

## **MINUTES of the Mount Royal Faculty Association**

**Meeting date: January 30, 2012**

**Call to order:** A General Meeting of the MRFA, was held in Mount Royal University, Calgary, Alberta on January 30, 2012. The meeting convened at 4:07pm, President Gerry Cross presiding.

### **Members in attendance:**

See attached attendance sheets

### **Agenda**

Approved

**Approval of Minutes:** Motion was made by Gerry Cross, and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 26, 2011 General Meeting. **Motion carried.**

Motion was made by Gerry Cross, and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 30, 2011 General Meeting. **Motion carried.**

### **Officers' Reports**

#### **President**

##### 1. Grievance Report

- Two Step 2 Grievances. In both cases there was no violation of the Collective agreement; however, in both cases, the members had a chance to have their concerns heard. One of the cases had a positive outcome.
- Department's change of practice in assigning overloads: the decision not to grant overloads does not violate the Collective Agreement.
- Reduction of workload/loss of benefits. Due to reduced student intake, decrease in sections offered, a member went from three courses to one and, hence, lost benefits. The member had eleven hours' instruction in the fall and three hours in the winter so based on the Fall/Winter average there was a one time decision to continue benefits for the winter.
  - Thanks to the dean for supporting this and thanks to Robin Fisher for agreeing to it. This put member concerns above concerns over setting precedents and demonstrates a true commitment to faculty.

##### 2. GFC Faculty Caucuses

Presented by Gerry Cross on behalf of Pat Kostouros, MRFA Academic Liaison Officer

- There are two faculties now actively caucusing prior to GFC meetings. We hope these caucuses come to be considered an effective use of time in fulfilling one's responsibilities as a councillor.
  - These are good forums for sharing information and discussing the issues, and result in better informed councillors and more useful discussions at GFC.

##### 3. Child Care Task Force Update

Presented by Gerry Cross on behalf of Pat Kostouros, MRFA Academic Liaison Officer

- The Task Force is preparing a survey which should be out in the latter half of February
- The purpose of this survey is to determine future demand for daycare and childcare
  - This survey is one step toward working on solutions
- Any comments about the survey can be sent to Gerry in advance

#### Directors of Research Institutes (Policy 586)

- The MRFA Executive and Robin Fisher agree that the directors of Research Institutes are not fundamentally management positions: they are academic positions. All appointments to these roles must be academic appointments.
- The Executive has asked the Negotiating Committee to incorporate language on these

positions in the Collective Agreement.

#### Promotion

- Gerry will write a report on Promotion in the next Monthly Report that should come out on Wednesday February 1.

#### Task Force on Leaves and the Academic Year

- We thank our members for completing the survey: it was a very good turnout.
- The results will be communicated to the Negotiating Committee

### **Committee Reports**

#### 1. Negotiating Committee, David Sabiston

- Both teams attended a two day workshop in January on interest focussed bargaining.
- David is exchanging our statement of interest with the Board's team on January 31.
- The Negotiations Survey will be made available tonight
- Time Logs will come out next Thursday so they can be done the week of February 6-13. Logs are to include all work done: this is to include work done on the weekend.
  - You can state whether it is a normal, below or above average work week

#### 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee, Bob Uttl

##### Introduction, Gerry Cross

- Background:
  - A year ago Gerry brought two concerns to the FEC
    - Should SEIs be confidential and signed or anonymous?
    - The questions do not apply to all forms of instruction
  - FEC did a survey to address these concerns. The unprecedented response rate necessitated further action by the FEC. The MRFA requested that FEC quantify the data and report back to the Executive and the membership
- Moving Forward
  - We do not yet know the process for moving forward.
  - There needs to be a review of the SEI process and form
  - We need a more robust means to evaluate teaching beyond SEIs
  - The Executive and FEC have agreed that if recommendations are to be made then we would have members vote on those recommendations.

