiple drafts the "cal state east bay new gold standard." Green passed handouts to committee. Green stated that the community needs to come to agreement about the purpose this is serving. Earlier CSU Taskforce had advice for faculty, chairs, and deans about the process and how it is used in administrative decision making. This begs the question "What evidence about teaching effectiveness could SET provide?" Administrators give most attention to summative numbers. Is too much information lost by only looking at summative numbers? Research indicates there is a high correlation between non-summative and summative so they are functional for administration decisions. If so, should there just be two items on it (rate course, rate instructor)?

It was suggested that the Office of Faculty Development Director be a permanent member of the SET sub-committee to ensure it is useful as a formative assessment tool to improve teaching effectiveness. If teaching is essentially number 1 on the RTP list, we need to be providing support in that capacity and the SET form needs to be relevant to effective teaching. Currently, our SET form is helpful but not clearly mapped to effective teaching. SET forms can also serve as indirect assessment, especially considering the renewed emphasis on assessments for annual reports and five-year reviews. Direct assessment is of artifacts of student work used to assess learning. SET form can't serve in this role. It can, however, serve an indirect role, similar to that of a focus group, in getting at student perceptions. In the new SET form, students are asked to rank personal progress on different learning outcomes. The comments section is more focused with information in parenthetical statements. One problem noted by a researcher in the field is that some students may report "hardly ever" and others "not applicable" if some item was not seen in the class. This is telling you different things. As such, if these items are expected to be part of the class, NA should not be an option. This researcher also suggested a 5 point scale, because students may be less comfortable in responding if forced to agree or disagree. The next stage in the process is taking it out to faculty and to students.

FAC was asked to look at it and give suggestions for change. Green also encouraged FAC members to ask students to complete the existing form and the proposed form and time them to see how long it takes. Following that, the students could be asked if there were questions they had problems with, items to get rid of, items that are particularly good, items they do not understand, etc... Ginno asked if she highlighted the difference in scales between the old and new forms for the students when doing this assessment (on our current form 1 is the best, but on the new form 1 is the worst). Green replied yes. Stempel feels that in terms of evaluating faculty, qualitative comments are most important. He wondered if by adding more quantitative items, we might lose qualitative responses. Green mentioned that online forms have a greater standard deviation than paper and that our current form is the shortest form she has found. Stempel proposed making qualitative responses first and putting a higher value on qualitative responses. Ginno mentioned that typed comments could come later since after they see the quantitative, they would be in the frame of mind to respond with written comments. Mashaw asked if the purpose of the form is to improve effectiveness of teaching. If that is the case, it is problematic since he knows of no good definition of effective teaching other than how much a student learned, which is not assessed here. He suggested including items about motivational factors. The discussion continued into the SET sub-committee meeting immediately following.

6. Other Business

     N/A

7. Adjournment

    4:05pm.(LeDuc)