

FAC Minutes
Friday, September 10, 2021

- Meeting begins at 2:03 PM. FAC Chair, Pat Welch invited new and returning committee members to re/introduce themselves before approving the May 2021 FAC committee minutes.
- The FAC unanimously approves the May 2021 FAC committee minutes at 2:07pm.
- Chair's Report/Update
 - Before the FAC meeting, Pat and Michael Heiss met to discuss the tasks, goals, and accomplishments that FAC was involved with during the 2020-21 academic year.
- Tasks and Initiatives for this year – Below are the proposed items that the FAC should consider addressing this year. Some of the FPS updates (i.e. recognition systems and digital measures) were carried over from FAC initiatives last year.
 - [FPS #43](#) (Harassment policy)
 - Elisabeth Ploran summarized that FPS #43 recognizes department chairs as administrators and not faculty. Therefore, if a harassment case involves a chair, the chair may not be entitled to the same union protection as a faculty member. The proposed update would provide a chair the same union protections a faculty member would receive unless the harassment case is one brought against the chair by another faculty member. Pat Welch and Elisabeth Ploran will come up with some initial language for a revised FPS#43.
 - Last Date of Attendance
 - The idea here is to try and develop a process by which faculty are further incentivized to participate in completing their LDA rosters. Pat Welch says that some faculty mistakenly believe that the LDA roster and the Midsemester Advisory serve the same end. However, the LDA is also intended to provide a more accurate depiction of Hofstra's student census (as opposed to the MSA which deals with student retention and academic advising outreach).
 - President Poser & Hofstra's Future – President Poser has asked for University members to help shape the future of Hofstra as she begins her presidency.
 - In October, Pres. Poser will meet with the Deans and ask that they solicit answers from their schools and programs about what Hofstra needs to do to have a successful future under Pres. Poser's leadership. On Wednesday, Pres. Poser met with the University senate's executive committee to begin thinking about where Hofstra wants to go in the future. The current plan is to have Pres. Poser meet with FAC in November to get a sense of our feedback and ideas about what Hofstra is doing well, what Hofstra is missing, and where we want to see Hofstra in five years?
 - Revisiting Old Business/Work in Progress
 - Online Ecosphere
 - Pat Welch says that the last year+ has demonstrated that online education is here to stay and something that we should devote time and energy into developing. A few committee members noted that, although creating or updating policies regarding distance learning and online instruction, there may be a time issue attached to conceptualizing these policies. Rebecca

Natow mentioned that this item should be something that the FAC advances during our meeting with Pres. Poser's committee dealing with Hofstra's future.

- Recognition Systems
 - Part Time Faculty
 - Elisabeth Ploran offered some context regarding the adjunct recognition system. Essentially, this isn't a new project that faculty members have wanted to see implemented. With new people in leadership positions, it seems that this would be a great opportunity to try and push the adjunct recognition system into existence.
 - Adjunct Recognition Subcommittee formed: Michael Heiss (chair), Kevin McElroy, Xiang Fu and Brian McFadden.
 - Classroom Innovation
 - There was much discussion about how to define classroom innovation. Elisabeth Ploran importantly noted that we need to come to a definition of what we mean by "innovation" before we can start awarding people for classroom innovation. Michael Heiss advised we go to individual departments and get some idea(s) about what can pass for innovation to help come to some definition.
 - Digital Measures
 - We heard many comments about the redundancy of digital measures. Some committee members offered that there isn't an obviously incentive for tenured faculty to continue updating their digital measures profiles. Stuart Bass says that this can make reaccreditation applications more difficult to assemble without updated information about faculty research, service, and teaching accomplishments. Jean-Paul Rodrigue offered that, to start, a software that auto-populated faculty publications would be a step in the right direction. Michael Heiss proposed that a first step in this process may be drafting a memo that to the University senate regarding the problems associated with Digital Measures.
 - Digital Measure's subcommittee formed: Sylvia Silberger (chair) Stuart Bass, Jean-Paul Rodrigue
- Meeting Ends at 2:52 PM

Minutes taken by Brian McFadden

Hofstra University Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Agenda: 22 October 2021 (zoom)

Meeting called to order at 2:02pm

Attendance: Holly Seirup, Deborah Elkins-Abuhoff, Pat Welch, Comila Shahani-Denning, Jean-Paul Rodrigue, Kevin McElroy, Mario Tomei, Michael Heiss, Rebecca Natow, Stuart Bass, Xiang Fu, Elisabeth Ploran, Sylvia Silberger