##### Bob Uttl, FEC Chair

- The SEI survey and consequent quantification, review, analysis and research that FEC has done falls within the Committee's mandate:
  - “The mandate of MRFA FEC is to monitor evaluation of faculty, keep abreast of the latest findings and practices elsewhere, inform MRFA membership, and make recommendations to MRFA Executive.”
  - A PowerPoint Presentation is available online that details the results and lit review that FEC has done. It is available at [www.mrfa.net/content/2011-2012-1](http://www.mrfa.net/content/2011-2012-1)
- Executive Summary
  - Principles behind FEC recommendations to the MRFA Executive
    - evaluation of faculty be based on faculty's performance only
    - evaluation of teaching performance be comprehensive
    - assessment of teaching performance be reliable and valid
    - processes, criteria, and standards be transparent and efficient
    - processes, criteria, and standards be in writing
    - evaluators be trained on processes, criteria, and standards
    - evaluation be against written processes, criteria, and standards
    - processes, criteria, and standards be equitable and uniformly applied across departments

- processes, criteria, and standards be periodically reviewed
- Measurement methods for data
  - Interpolated Median should be used as it is not dragged down by outliers and indicates, most accurately, where the mass of the distribution is
- Turkey's Analysis
  - Should be used to determine whether a score is to be considered an outlier
- SEI Evaluation of Teaching
  - SEIs only evaluate one element of faculty teaching yet they comprise a significant portion (90%) of the evaluation of teaching at MRU
  - CAUT recommends that SEIs should not be the exclusive basis for evaluating the teaching of faculty
- Factors Besides Teaching that Impact on SEI Scores:
  - Motivation of students
  - Class size
  - Attendance
  - Discipline
  - SEIs can cause faculty to inflate grades and reduce students' workload to get better SEIs
  - Some students use SEIs as reward and/or revenge
- SEI Validity
  - "The validity of a test is the extent to which it measures what it is supposed to measure."
  - SEIs are not valid measure of student learning/teaching effectiveness:
  - SEIs are (somewhat) valid measure of student opinions about teaching
- SEI Satisfactory Standards
  - Setting four methods of standards were reviewed
- Reliability
  - Three year running averages are more reliable (CAUT recommends doing this)
- Policy in SEI
  - Processes, uses, measurement interpretation &c. should be in writing, in Policy, and available to faculty
- Having knowledgeable Evaluators is important
  - Evaluators should be trained in interpreting SEIs
  - Evaluators should be provided with written guidelines, standards, interpretive guides, warnings
- Summary: Things to consider
  - What do SEI measure?
  - What weight should SEI have in evaluation of teaching?
  - Should we develop a new SEI form? What response scales should we use?
  - How should we summarize SEI data for valid interpretations?
  - Should we include 95% confidence intervals?
  - Should we control for TEIFs and how?
  - What SEI performance standards should we use? Norm-referenced, criterion-referenced, or distribution referenced?
  - Should procedures, criteria, & standards be known to faculty?
  - Should evaluators be trained?
  - Should students be informed about SEIs and their use?
  - Should we facilitate formative uses of SEIs?

## **New Business**

### 1. MRFA Political Action and Advocacy Policy (att.)

- It is an Executive goal for 2011-2012 to review our Policy on political activity.
  - It is important for faculty associations to take a more active role in arguing for/defending the benefits of PSE and promoting the improvement of PSE.

- The Executive is preparing a discussion paper on the organization of the MRFA for the Annual General Meeting in May and one of the things we will recommend is the creation of a political advocacy standing committee.

2. MRFA Elections (att.)

- A list of open positions for the May 2012 election is available online.  
([www.mrfa.net/content/elections-2012](http://www.mrfa.net/content/elections-2012))

**Announcements**

Faculty Tenure Party, February 10 at 4:00pm

Reading Week PD Day: February 22, 2012. Register at [www.mrfa.net/thebook](http://www.mrfa.net/thebook)

Spring 2012 PD Retreat, Save the Date! May 15-16

ACIFA Conference, June 3-5, 2012

Winter 2012 MRFA Meeting Schedule

Thursday, March 1, 2012. 3:00-5:00pm. Location: LPR (J301)

Tuesday, April 3, 2012. 2:00-3:50pm. Location: Y224

AGM: May 11, 9:00 - 2:00. Location: Jenkins Theatre (I115)

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:58pm

---

Secretary  
Mount Royal Faculty Association

---

Date of approval