



## Faculty Assembly Steering Committee

### Minutes

September 13, 2013  
Dean's Conference Room  
10-12pm

#### Attendance

Bob Zoeller (*ES Rep*) ♦ Paul Peluso (*CE Rep*) ♦ Connie Keintz (*CSD Rep*) ♦ Patricia Willems (*TL Rep*) ♦ Traci Catto (*OASS Rep*) ♦ Rose Gatens (*CCEI Rep*) ♦ Mary Lieberman (*EDLRM Rep*) ♦ Mary Lou Duffy (*ESE Rep*) ♦ Mena Marinaccio (*President*) ♦ Meredith Mountford (*Vice-President*) ♦ Ray Amirault (*Secretary*)

*Please contact Ray Amirault regarding any errors in the attendance listing.*

#### Future Meetings

##### Faculty Assembly Steering Committee

- Friday, November 8, 2013, 10 am-12am, Boca, Ed 356 (Teacher Ed Conference Room)
- Friday, January 17, 10 am-12am, Boca, Ed 356 (Teacher Ed Conference Room)
- Friday, March 28, 10 am-12am, Boca, Ed 356 (Teacher Ed Conference Room)

##### Executive Committee Meetings

- Friday, November 15, 2013, 11am-12am, Dean's Conference Room
- Friday, January 24, 2013, 11am-12am, Dean's Conference Room
- Friday, April 4, 2013, 11am-12am, Dean's Conference Room

##### Faculty Assembly Meetings

- Friday, September 27, 2013, 10am-12am, Boca Ed 313 (teleconferenced)
- Friday, November 22, 2013, 10am-12am, Boca Ed 313 (teleconferenced)
- Friday, January 31, 2013, 10am-12am, Boca Ed 313 (teleconferenced)
- Friday, April 11, 2013, 10am-12am, Boca Ed 313 (teleconferenced)

#### Announcements

Mena Marinaccio announced that the FA website has now been updated.

#### 4/15/13 Minutes Approval

Mena Marinaccio submitted via e-mail minor edits to be made to the 4/5/13 minutes, and these changes were made to the document. Paul Peluso motioned to accept the minutes. Bob Zoller seconded. The vote to approve the 4/5/13 minutes carried unanimously, with no abstentions.

### OSU Data Committee / Merit Pay

- Victor, Connie, and Mena have volunteered to work on examining the OSU data for the broader consideration of merit.
- The document the UFF recent sent out is not the same study as the OSU data. The Union is looking at the amount of money going towards administration, as opposed to faculty. The ratio of administration to faculty at FAU is far higher than at FSU, and this is even before the QEP came in, which further increased administration.
- Connie motioned that we table this topic until Victor is present.
- Question: What is the objective of this committee? Response: To examine market equity, but there is a need to further discuss this committee's charge.
- There has been informal talk of a 3% merit raise, but no formal offer as of yet. We will make a counter offer at a greater level that would bring us to equity, perhaps about 6.8%. We will try to make it more market equity as opposed to merit.
- Chris Robé will be the first speaker at the 9/27/13 FA, so if questions for him can be formulated ahead of time, please send to Mena, and she will forward to Robé. All Departmental Reps should solicit these questions from their departments, including Collective Bargaining issues, but also any question for any speaker (including the QEP speaker, Donna Chamely-Wiik).
- Question: There was wording in the Collective Bargaining Agreement on providing Chairs additional time to complete evaluations. Response: This information is on the website.

