

-Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

-The NFC website (<http://nfc.newark.rutgers.edu>) has been updated, but it is missing minutes for several years. We will try to fill in missing years (please email Gilman, Satter or Rivera if you have missing minutes).

-We (the NFC) have standing committees on various topics listed in our by-laws. We are not currently using that format and have not appointed anyone to the committees this year. We need to look into this.

The NFC has been asked to address certain issues such as RAPPS, Cornerstone, and Rutgers Connect and the cost of using Rutgers facilities for events and the like. We have been asked to table these issues so as not to interfere with our administrators who are currently dealing with these issues and trying to resolve them. We agree to this, but also want our minutes to note that the NFC is aware of the problems and their importance.

-Laszlo Zaborszky was scheduled to present a revision on the system for electing PTLs to the NFC, but he's out as he recovers from severe injuries from a car accident. We will revisit the issue on his return.

Reports from Vice Chancellor John Gunkel and Chancellor Nancy Cantor:

-Update on DACA students. RU-N is advocating for Dreamer legislation. Cantor is a co-chair of the President's Alliance on Higher Education and Immigration, and they are supporting this legislation. The Alliance is forging connections with groups in D.C., pushing the higher education version of why this legislation matters. Cantor has been active in moving this initiative forward, with speaking engagements and active support of an intensive letter-writing campaign targeting congressional leaders (250 university presidents are in the Alliance). NJ might extend TAG to NJ Dreamers (a big piece of the financial aid conundrum for Dreamers in the state), but the TAG legislation is not yet signed by Gov. Phil Murphy. Only 5-6 states in the country extend in-state financial aid to DACA students. We have about 217 dreamers on this campus, and many more across the Rutgers system. Our immigration law faculty is assisting students, including advising families. Jason Hernandez was hired by Rutgers to expedite DACA renewals and create one-stop counseling for this group. The majority of DACA students attend R-N and R-NB. It's important that faculty know that they need to refer these students to Student Affairs. There has been a care team established there for Dreamers; also, Student Affairs can connect them to the Immigration Law Clinic.

Faculty member suggests that we sent a short email about the care team that faculty can use if they have Dreamers in class asking for help. Perhaps include name, title, office hours. However, note that this information has already been sent to all faculty.

Gunkel:

Three main issues for Dreamers: 1) Legal (Jason is helping with that). Important to get word out about him. 2) Social (anxieties, etc.). 3) Financial. Families don't have much money. Although many have applied for and received help, for in-state tuition (if they graduated from NJ high schools), they can't get federal or state financial aid at this point. We've been working since 2012 to assist Dreamers with financial aid. We do an assessment of their need and award them institutional funds; but it's not a lot of money. For past 3 years we've been working with a group, "Dream.US", supported by the Graham Foundation; they support some scholarships for Dreamers. We're the only 4-year institution in NJ that gets this help (right now only R-N, not R-NB). Dream.US assists community college transfer students; those who

transfer with an Associate's Degree get \$25,000 so they can graduate in another two years. Students also get extra supports – potential internships, etc.

Cantor:

Dream.US is a great organization. Jeff Bezos of Amazon donated to them; also people from Washington Post. They will be teaming up with the President's Alliance on Higher Ed and Immigration and are looking for places where real social mobility is happening. Dream.US is a lifeline for these students. The median age of arrival in the US is 6 years old; the DACA students can be sent back to places they've never known. In addition they are frequently the lynchpin of entire family networks; it is a disaster if they are expelled. NJ is the third most dense immigration state in the nation, so it's no surprise we have a lot of DACA kids. The numbers are likely to grow. For our size, R-N has the most Dreamers. R-NB, like R-N, has a Dreamers' Club that can give further support to these students.

John Gunkel noted that Jason Hernandez is working on all three campuses.

A discussion ensued that included queries including: what would happen if DACA was ended, what our contingency plans were, and about the type of record-keeping at Rutgers concerning undocumented students.

Gunkel and Cantor reassured the NFC that they are reaching out in many directions including the Mexican consulate, the General Council of Latin American Communities, etc., explaining options for college applications for undocumented students. Importantly, no student information is released without a warrant. Chancellor Cantor also notes that we have a good working relationship with our new Governor, Phil Murphy. TAG came on the table fast – a good sign. NJ Offshore climate change laws are again under consideration and Ron Chen from our Law School and others here have excellent relationships with Gov. Murphy's administration. Gov. Murphy knows RU, has people around him, knowledgeable about Newark and urban issues. Murphy comes to Newark and cares about it.

Alan Sadovnik: Update from P3 Liaison to the R-N Teaching Evaluation Committee

Below is a summary of Sadovnik's report and a brief summary of the subsequent discussion:

Sadovnik reported on the TEC meeting concerning resources available to our campus as we move towards implementation of the required teaching plans. Surveys have been conducted of students, peer evaluations and teaching portfolios. In particular, the SIRS was examined including the questions about whether teacher/course improved your knowledge. We will replace the current yes/no answers with a 1-5 point scale. There is also a new service, "BLUE", that gives detailed statistical results to students, faculty, chairs. It groups student comments. BLUE is already operative at the Business School. Most surveyed felt that the deductive method used was unsound (the instruments are pushing comments into preconceived themes, which is the wrong direction to go towards).

-Peer observations: one of the three History Departments uses an elaborate peer observation tool to observe untenured assistant professors; they are regularly observed by 2 faculty.

-The group was showed various rubrics used by Penn State and others; Sadovnik found them a bit weak.

-Problems with peer observations; 1) labor intensive; 2) colleagues not critical of their colleagues.

