

Minutes
Commission on Faculty Affairs
April 1, 2022
10:30 am – 12:00 pm
Hybrid (Newman; Zoom)

Commission Members Present: R. Queen, (presiding)

R. Blieszner (Dean), A. Bond (A/P Senate), Ron Fricker (ex officio), D. Hindman (Faculty Senate), B. Jones (Staff Senate), E. Kaufman (Faculty Senate), V. Kraak (Faculty Senate), L-A. Krometis (Faculty Senate), L. Learman (Dean), R. Miles (Faculty Senate), A. Nelson (Faculty Senate), T. Schenk, Weiss (Faculty Senate).

Absent: C. Boyd (Undergrad Senate), A. Fox (Grad/Prof Senate).

Guests: B. Hicok (Faculty Senate), E. Kim (Faculty Affairs, Provost's Office), A. Myers (Office of Governance and Policy), E. Plummer (Faculty Affairs, Provost's Office).

R. Queen called the meeting to order at 10:38 a.m. A quorum was present (50%+1 of current membership = 9; 12 members present)

1. **Approval of Agenda.** Members of the commission moved and voted unanimously to adopt the agenda.
2. **Approval of Minutes.** Members of the commission moved and voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the 03/04/2022 and 03/28/2022 meeting.
3. **Old Business**

A. Second Reading: CFA 2021-22B: Resolution to Revise Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws.

Resolution approved.

Notes and comments on the resolution were reviewed, which included the identification of a typo (p.34), increased clarity on the differentiation of senate bodies (p.29), and language regarding Senate expectations (p.30). A motion to amend and approve the resolution with the proposed edits to Article X (p.29) and the typo (p.34) was passed unanimously.

B. Second Reading: CFA 2021-22E Resolution to Revise Faculty Handbook Language Regarding Appeal of Probationary Non-Reappointment.

Resolution approved

Commission members discussed whether the processes outlined in the resolution pose an added burden on college committees. E. Plummer recounted her discussion with college associate deans, who oversee department and college promotion and tenure processes. The associate deans had no issue with the proposed resolution. A suggestion was made that the Faculty Affairs office assess the implications (e.g.,

additional work) by investigating the number of appeals and other procedural events over the past five years to gauge impact and to help inform decisions. A motion to amend the language in the first paragraph of the second page (“committee” clarified to “*departmental* committee”). The resolution, as amended, was approved unanimously.

C. Update on discussion with Center for Excellent in Teaching and Learning.

R. Queen recounted her discussion with Kim Filer about the CFA, Senate, and other faculty members partnering with CETL to create best practice documents to guide the use of teaching evaluations and for faculty members to use when conducting a peer teaching evaluation. K. Filer suggested the development of a framework that includes four pillars or dimensions surrounding teaching evaluation with metrics that flow through each. The development of a framework and metrics is best based on scholarship and aligned with goals focused on improvement (rather than on SPOT scores). Commission members agreed with these ideas and suggested connecting with other relevant stakeholders such as TLOS and the School of Education. Commission members underscored the importance of faculty leading and being central to the development of any framework and metrics associated with evaluating teaching. In addition, all instructional faculty tracks ought to be represented and included in the process. To ensure broad participation, work on a framework ought to occur during the academic year and not over the summer months. Commission members discussed who might be the appropriate faculty group to take the lead on this effort.

4. Adjourn. 11:38am.