

SCSU Faculty Senate

Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020

Time: 1:00 PM

Attendees: Barb Cook, Maria Diamantis, Robert Gregory (chair), Matt Miller, Troy Paddock, & Jeff Webb; Guests: Liz Keenan & Helen Marx (Director of Faculty Advising), Faculty Advising Leadership Group

Topic/Charge for the Meeting: To discuss articulating advising activities in faculty evaluation documents (Promotion and Tenure, Renewal).

Agenda items:

1. L. Keenan and H. Marx presented their vision for articulating advising activities in faculty evaluation documents (promotion and tenure, renewal).
 - Request that Faculty Senate documents guiding faculty evaluation add policy and procedures regarding the following:
 - 1) Establish basic expectations for what constitutes “adequate advising” as specified in the contract (10.9).
 - 2) Establish criteria for faculty advising that supports the value of faculty advising within the Promotion, Tenure and Professional review process.
 - For Faculty: Establishing criteria will allow them to explicitly speak to their work as faculty advising work within their P&T process and professional review.
 - For Promotion, Tenure and Professional Assessment Evaluators: Establishing criteria will support their ability to evaluate and articulate faculty advising work within P&T process and professional review.
 - 3) Establish the maximum number of advisees a faculty advisor should have (as part of service).
 - This will provide guidance to departments, chairs, and Deans as they assign and manage faculty advising of students and establish advising practices in their department that align with the articulation of “adequate advising” in the contract.
 - This would provide a mechanism for departments to seek workload credit or additional assistance if/when they exceed these numbers (when all of their faculty exceed a particular number), including assigning a qualified part-time instructor

to assist with this (as specified in 4.6 of the contract; compensation in Article 12.8).

- Potential ideas for criteria:
 - 1) Faculty Advisors are to provide effective academic advising to their assigned advisees (potential evidence: statement of teaching and advising philosophy).
 - 2) Faculty Advisors are to establish and maintain advising relationships with their advisees (potential evidence: statement of teaching and advising philosophy, examples of establishment and clear communication and correspondence with students, SSC Navigate e-mail campaigns).
 - 3) Faculty Advisors are to be knowledgeable about advising resources and program curriculum (potential evidence: participation in professional development opportunities, service on department and university committees related to curriculum).
- 2. Rules Committee members engaged in a discussion regarding faculty advising with L. Keenan and H. Marx. Various issues discussed included:
 - Based on Section 10.9 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, advising appears to be linked to teaching responsibilities/credit load. Therefore, advising should be moved from the Service category to the Credit Load category for faculty evaluation. However, there is not universal agreement by schools/colleges and departments that advising should be perceived as credit load activity and not service (“If you don’t receive credit, it doesn’t count as credit load.”).
 - Concern about increased workload for preparing promotion & tenure and renewal files due to documentation of advising activities.
 - The chair of the Promotion & Tenure Committee (M. Diamantis) expressed that documentation of advising activities is very helpful when evaluating candidates.
 - Departments should establish guidelines for review of advising activities.
- 3. Discussion of articulating advising activities in faculty evaluation documents will continue at a future meeting of the Rules Committee during the Fall 2020 semester.

Meeting adjourned at 2:10 PM.

Minutes prepared and respectfully submitted by Robert Gregory, SCSU Faculty Senate Rules Committee Chair