

Minutes of Senate FSC meeting 10/17/13, 2-3 PM

In attendance: Mark Boyer (chair), Marcy Balunas, Pam Bramble (by video), Diane Lillo-Martin, Allison MacKay, Girish Punj, Sally Reis (ex officio) Robert Ricard, Zeki Simsek, Cheryl Williams, Suzanne Yelin

Review of minutes from 9.26.13; acceptance moved and seconded; unanimous approval.

A. Discussion of Subcommittee meetings re: PTR process issues

1. Review of and Revisions to PTR forms –

- SubComm: Zeki Simsek, Preston Britner

SUGGESTED SERVICE NARRATIVE

"Briefly (suggested length 300-500 words) describe the focus of your academic and professional service, your goals relative to your activities, and the impact of your service."

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Briefly (suggested length 300-500 words) outline your scholarly/creative goals for the next 5 to 10 years and the activities you have initiated to achieve them.

UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE TEACHING

Briefly (suggested length 300-500 words) describe your teaching philosophy, your goals relative to your instructional responsibilities, and any activities you have undertaken to enhance your pedagogical capabilities.

- Zeki Simsek reported out of his deliberations since the Sept meeting.
- Ask Suresht Nair about the status of the revisions to the Provost's Annual Review form. FSC should review and then recommend to SEC. The chair followed-up with the chair of the SEC; the FSC should be consulted but neither the Senate nor the FSC have a decision-making role on this issue.

2. PTR Standardization across colleges and schools

- SubComm: Bob Ricard, Suzanne Yelin, Allison MacKay
- **Document attachment from the subcommittee.**
- How do we move next? Council of Deans; dept heads; VPs to get ideas.
- Need for greater clarity; written guidelines; guidelines that allow for exceptions.
- Without clear guidelines, problems tend to develop in PTR.

- Sally will circulate the Neag standards before the next meeting.
- Without standards, faculty struggle to figure out what they are supposed to be doing.
- This conversation will be continued at our next meeting in November.

3. Possible revisions to Provost PTR review

- SubComm: Pam Bramble, Larry Armstrong
- Pam Bramble led this discussion via video conference.
- How do populate such a committee? Size of pool raised? Duration of terms? Questions asked about structure of Provost level review at this time. What is manageable size for such a group?

B. Comments on Intellectual Property and Commercialization Policy (distributed last meeting)??

- Further comments will come in – issues being raised by Engineering;

C. Data Ownership document – VPR’s Office – attached for consideration.

D. Proposal from SSC regarding Syllabi for courses – from Gerald Gianutsos, SSC chair

Email text: The Scholastic Standards Committee passed a motion to require syllabi in all courses. It was recommended that the motion be sent to C&C and Faculty Standards for further comment before bringing it to the full Senate. The proposed motion is appended below for your consideration. Please let me know if you need anything else.

I would note that SSC felt that this was at least as important for the protection of the faculty as it is for the benefit of the students.

Thanks,
Gerry

All faculty must provide a syllabus to students in their classes. The syllabus must include faculty expectations of students and course assessments (exams, final exams, papers, etc.).

In addition, faculty are encouraged to consider putting additional information in the syllabus, such as, disability access, attendance policy, academic conduct, course overview and learning objectives, prerequisites, supplementary information, grade policy, notification of weather-related class or exam cancellations, lab requirements and policy, and policy on religious observances.

- Endorsed by a unanimous vote of the FSC.
- The chair informed the SSC chair of this vote.

D. Other issues raised by committee members? None were raised and the meeting adjourned.