1. Approval of Minutes/Notes of 10 September meeting
 - Minutes were unanimously accepted with that one correction. Comila Shahani-Denning offered a revision: President Poser isn't planning to have a separate meeting with the Faculty Affairs Committee as noted in the September FAC minutes.
2. Informal Report of the Special Committee on Education and Research Technology Meeting (20 October 2021)
 - **GradeScope.** Pat Welch attended a meeting about GradeScope – a grading technology that is being tested by some faculty. Elisabeth Ploran added that GradeScope can expedite grading and is seen as an eventual replacement for Scantrons (the main difference between GradeScope and Scantron is that you don't need a Scantron certified machine to score an answer sheet). Elisabeth also mentioned that there will be a GradeScope demonstration on Monday for any interested faculty.
 - **LMS Pilot Program.** Pat's second update centered on the Learning Management System (LMS) pilot program surveying the viability of Blackboard Learn, Blackboard Ultra, and Canvas in future semesters. According to the information Pat shared with FAC, surveyed student respondents seemed to have robust preference for Canvas. The surveyed faculty respondents, however, didn't demonstrate a clear LMS preference with notable statistical significance.
 - **Classroom Space.** Pat's final update was to inform FAC that there have been conversations about updating some classroom spaces around campus. Part of those conversations are attempting to grasp what it is faculty and students think they need in their classroom spaces as we look into the future.
3. Subcommittee Reports:
 - **FPS #43 – Harassment Policy** (Pat/Elisabeth): Elisabeth explained that under FPS #43, department chairs are seen as administrators and not faculty. Therefore, department chairs wouldn't receive union protections if a harassment case was brought against them. The language in FPS #43 was cleaned up to prevent chairs from being denied these union protections in potential harassment cases (note: department chairs would lose these union privileges if the chair harassed another faculty member). The AAUP also reserves the right to deny representation to a chair in harassment cases.
 - **Part time and adjunct recognition system** (Michael Heiss): Michael briefed the FAC on the subcommittee's discussions and considerations regarding part time

teaching recognition system (i.e. What would the recognition criteria be? Should the recognition system be consistent with the current full time recognition system? Should also be a monetary award consistent with the full-time recognition system?). Michael went on to say that attempting to build this system from the ground up could be a laborious exercise. To that end, Michael and the subcommittee proposed that the part time recognition system mirror that of the full time recognition system. Elisabeth mentioned that the FAC had tried this in the past and those past efforts have been halted at the provost level. Pat asked a question about the methodology for how the data is collected for these awards. Elisabeth explained the process as it relates to the Cap and Gown survey for graduating students (graduating students pick a faculty name from a drop-down menu). Pat also asked about whether this subcommittee considered having a requirement about the number of credits an adjunct must be teaching. Michael says that we didn't think that a credit distinction was necessary for this award system. Pat asked the subcommittee to draw up a proposal for the senate and plan to proceed send it to the senate for a vote. To help, Elisabeth suggested that we contact Caroline to dig up the old proposal since this new amendment seems very similar to that original recommendation.

- **Digital measures** (Sylvia): Sylvia said that the subcommittee scheduled a few meetings with department chairs to get a sense of how their respective departments use digital measures. The subcommittee also met with Steve Fabiani to learn about whether it's possible to remove digital measures and implement a new system. According to Fabiani, Hofstra possesses a baseline version of digital measures and the product can be upgraded. The subcommittee's next plans are to interview faculty members about their experiences with digital measures and how they would like to see digital measures changed/used in the future.
 - **Online Learning Ecosphere:** This item wasn't addressed during the October 22, 2021 meeting. No update provided.
4. New Business (please let me know if you have anything)
- Brian McFadden asked for clarification the teacher of the year voter eligibility (i.e. can graduate students also vote in the teacher of the year awards). Rebecca Natow said that all graduating students are eligible and the votes aren't separated between graduate and undergraduate students.

Meeting concludes at: 2:41

Hofstra University Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Agenda: 12 November 2021 (zoom), 2:00 PM
Minutes

Chair did not have minutes of the previous meeting to approve.

Meeting began with updates from the various subcommittees.

FPS #43—Pat and Elisabeth circulated the revised #43 Harassment policy; with some additional revisions, mostly grammatical, will be presented at the next meeting.

