

Committee on Faculty Affairs
Minutes for meeting, October 28, 2020 (prepared by C. Fisher)

Present: Martha Stella, Joely Torres, Linda Dempf, Tim Clydesdale, Amanda Norvell, Lisa LaJevic, Manish Paliwal, Matt Wund, Chris Fisher

Excused: Harriet Hustis, Gary Feinberg, Deborah Hutton

Absent: Holly Haynes

Actions still in progress

1. [SOSA Charge](#) – M. Wund informed CFA testimony is being collected and he would contact SOSA Council about its progress and report back to CFA at the next meeting.

CFA Action

1. [minutes](#) from 10/14/2020 approved; T. Clydesdale motion; A. Norvell seconded.
2. [MUSE RFP](#) review: M. Wund restated the charge required CFA to review the new portions of the MUSE RFP that responded to the challenges and uncertainties posed by the COVID 19 pandemic; FSSCC offered faculty the option of deferring until Summer 2021 and FSSCC wanted those faculty to report any changes to the project before they began at a deferred date; CFA will suggest MUSE modify its application deadline to meet changes to the academic calendar in Spring 2021; CFA will ask FSSCC to clarify the point count on its Evaluation Rubric in the Broader Impact section; CFA wondered if FSSCC wanted to allow double counting between institutional and departmental assessment of underrepresented participants; CFA will recommend that the MUSE application give students the option to self-identify their demographic information in their portion of the application, and faculty use that to comment on the underrepresentation qualification in the application packet.
3. Checklist for Departments revising Disciplinary Standards—CFA approved the DS Checklist and M. Wund will send the [final document](#) to Department Chairs and PRC Chairs
4. Timeline for Promotion Appeals and PRC timeline – (folder: [RPD timeline](#)); CFA endorsed the working group's (M. Wund, T. Clydesdale, L. LaJevic) [draft of a new RPD structure](#); T. Clydesdale explained modifications to the Definitions and Clarifications

section, the footnotes associated with that section, change of the numbering system, and modification of information within select sections (notably, external review and peer review of teaching); CFA approved the subgroup's continued work on the document.

5. [Student Feedback](#)—C. Fisher reported the working group (A. Norvell, J. Torres, G. Feinberg) met October 21 and decided on the following next steps: contact the leadership of the 2017-19 Task Force on Student Feedback, the Office of Inclusion, and the Campus Diversity Council to get their input on the DEI question and the purpose of a midsemester feedback assessment; the working group also discuss where to place a DEI question in the current Student Feedback instrument and the ordering of the questions in the current instrument; the working groups discussed what administrative role a midsemester course assessment might serve. CFA asked further questions about how to add a DEI question without targeting students; M. Wund suggested the Student Feedback instrument might have a demographic section that is disconnected from the assessment questions to give the department and schools a generalized sense of representation in the courses without a connection to any student. A. Norvell argued that demographic data should include when a course is taught to get a profile of the connection between overall sentiment about the course and time it is taught. Issued tabled until the working group has a change to meet with stakeholders.
6. [Assessment of Advising](#) - (folder: [AdvisingAssessment](#)); M. Wund asked Steering to clarify the [charge](#), and Steering reiterated its expectation that CFA develop a process for assessing student advisement; M. Wund noted resources that CFA was collecting on best practices and models; T. Clydesdale recommended the Campuslab survey as a model; M. Stella recommended the NACADA's NSSE instrument. M. Wund asked for a working group to weigh CFA's options; no volunteers.

Meeting adjourned at 2:46pm; motioned by T. Clydesdale; seconded by L. LaJevic.