### Voting Rights of Faculty on Sabbatical

- The Constitution states that those on medical leave or sabbatical may vote, but other documents indicate the opposite. (Meredith previously sent this information to the FASC via e-mail.) A vote on this issue was taken last year in FA to keep the original language of "excluded." The vote was taken to clarify discrepancies between the various documents, when a motion was recorded as making a change the wording from "excluding those on leave of absence, sabbatical, or medical leave." The vote arose because the language had apparently been changed, but no evidence in the minutes could be found that a vote to do so had been taken. Then why was the motion made, if it was simply to keep existing verbiage? Response: Because of the confusion caused by the contradictory wording across versions of the document, and because of the discussion in the FA that covered both perspectives.
- Mena state the Archivist will update this language the language on the website. Because the minutes from the 4-19-13 FA have not yet been distributed or voted upon, no further action on this has yet been taken.
- Meredith pointed out that, just because one takes a sabbatical does not mean that one does not want to lose the right to vote.
- Question: What does the Faculty Senate do in terms of the rights of faculty on sabbatical voting? Response: Mena asked Ron Nylan, and found that, there is no precedent, because no faculty member on sabbatical has made this an issue in the University Faculty Senate.



## New Business

### Parliamentarian

- Mena requested that a volunteer assume the role of Parliamentarian.
- Connie made a motion to assume this role herself. Meredith seconded the motion. The motion passed without objection, no abstentions.

### Use of Blackboard Collaborate for FASC Meetings

- Mena proposed that the FASC consider using Blackboard Collaborate to support those who cannot commute to Boca, not replace face-to-face attendance of FASC meetings from this point on. Mena provided a brief demonstration of the Blackboard Collaborate system, and Mary Lou connected to the system from her remote location.
- Connie made a motion to incorporate the use of Blackboard Collaborate in future FASC meetings. Patricia seconded the motion. The motion passed without objection, no abstentions.

### Moisture Testing

- A number of departments have asked about questions regarding moisture/mold/mildew that may be present in the building. Due to the number of faculty raising this issue, the issue involves respect for faculty needs. Inspectors have given various reports on the problem over time, and a monthly report is now being created.
- On Tuesday, Vincent Cucchiella came (he answers to the VP of Physical Plant Services). He is now alerted to the puddles that have been forming in some of the offices, and that mold is likely a factor in these settings. He wishes to meet every other week to discuss the issue. Some destructive testing may have to be accomplished while testing and documentation of the problem is being accomplished.
- The concern is therefore now receiving a higher-level attention. Question: Should we bring this this issue up at FA? It would be good approach to have a copy of this report. The faculty should make a statement of OUR concern of the dramatic impact of this so that action is taken. We should also speak from the perspective of students, who are also being exposed to this condition.
- Question: Should we bring this up to the Dean at the Executive Committee meeting? This would be a good way to get this conversation started. The next step would be to come up with a plan that will attract more focused attention that will achieve results. Reps could solicit from each person in their department symptoms that may be linked to time spent in the office, and we could compile these. (Any information that is of a medical nature should be kept confidential.) This information could be forwarded in aggregate. This problem has been reported in both Davie and Boca campuses. Have students reported any issues? These should be included, as well.

### Joint Appointments (53:02)

- One faculty member requested that a discussion concerning the possibility of creating appointments across departments so that credit could be earned for chairing and co-chairing dissertations in different departments. Working collaboratively with faculty across courses would also be an option for assignments, with this as well. Can this subject be discussed in faculty assembly to discuss feasibility and desirability?
- It was mentioned that this this is a faculty assignment issue, and we may not have standing (i.e., be the right body) to handle that. But perhaps this could then be brought to the Dean to find out if we do or do not have standing on this issue. It was decided that this issue would be brought up to the Dean in the Executive Committee meeting.