Digital Measures—Sylvia sent the following report: *“The committee on looking at digital measures has met a couple times. We’ve composed an email, or rather a letter to send to the Deans asking them to contact chairs about what they want to see out of a program like digital measures. We haven’t sent that yet. We’re still tweaking it.”*

Adjunct Recognition System—At the October meeting, it was decided that Patricia would try to get a copy of the proposal that was introduced in 2017-2018, and agreed upon by Gail Simmons (who was soon out of the provost’s office). Unfortunately, the chair of the FAC at that time is no longer at Hofstra and Caroline doesn’t have a copy of the document. Emails located by Caroline, do suggest willingness on the part of not only Gail S, but also Herman to institute this system. The subcommittee will work out language for a proposal.

Informational Updates—

At the Full Senate meeting of 1 November 2021; the two action items (Revisions to Graduate Bulletin - Academic Leaves/Withdrawals, and Maintaining Matriculation RE: Leave Duration; the other on Revisions to Undergraduate Bulletin - Graduate Courses Taken by Undergraduates RE: Double-Counting) passed the full senate; Comila Shahani also reported that focus groups have begun their work on the self-study. Lastly an ad hoc group on classrooms met earlier this week to discuss what faculty might like to see in classrooms as they are renovated. Much of what is wanted is low-tech (more boards and similar); it was an interesting discussion.

New Business—Bill C asked the committee to consider proposing a new name for the position of the Secretary of the Senate. We agreed to table this topic until a future meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 2:42 pm

Hofstra University Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Agenda: 10 December 2021 (zoom), 2:00 PM

The Faculty Affairs Committee met on 10 December 2021, 2:00 pm, on Zoom.

Pat Welch asked if she could record the meeting for the purpose of meeting notes. No objection. She began by thanking people for their work; hoping that the final days of the semester find them well whether they are faculty or administration. She then asked if the committee would mind changing the order of business so that Bill Caniano could talk a bit about his desire to change the title of “Secretary of the Faculty” to something that more accurately reflects the position’s responsibility.

Bill C explained that a description of the position of **Secretary of the Faculty** can be found in Statute IX of the Faculty Statutes of Hofstra, but that the position as described in the statutes had actually changed considerably because over the years few people ran for the position. Faculty Statute VII also allow for a Secretary to the Faculty whose major responsibility is to take minutes and other clerical work. (Caroline S. is currently in that position.) The upshot was that over the years, the secretary TO the faculty (CS) has ended up doing both the responsibilities of her position and some of the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Faculty, as well as responsibilities related to SCREAN. It is Bill’s desire that CS’s scope of work not include SCREAN, and that the secretary of the faculty (now Sabrina Sobel) direct elections and recruitment through SCREAN.

Much discussion followed. Topics included whether this position was necessary, whether CS would—even if the title of the Secretary OF position were changed—would be doing most of the work. Bill stressed that would not be the case. Some possible titles were suggested including Chair of SCREAN and SCREAN Director. Holly suggested that we combine the existing title with the descriptive marker, for example “Secretary of the Faculty and Scream Director. Members seemed to approve.

Motion: Sylvia Made a motion “Secretary of the Faculty and Scream Director.

Motion passed unanimously.

Sylvia gave an update of the subcommittee on **digital measures**. Members of this subcommittee (Sylvia, Stuart Bass, and J-P Rodrigue) met with KG Viswanathan of Zarb because they use DM for accreditation. KG was concerned that no switch happen until after accreditation in 2024, but that otherwise no problem with switching. They do, however, need a databases that can pull together info on scholarly activities of various sorts so that don’t have to go through individual evaluations. They have had issues with the program, including the non-intuitive nature of fields, no automatic end date, expensive tech support (\$200/hour), wasteful and ugly printing. They later met with Steve Fabiani who said the issues are “operational” not “technical”. His point, after talking about 2 other programs (only one which he has experience using, was that “implementation” was key. He stressed that the features we might like to see are both expensive and hard to implement once original set-up has occurred. They then met with Krishnan Pillaipakkamnatt, who was part of the Provost’s task force to evaluate DM 1.5 years ago. From him they learned that it costs about \$20K a year, that the task force was convened because fewer and fewer people were using it, and also that if change is considered Steve F should be involved. The committee’s next setps will be asking chairs for input. They have drafted a letter which will ask for input re its use in evaluations and P&T, key issues and shortcomings, etc. This letter will go out in the spring

Michael Heiss gave an update of the **Adjunct Recognition subcommittee**; because the original

Proposal doesn't seem to exist at Hofstra any more the committee will be meeting early in January to come up with a formal proposal that we can vote on, hopefully in the January meeting.

