

Comments and suggestions from members of FSAC with particular attention to sub-theme four.

- In the second paragraph of 4. *Approach for the Capacity...* that the points to which committees are to pay particular attention are on the worksheet, which we have not yet seen, rather than anything which is to be added to this document. The comments provided by FSAC cannot be interpreted as an endorsement of this document, since it appears that other relevant portions of the document were not available to us. If these worksheets exist, we would like to comment on them as well.
- It remains unclear in the reading what is the relationship between the outcomes listed Part 2: The description of outcomes and the subthemes that follow in Section 5. One interpretation is that the outcomes should be somehow crossed with the subtheme. If this is the case, then the outcomes listed in subtheme four do not seem to match back to the outcomes. This should be clarified.

I

Sub-Theme Four – Faculty Roles and Responsibilities in Teaching, Scholarship, Mentoring and Advising

Outcome One: Continue discussion of the potential revision of the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy to insure coherence between institutional mission and objectives and consensus on performance expectations for faculty at all review levels: department, school, and university. *Questions for reflection:* What are the expectations for all of the faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service? Are the criteria for RTP articulated at all levels? Are they explicitly stated and understood? For faculty, what is the relationship and balance ~~between~~ among meeting department, school, and university objectives and mission? How are faculty best mentored into their roles as teachers, scholars, and members of the university community? What is the relationship between teaching and scholarship in a liberal arts and sciences university? **Research can be used to simulate new ideas in teaching. Also students can be part of the research experience making this a learning experience not just a pair of extra hands.** What are the roles of the discipline and of general education in a liberal arts and sciences university?

It looks like the authors intended that the "outcomes" listed in section 2 are then used in the "sub-themes" to organize the listed activities. I can't find where they state that this is what they've done. If they HAD HEADED each "outcome" within the "sub-theme" with the full text description of that outcome, it would have aided the organization and writing of each section of the "sub-theme". It would also have raised questions about the order in which activities should be undertaken. For example, "Outcome One" begins "Develop

and utilize indicators of performance.....". Applying this to "Sub-Theme Four" would call for reorganization of the section to lead off with the "Questions for reflection", rather than the "Continue discussion of the potential revisions". Should we not be asking what the expectations of faculty are and what the criteria articulated are before discussing revisions of RTP procedures? The remaining sections should be rewritten in the same mode, text of outcome first, questions second, activity third. As it stands, it makes us look pointlessly busy, rather than working to define a goal and then work toward it.

In the description of the outcomes Part 2, the description of outcome rests on the heavily on financial and analysis of SFR etc:

Outcome 1: Develop and utilize indicators of performance, such as a set of functional categories for budgetary purposes; analysis of student-faculty ratio (SFR) longitudinal data to aid in alignment of resource allocations; administrative, faculty and student performance indicators; and benchmarking of financial and other data from other CSUs and other similar institutions (COPLAC).

It seems that Subtheme 4 Outcome 1 does not match in tone or tenor with the description of outcome 1. I recommend that Outcome 1 be broadened to include other performance indicators. For example, administration, faculty and student performance indicators.

Outcome Two: Enhance, expand and develop SSU's faculty development program to provide new faculty with a full orientation to the university, on-going mentoring, and access to training and development opportunities. *Questions for reflection:* What resources need to be made available to new faculty members to support them in their first years at SSU? In the school of science faculty members need start up money and release time. These resource will be used to start a productive research program involving undergraduate and in some case graduate students. They also need to be supported in their and efforts to obtain funding that may not have indirect costs. What kinds of mentoring are needed? Both teaching and research mentors are needed to help new faculty. They need proof reading of various documents from RTP to grant proposals. How can new faculty orientation be used as way What do new faculty members see as their needs and priorities? How can existing faculty development opportunities through the Center for Teaching and Professional Development, RSCAP funding, etc. be better utilized to support new faculty? We really need matching funds to show university support for grant proposals.

Outcome Three: Enhance, expand and develop on-going training and in-service in the key areas of academic technology, assessment of student learning outcomes, academic (GE and major) and career advising, and the goals and objectives of a liberal arts and sciences education for the 21st century, utilizing the Center for Teaching and Professional Development. *Questions for reflection:* What are the components of an excellent in-service training program? How can we know if inservice is successful? What kinds of training do faculty members need in the uses of academic technology? We need more Barbara Moore's. She is great but there is only one of her. How can assessment tools and strategies be made available to faculty who are interested in new approaches to

assessment of student learning? How best can we use the information that we collect from assessment to improve teaching and student learning? We believe there is a need to assess effectiveness of technology in the university classroom and assess institutional ability to provide appropriate technological support. If technology can be demonstrated to increase university teaching effectiveness AND the SSU is funded to provide appropriate technology support for instructors, then the Center for Teaching may provide inservice to promote the use of technology to increase student learning.

- Overall, this section does not discuss the graduate and professional programs on which SSU was founded. These programs cannot be forgotten here.