

UHD Faculty Senate Minutes
Meeting: 2/21/23
Hybrid meeting (UHD and Zoom)
Minutes recorded by: Dr. Candace TenBrink

Guest and senator roster are at the end.

Meeting opened at 2:33 p.m.

Meeting minutes from February 7th, 2023: approved.

Drs. Diane Miller & Heather Goltz - Preliminary results from the annual review survey

The survey closes tomorrow. Here are some findings to date (n = 157):

- The majority of faculty are dissatisfied with their annual review rubric and process.
- Many believe the rubric is applied consistently across their department.
- Faculty believe they are a part of the discussion (majority)
- Is time needed for the review appropriate? Most say no
- Most spend a great deal of time on the annual review
- Mixed results on using the evaluation as self-reflection
- Does the rubric capture your teaching efforts, and your workload in teaching? Mixed results
- Is there an alignment between rubric and R&T? moderate agreement
- Service- higher degree of agreement that service is reflected in workload, and is captured in rubric, and is differentiated.
- Scholarship- similar to the comment about service that this is more positive.
- However, higher scores in scholarship are not seen as attainable given the workload by the majority.

The open comments were lengthy, and they have not summarized them yet.

There were 54 comments.

Guest- Maybe there are a number of faculty that always score low. Faculty are given an opportunity every year to make changes to the rubrics and yet we still have issues.

Gehring- there are likely junior faculty that feel they cannot push back and sometimes there are voting majorities, these could be explanations.

FS- The results are disastrous. There are too many that are dissatisfied, and we are capable of being better.

FS- Where is this going? Are we taking away the control of the departments?

FS- The junior faculty experience is not the same as that of senior faculty. The process is often mysterious, and it is different between departments.

FS- We also have institutional norms that are difficult to circumnavigate. Some of us do not have time or the desire to participate in updating policy and procedure, in which this is entangled.

FS- Those of us that are tenured have to read a lot of reviews and I am not sure this is rewarded. I think we need to look at the effort and the reward.

FS- it seems we have different ways of participating in the process.

FS- We still have too little similarity in doling out the 6 and 7 scores.

Guest- There is a lack of agency for junior faculty. Both on the input and the contesting of scores. This may be a systemic point.

FS- If we exclude junior faculty, then it is a self-fulfilling prophecy. For example, a recent memo went out that asks for two tenured faculty members to discuss this issue. This is an example of over-protection.

FS- Change is difficult. Seems sort of hopeless.

FS- we used to have merit distributed in a different way. Now we have it by department, which is better. As long as the departments can make their own choices it is not the end of the world.

FS- The whole raise process is unknown and not transparent.

Gehring- IDEA survey. Any follow ups from our last meeting?

FS- there needs to be a way to remove personal attacks, not bad comments, but the ones that are not related to teaching.

Guest- Faculty should not have to share these personal comments about, for example, body and clothing.

FS- I have issues with redacting. R&T does not require IDEA.

Many FS- No, you are wrong. It is required.

FS- I want student opinions but yes, I agree there must be some redacting

FS- It is like blaming the victim. Again, and again.

FS- It is beyond UHD; if you go up for state or other awards outside of UHD you have to share comments.

FS- I do not know how to read quantitative results and I need a way to get higher responses so I can read my qualitative comments.

FS- I agree, I also need to understand the numbers.

Guest- We need to help each other. We need to find a way to report student opinions without self-libeling.

FS- There is one university that owns the numerical data and the faculty own the comments.

FS- I do not want my chair to review these comments. Maybe someone in Title IX

FS- Or a bot that searches, something from IT.

FS- Title IX is not the right office. There seems to be no way to deal these microaggressions.

Gehring- I do not think there is a rule about how we use student evaluations.

FS- Correct

FS- We need to do something.

Guest- Redaction is possible in IDEA. We just need to ask for that.

Dr. Moosally- Our IDEA contract lasts through 2024. I will reach out to IDEA and ask about redaction capabilities. However, we may also think about declaring if we redact as they are often correlated to quantitative scores.

FS- We should ask IDEA representatives to come and explain about their options and such.

FS- I am not satisfied with cryptic videos. IDEA should come and speak.

FS- when will the calendar be updated on our website? We need the start date of the fall 23 semester via email. Faculty need to be informed, not just via a website.
 Provost Bordelon – It will be posted soon.

FS- We need to come back to the issue of IDEA and bias next time.

The meeting closed at 4:03 p.m.

FS = faculty senator

Guests:

Provost Bordelon, Michelle Moosally, Judith Quander, Darlene Hodge, Jerry Johnson, Ron Beebe, Katharine Jaeger, Christine Stempinski, Lisa Braysen, Anne Zwicky

Senators and Senate Leadership:

Count	Senate Member	Pos/ Dept.	Feb. 21
1	Krista Gehring President	President	x
2	Bernardo Pohl	President-elect	x
3	Edmund Cueva	Past President	x
4	Candace TenBrink	Secretary	x
CHSS			
5	Ayden Adler	A&C	x
6	Carolyn Gascoigne	HHL	x
7	Katrina Rufino	SOS	
8	Natalia Matveeva	A&C	x
9	Nell Sullivan	ENG	x
10	Paul Fortunato	ENG	x
11	Raquel Chiquillo	HHL	x
12	Stephanie Babb	SOS	x
13	Travis Crone	SOS	x
14	Luke Fedell*	CHSS	x
CPS			
15	Diane Miller	UE	x
16	Franklin Allaire	UE	
17	Heather Goltz	CJSW	x
18	Kevin Buckler*	CJSW	x
CST			
19	Adriana Visbal	NS	x
20	Gabriella Bowden	NS	x
21	Katherine Shoemaker*	M&S	x

22	Ling Xu	CSET	x
23	Youn-Sha Chan	M&S	x
24	Kulwant Singh	CST	x
MDCOB			
25	Arpita Shroff	ACCI	x
26	Austin DeJan	FNIS	x
27	Paul Fulbright	GMSC	x
28	Prakash Deo	FNIS	x
29	Scott Davis	GMSC	x
30	Don Holmes	ACCI	x
31	David Epstein	MGT	
<i>*Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members</i>			