

3-10-2016

## FAPAAC minutes 03/10/2016

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fpa\\_affairs](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fpa_affairs)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee, "FAPAAC minutes 03/10/2016" (2016). *Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee*. 52.  
[http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fpa\\_affairs/52](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fpa_affairs/52)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 10, 2016

Prairie Lounge, 9:00 a.m.

Present: Gordon McIntosh, Chlene Anderson, Kerri Barnstuble, Julia Dabbs, Kiel Harell, Peh Ng, Melissa Vangsness.

Minutes of the 2/18/16 meeting were reviewed and approved with one revision. The revision was to note in the “Discussion on Faculty Development Day” that G McIntosh will contact David Langley to see if he is available to lead a session on interpreting SRTs at Fall Faculty Development Day. Kiel Harell is willing to lead the session if D Langley is not available.

Committee discussion included:

Sub-committee developing executive summary for the salary survey report (Melissa, Kiel, Kerri, Peh):

The process has been to look at previous reports to see what data had been pulled. Due to the audience of the report, the committee doesn't plan to pull metrics about student engagement and work effort; they may replace those graphs with a summary paragraph. The report is more likely to be read if it is kept short. They also plan to include a paragraph about the efforts that have been made through the Campus Compact to bring UMM salaries more in line with comparison groups. The important part of the story is that the gap isn't closing even with that additional 3-year infusion of money, and that money will soon be going away. The committee wants to present less of a snapshot; more trends over time. Peh offered to supply some language for the report.

The sub-committee met with Melissa Bert, Nancy Helpser, and Roger Wareham. The meeting revealed that stating the number of instructors is complicated. The University system only collects information about “regular” faculty (tenured and tenure-track faculty). If a person is ABD, they are classified as an instructor; if a person has completed their dissertation, they are classified as an assistant professor. Some instructors are classified teaching P&A.

The report will leave out the old comparison group and only use the current comparison group including those considered aspirational. There are other internal measures that will not be included in the report, but would be covered if M Bert and N Helpser give a brown bag discussion to explain internal measures.

Timeline is to distribute the report to faculty this spring and offer a brown bag session early next fall. Because it is unclear when the new data will be released, the sub-committee will decide whether or not to wait for the new data to release the report. There was discussion about whether the report should go back 10 years for those with a longer history at UMM.

Chancellor Johnson has language about being competitive in terms in salary, but after a brief search the committee could not confirm if there is a percentile goal for UMM to reach when compared to the comparison group, or if there is a goal in comparison to ourselves. The one comparison we will lack is to what the comparison group has done this year; we are always one year behind when comparing to that group. The overall consensus is UMM's slope (on the graph) is lower, and more erratic, than

the slopes of those used for comparison. The conclusion is that we need a higher slope to close the gap.

Sub-committee developing best practices for interpretation and implementation of SRTs (Chlene, Gordon, Julia, Peh):

The sub-committee met with David Langley, Center for Educational Innovation (CEI), on March 3. He has been working on interpretation of SRT comments for UMC. He thinks it is best for division chairs to divide SRTs for an instructor's course into two groups: positive and negative. He noted that he did a hands-on session with department chairs at another campus, and they could do this quickly with relative accuracy. D Langley promotes longitudinal, self-comparisons rather than making many comparisons to others based on class size and division. He suggests looking for overall trends and trends at the course level.

It was noted that research indicates it is better to conduct SRTs at the beginning of a class period rather than at the end. Rice increased their online SRT response rate by allowing students who complete SRTs to view their final grade as soon as it is posted by the instructor, possibly ahead of the official post date. University policy does not allow the use of "carrots" to increase response rate.

The sub-committee will meet once or twice before the next full meeting to work on a draft report. The draft will pull heavily from the Rice University document, the University of Massachusetts Amherst document, and the information gathered from D. Langley. It will discuss interpretation of both the numbers and the comments. Our audience will be the faculty. When G McIntosh met with Dean Finzel, the Dean was interested in best practices and increasing response rates.

One suggestion for inclusion in the report was to give faculty more information about standard deviation, mean and the significance of those measures; some language to help faculty interpret the numbers along with the comments. We should look for trends over time and spread, and we should expect that the standard deviation for an instructor's course will get smaller over time and with faculty experience.

Another comment was that if the Dean hears the same information about SRTs from two groups (Faculty and P&A Affairs and Faculty Development) it is more powerful.

Discussion on Faculty Development Day:

G McIntosh noted that David Langley will lead a session on SRT interpretation at the Faculty Development Day.

Upcoming meetings:

Jenny Quam will schedule the next FACPACC meeting the week of April 4-8. Sub-committees should meet before the next meeting.

Submitted by: Chlene Anderson