Pat gave an update on the FPS #43 revisions. The subcommittee (Elisabeth Ploran and PW) incorporated the few remaining changes from the last meeting, and it was circulated to the members of the committee. Pat asked if there were any comments or changes. There were none.

Motion: PW made a motion to send the revised FPS #43 to the Senate Executive Committee.

Motion passed unanimously.

The group then discussed when they would meet in January to discuss the applications for Special Leave. They decided they would meet at 11 am on January 3, 2022. PW said she would provide Carolyn with the information for the meeting, and that they should get the link to the Google Drive with the applications, etc early next week.

Elisabeth Schlegel mentioned that she was transitioning off the committee but that she would be available for health education questions and that she would still be on the full senate. Pat and the Group thanked her for her service.

After thanking the group for their service this semester, wishing all a good break, there was a motion to adjourn at 2:43.

Hofstra University Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Agenda: 4 March 2022 (zoom), 1:00 PM

1. Approval of Minutes/Notes. The committee approved the minutes of 10 December 2021. Minutes for the January meeting will be distributed and approved at the next meeting.
2. Subcommittee Reports:
 - a. Digital Measures: Sylvia provided a brief updated of the subcommittees' work since the last meeting. They have begun to survey the chairs to see how they feel about digital measures, and have spoken with Karyn Valerius of the Chairs' Caucus
 - b. Adjunct Recognition System (Michael H.): The subcommittee has met numerous times both in person and on line to discuss this topic, and after review of recognition systems that are in place at Drexel and SUNY came to the conclusion that it made the most sense to create either a second ballot or a combined balloting process for students to select from, with all other qualifications and conditions remaining as in original (i.e., must have taught for 3 years). Just as the Teacher of the Year for each school and division of HCLAS is sorted out at the back end, following the submission of the ballots, the data could further be sorted to identify which adjunct faculty would be selected for the award. The advantage to this method is that it would permit the Medical School and the Law School to maintain the systems already in place.

After some discussion among the committee, the committee decided to proceed to a committee vote on a combined balloting system.

MOTION: P. Welch made a motion to amend the Teacher of the Year voting process to include all adjuncts who met the eligibility criteria for the award. With this motion, a single ballot would be created containing the names of all eligible faculty, both full-time and part-time; following the voting process the respective full-time and part-time awardees for each school and division of HCLAS would be selected.

Motion Passed.

Eligibility for Teacher of the Year Award.

Eligibility is as following: All faculty members who have taught a minimum of three (3) full years at Hofstra are eligible for the Teacher of the Year award. A faculty member who receives the award will be removed from the ballot for the following four (4) years (i.e., excluded for one four-year academic cycle). Once back on the ballot, the faculty member would be eligible for the

Teacher of the Year Award after three (3) additional years. Following this procedure, both potential first-time and past Teacher of the Year recipients are treated equally.

- c. Scholarly Leave Application update. P. Welch mentioned she had received an email from Comila S-D regarding an application for leave which had been submitted on time, but which had not been forwarded to the FAC at the appropriate time and had only come to her attention yesterday. As this is the second time this season that something like this had happened, there was discussion about ways to improve the process, in order to minimize the chance this might happen in the future. Possible solutions would include:
 - i. Cc'ing application to Provost's office simultaneously with submission to dean
 - ii. Using Blackboard or similar as a submission portal, as it provides a receipt for submissions.
 - iii. Using Curriculog or similar as a submission portal, despite its flaws, because it has a built-in workflow mechanism.

There was agreement that the system needed to be tweaked but no substantive discussion on exactly how.

Additional items of discussion regarding scholarly leaves concerned the existing rating scale and whether or not an explicit rubric should be used or feedback provided. In general, the committee agreed that the application of candidates which are not recommended for leave be given some explanation, at least on the rating form. The committee decided to look further at this issue over the upcoming semester.

The committee also agreed to review the application which had just been received by the Provost's Office.

- d. Possible agenda of work for Spring semester (outdated FPS). Tabled until next meeting.
- e. Brainstorming of topics for a possible academic symposium. Some sense that this was not exactly the purview of the Committee, and that perhaps ideas might have been solicited from the entire faculty. As it was already 2:00, we left discussion with that, and with ideas presented as merely ideas and not supported by the FAC.
- f. Motion to adjourn at 2:04.