### **Evaluation of Chairs**

- It was discussed that ESE has one additional question on the evaluation that other departments do not have. This may be because the ESE Chair desired to add this question. This issue will be brought up to the Dean in the Executive Committee meeting.
- Some of the questions asked in the evaluations would seem to potentially compromise the anonymity of the respondent (i.e., Are you in a tenure track line?, which, for small departments, might compromise anonymity). The best evaluation input is anonymous, so this is an important issue.
- Question: How might the 360 evaluation be improved to collect meaningful data for the purpose of improving a situation, not to be used for punitive purposes? Additionally, the 360 evaluations are supposed to be followed up to see if improvements have been made, but there often seems to be little real follow up in the evaluations.
- It is important that the P&T committee see the evaluation data when one is going up for promotion. Faculty should remember the importance, too, of responding to evaluation data so that the response can be placed in the faculty member's file.
- It was discussed that it should be brought to the Dean's attention the concern about the transparency of the process of Chair evaluations, including the issues discussed above, as well as how we might be able to change the perspective in how evaluations are used (so that they are not viewed as punitive, but opportunities to improve).
- The low response rate of online SPOT evaluations was discussed, as well as how SPOT data is being used. SPOT data is probably not being used in the most effective manner, particularly in regards to the quality of the data (including the written comments from students). Because this data is used in promotion and tenure, merit, and salaries, this data should be collected in a better, more complete manner.
- With an increased demand for online courses, online instructors should not be punished because of deficiencies in the SPOT data. We could consider making SPOT evaluations mandatory in order to receive a grade for the class to improve response rates. Perhaps we should look for a better instrument that is more reliable and meaningful. (Even a random sample of a class, for example, might be a better approach). The difficulty is in collecting data on the sometimes subjective characteristics tied to teaching, and yet this data is used for all important career factors.
- Question: Can a sub-committee in the College look into SPOT issues across colleges, etc., and perhaps even across Colleges of Educations. The entire process, not just the SPOT instrument itself, should be re-examined.

### **Presidential Search Committee**

- A question was raised concerning the lack of faculty representation on the newly formed Presidential Search Committee. Mena provided a printed handout from the AAUP on how the committee was formed. Question: Should this issue bring this up to Faculty Senate? Why would the committee be formed in this manner, and what should be done about it? The decision process did not allow the faculty to choose their own representative.
- There may also be a conflict of issue in how the search committee was formed. The President of Faculty Senate is also a member of the BOT, which is a conflict of interest, and so this person cannot fully represent the faculty (but which is no reflection on the character of the person, but rather just a conflict of interest). This should be brought up at Faculty Senate next meeting, which is the best venue to bring this subject up. If the union can be aligned with this undertaking, that would be even more desirable.
- Question: Do we wish to develop a statement from the faculty, and compose that statement at



the full faculty meeting? Yes, if we want to make a statement.

- Ron Nylan responded to Mena that the BOT chair will address this at the next University Senate meeting on October 4, 2013.

#### **Positions / New Lines / Searches**

- Questions concerning new faculty positions were discussed. There is some lack of clarity as to which lines are funded from the Provost, which lines are being converted from existing instructor positions, and so on. For example, is the "14" lines being discussed a part of the "50" positions that were previously reported? Exercise Science, for example, reported not having received any positions to date. EDLRM's Chair lobbied the Dean about this issue, and these efforts by Chairs may explain some of the seeming discrepancies in understanding the topic. It was discussed that there are two types of faculty requests, one funded by the colleges (all of which have been approved), and those funded by the Provost (and which have not yet approved). It was discussed that the Dean should be asked when the Provost lines will be available, and the item is therefore added to the Dean's talking points.

#### **Departmental Reports**

There were no departmental reports given at this meeting. Departmental Representatives were reminded to solicit information from their respective departments to develop their departmental reports for the 9-27-13 faculty assembly.

#### **Dean's Talking Points**

Items to be brought to the Dean

1. Moisture Problems
2. Possibility of Joint Appointments Across Departments
3. Evaluation of chairs, professors, 360 evaluation, faculty responses to evaluations, annual assignments, etc.
4. Presidential Search Committee – advice
5. Budget/faculty lines, when Provost lines will be filled, and the process
6. Raises

#### **Closing**

The meeting was closed by Mena Marinaccio at 11:59am.

*This report was submitted by Ray Amirault, FA Secretary.*