-Portfolios; philosophy of teaching, assignments, graded with comments. Anything used as a formative evaluation can't be used as a summative evaluation. Student surveys can't be used to help faculty learn, and for tenure. (Not clear why.)

-Time tables; how often do we do evaluations? Surveys? Require a teaching portfolio?

-See PowerPoint about BLUE and the URL to their site, which has everything Sadovnik's discussed, which is on the NFC website.

-Our charge is to look at each department and school's finished proposals. Due at Dean's Office by March 1st, 2018.

Discussion:

Concerns were raised that the process is moving too quickly given how complicated this issue is. No real need for a March 1st deadline—it's a preliminary stage where feedback is critical.

Questions that arose included: How do departments set syllabi in multi-section courses? What quality control standards are set by each department? (For example, quality control would ensure that classes are covering a reasonable amount of material in a reasonable way.) Additional important issues include: How do we evaluate the evaluation tools? What is it that student surveys measure? How can we ensure that evaluations don't have language leading to gender bias? (The themes that were constructed thus far included many that are tied to traditional male vs traditional female roles.)

Response: Bias against women and people of color is one of the reasons we're addressing the evaluation issue, adding portfolios and peer reviews, etc. We can use an already developed tool, and look at the degree to which it has been vetted as reliable. And we can ensure that it doesn't have language leading to gender bias. The themes that were constructed thus far included many that tied to traditional male vs traditional female roles and that will have to be remedied.

Additional concerns were voiced over using student evaluations for summative reasons, although all find it useful for formative. It's clear that depending on student evaluations encourage lower quality (if you give less work, students like you more). How can we remedy this? Further, junior faculty feel (and probably are) more dependent on the student surveys as they come up for promotion and tenure. Another critical issue is that there is no way to know how predictive the surveys are as far as faculty doing well and succeeding in the long term, particularly in the teaching domain. In some cases bad teaching is obvious – but not always. Moreover, we have poor returns on surveys, how can that be remedied? We need a new mechanism so we can get complete survey returns.

Response from Sadovnik:

We've been using same SIRS for many years. Some reliability studies have been done, however they are limited. So how do we know if the evidence is reliable? But student voices must be part of the evaluations – they just need to be done more carefully. If a PTL is getting all ones, we need to know – and not reappoint them. But we have 10 questions on the survey; we now only use two. Further we don't look at correlations or other data. There are only a couple of universal questions that stretch across department and campus.

New topic: Connection with University Senate.

How will we facilitate our connection with the University Senate? Recently NFC Chair Gilman learned that the Senate in NB expected a report from us at each meeting, and had us on the agenda. The University Senate meets 9 times a year; we meet 6 times. So, is it necessary to report at every Senate? Gilman submitted a report for the last Senate meeting, but no feedback was received. That report was the only one they had gotten in 14 years, and it didn't seem to make a difference. Gilman reached out to the chair of University Senate about this matter; however, the chair did not respond to repeated emails. So the question arises—what do we want from the University Senate? They don't seem to expect anything from us, and Newark is now more independent.

Kettle: Ted Szatrowski and I are on the senate. They don't want a formal report. There is just

a space for people to give reports.

Szatrowski: They just want a sense of what the new issues are. Maybe we have a question or a comment. We should be presenting, but it is just an opportunity to connect, nothing more. It can be a very short report.

Cantor: I meet with the Executive Committee of the Senate 1 or 2 times a year. Gilman can meet with them at that time. It's a way to create a closer tie. The Exec Comm sets the agenda, so it'd be good to check in with them

Gilman: We sent them a report about the teaching evaluation study. Also, everything is on our website.

As Kettle is on both committees, he agrees to give brief updates at the Senate on important topics that are discussed at NFC that have resonance for the University at large.

Faculty member: I see why FASN has a rep at the University Senate. I see why student groups should have a rep at the University Senate. When two members of the NFC already attend, why do we need a rep from the NFC as well? *Note-added later: it turns out that the NFC by-laws call for such a rep.*

Faculty member: AAUP leaders are presenting their vision for the future. They'd like to meet with the NFC.

Gilman: We will put them on the agenda---a vote is suggested.

The NFC votes to invite them to come speak to us.

END OF NFC MEETING

Appendix:

Report of meeting Alan Sadovnik had with the Rutgers-Newark TEC, Monica Devanas and staff with CTAAR.

Discussed the three measures proposed for teaching evaluations:

1. Surveys of students
2. Peer Observations
3. Teaching portfolios

The CTAAR website has materials for each of these at:

https://ctaar.rutgers.edu/wiki/pages/D8A0H32/Improving_the_Evaluation_of_Teaching.html

A. Surveys

Discussed SIRS and questions proposed as required by Ad Hoc Committee and the problem with binary choices. Discussed race and gender bias in student surveys. Discussed problems across different types of courses. CTAAR presented a new survey "Explorance Blue" that provides detailed statistical and graphic results for students, faculty and chairs. It also has an algorithmic qualitative analytic tool that makes deductive groupings of student

comments based on a priori themes. We discussed that this is methodologically unsound as inductive analysis is preferred.

B. Peer Observations

CTAAR presented the NB History Department's peer observation tool and a number of rubrics. We discussed problems with peer observations including labor intensity and the anecdotal evidence that colleagues are rarely critical of their colleagues.

C. Teaching Portfolios

CTAAR discussed what they usually include:

Philosophy of Teaching

Syllabi

Examinations and Assignments

Graded papers with comments

D. Issues Across Evaluation Types

Summative versus Formative

Timetable for each rank Tenure/TT, NTT, PTL