**Hofstra University Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes for the meeting of 8 April 2022 (zoom), 1:00 PM**

Minutes were approved after the meeting was called to order.

There were no updates from subcommittees.

The committee then began a discussion about the application/review process of Special Leave applications, given that two applications which had been submitted correctly on the candidates' end, had not made it to the Provost's office in a timely fashion, and thus did not make it to the FAC in time for the FAC review of the applications. One committee member indicated that in his experience this has not happened before, and that we should be careful to what extent we change a process that generally works well. There was general agreement that if the process changed it shouldn't put an increasing burden on any of the parties. Another committee member said that it is important to ensure that the process is transparent because Special Leave funds are limited and many years there are more applicants than available funds. In cases like this we would probably be forced to take a hard line on deadlines regardless of where the fault lies.

Discussion then focused around particular ways of making the system more transparent. Blackboard and Curriculog were posited as ways that might work. One of the advantages to Blackboard is that faculty (and chairs and administrators) are already familiar with it, and access can be turned on and off as relevant. An advantage to Curriculog is that while it was set up to monitor the steps necessary to bring a course/program proposal from its inception to approval, it can be used to monitor approvals in a variety of areas. A disadvantage to the system is some general unfamiliarity on the part of most faculty members. A second disadvantage is that deans often write a corporate letter for all candidates in their division, and the nature of Curriculog might make that difficult. A third option could involve required cc-ing of the provost's office with application to the chair. This would allow for a relatively simple comparison between the total of those applications and ones which made it to the provost's office with subsequent approvals. Other tracker systems were briefly discussed.

There was also a brief discussion about the review process, perhaps to better operationalize how the scale points should be utilized, and the helpfulness of feedback for unsuccessful applications.

Two Special Leave Subcommittees were formed: Li Huang, Patricia Welch, and Deborah Elkins-Abuhoff will be focused primarily on the review side. Xiang Fu and Pat Welch will look primarily at the application side. Pat mentioned that she would start a discussion with Dia Whyte in the provost's office about the possibility of using Curriculog for the process.

Information Item—Pat Welch then mentioned a project that Bill Caniano has begun, namely to look at the governing docs of the university given that they are largely outdated. This project is just at the beginning.

Meeting adjourned at 1:47.

Hofstra University Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Agenda: 22 April 2022 (zoom), 1:00 PM

1. Approval of Minutes/Notes—minutes from the meeting of 8 April 2022 were approved.
2. Subcommittee Reports: there were no reports from existing subcommittees
3. New registration schedule—Guests: Lila and Juline

In Spring 2022, student registration was changed in response to feedback from chairs and others. The changes included making it somewhat later (so that it didn't take place during spring break) and after the Mid-Semester advisories (MSA). The time for registration was also changed from 10 pm to common hour on two successive weeks. On the whole, the early registration went very well, and earlier registration will continue. Some tweaks might be good. There was a sense that the changes were a bit abrupt, but that more notice might be of use. There was also a suggestion that it might be useful for more specific pre-requisite error information to populate so that students would know who to contact for their next steps should they have trouble registering. There was also a suggestion that a kind of registration handbook (with all chairs names, for example) be available for students and others during this time. Holly Seirup explained that it would really be great if graduate students were no longer grouped with seniors. This made sense to all. There seemed to be consensus that it wasn't ideal to take four common hours for registration, even though the registration part of it only takes about 15-20 minutes. Suggestion that maybe registration be at 10 pm Sunday and Common hour on Wednesday.

Following this discussion the student guests left the meeting.

4. Information Items
 - a. Overall review of governing documents re University Senates—update—the subcommittee to review the University Shared governance documents had their first meeting on 7 April 2022. They will be meeting again in early May. At this stage, members of the subcommittee are reviewing the self-governance documents of various universities to get a sense of structure so as to guide the committee when they begin to make recommendations.
 - b. President Poser's *CHE* article—I submitted President Poser's Chronicle of Higher Education Article on peer and aspirant institutions because I thought that it would be of interest to the FAC committee, especially since she will be speaking to the full faculty in May. Comila Shahani-Dening shared some information about the methodology and also about the peer institutions that were identified as part of Poser's research and the self-study. We are looking forward to hearing more.
5. New Business?—no new business.