

**UHD Faculty Senate Minutes**  
Meeting: 11/15/22  
Hybrid meeting (UHD and Zoom)  
Minutes recorded by: Dr. Candace TenBrink

Guest and senator roster are at the end.  
Meeting opened at 2:31 p.m.  
Meeting minutes from Nov. 1, 2022: approved.

**Guest updates / presentations**

**1. Dr. Michelle Moosally (MM) Associate Vice President for Programming and Curriculum – IDEA Student Opinion Survey**

She gave an overview. We pay ~\$45,000 per year to Campus Labs for this contract. We have had a contract with them since 2014.

- a. Use of the IDEA survey: 1) The results may be used by the departments. 2) The faculty always have access. 3) R&T PS10.A.01 requires summary data. 4) It is not publicly available.
- b. There are 40 questions in the undergraduate survey and 18 in the graduate survey.
- c. Remember to select your objectives as the weighting matters. Double weight (essential), single weight (Important), and minor (not weighted). You can add custom questions but those are not included in the weightings.
- d. Encourage students with a direct link, explain why it is used, and set aside course time (it can be done on a phone). By policy, there should be no incentives given to students for completing the survey.

FS- Can or will we make these public? At this point we are not making them public.

FS- We had better results with paper and pen surveys.

FS- Maybe technology is not better.

MM- it is unlikely that a paper and pencil strategy will be viable. We need to have a conversation about what to do next when our contract expires.

FS- What about biases for minorities and women? I do not want students to evaluate me.

MM- It is not an evaluation.

FS- Is IDEA working? Why do we think it is not working?

Gehring- it is not working if students are not taking the survey

MM- it depends on the department, patterns

FS- It is not working for POC and women. There is a lot of data out there that it (student opinion surveys) is not working (not IDEA as a firm, but the standardized surveys are not working).

MM- We can look into this.

FS- Maybe we can get a TikTok group to promote it.

Gehring- we should not hang our hat on how students feel about us in class.

FS- what is the problem with *university*-based incentives?

MM- there can be, but we would have to think about it.

FS- If you complete a course evaluation (at UT Brown) students can get their grades a week earlier. After they did this, they had higher (completion) rates, at least for the semester that I was there.

MM- that is a possibility.

FS- We need to put equity front and center if these are biased against women and minorities. This should not be an afterthought. I have been hearing about this issue for 6 years.

MM- yes, we should.

FS- evaluation of teaching should be holistic.

Gehring- given all the issues, why do we have to have student evaluations?

MM- it is a state mandate that we have evaluations.

MM- discuss messaging and results in the department.

## **2. Dr. Deborah Bordelon, Provost**

- a. (Adding on to the above conversation) It would be good to take a look holistically at how to improve the evaluation and feedback loop- it is just one data point. We should look at how we can work together to effectively use this information, as one part of the picture.
- b. Also, we should consider paring down the opinion survey. 40 questions are a lot.
- c. Keep in mind that there is no perfect tool. This is an issue on all campuses

FS- should we have a task force?

MM- let's have APC handle this for now and then see.

FS- how do students know where to find it?

MM- it is emailed to them via gatormail. Maybe they can also find it in student services.

## **3. Dr. Judith Quander (JQ) Interim Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Faculty – Post tenure review**

The latest draft of the performance evaluation of tenured faculty has been sent out. It will be voted on 11/18 in AAC.

### **Faculty Senate Business**

#### **A. Consulting and Paid Professional Services Policy Update**

Gehring spoke with her Clear Lake counterpart. She reported that this is a regent policy, not a UH System policy. She will keep plugging away and try to get this one day maximum waived for us as it is for the Architecture School at UofH.

#### **B. Rank and tenure criteria and annual evaluation repository in the provost's office follow up**

Gehring- need a task force to work with Dr. Quander as to how we use this. Who wants to be on it?

Luke Fedell, Heather Goltz, Bernardo Pohl, Don Holmes, Diane Miller

JQ- we need to create a place and website; we need a way of marking the years they (reviews and R&T policy) were created so people (faculty) know which one to use. What do we want to do with this? This group discussed how different departments have varied standards and others want to see how these forms/matrices look.

Gehring- this will be a preliminary task force to consider how to organize and share the data

**C. Dr. Quander – Discussion about the pre-Rank and Tenure process.**

People have proposed to offer one shell that mimics the R&T shell so the 2 year and 4-year process could be more efficient. This is an opportunity to give feedback and more specificity around the 2nd and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews.

Gehring- maybe some more guidance in the policy would be helpful

FS- We are in the danger of over prescribing.

JQ- now each department sends what they want in a shell and these requests are varied by time and requirements.

FS- The 2- and 4-year reviews are dry runs for R&T. As such, candidates should follow R&T guidelines.

FS- We need to give some room for disciplines to do their own thing.

FS- These reviews are also a part of the holistic process of growth.

FS- I was told to put my info into the shell and I only had one week. Maybe we should have more time.

JQ- Maybe we should reflect on these areas in FAC: what is included, timelines, and what is the point?

FS- I disagree. I am not a fan of handholding. Faculty need to take the onus and be in charge of their own career.

FS- I think the uniformity should come from the provost's office.

FS- Can we really expect new faculty to know we have a policy for everything?

*There was a discussion pursuant to the pros and cons of more or less going into policy.*

JQ- FAC will begin working on this and JQ will provide us with feedback.

Any last comments?

Gehring- Any Fulbright news?

TenBrink- stay tuned for exciting news at the January retreat.

MM- Reminder- The only faculty that can teach in Canvas this spring are ones that are in the pilot program.

Our next meeting is Dec. 6

Cueva moves to adjourn and TenBrink seconds.

The meeting closed at 4:01 p.m.

FS = faculty senator

**Guests:**

Provost Bordelon, Michele Moosally, Judith Quander, Darlene Hodge, Y. Cecillano, Sandra Dahlberg, Ron Beebe, Courtney Standlee, Lisa Braysen

**Senators and Senate Leadership:**

Count	Senate Member	Pos/ Dept.	15-Nov
1	Krista Gehring	President	x
2	Bernardo Pohl	President-elect	x
3	Edmund Cueva	Past President	x
4	Candace TenBrink	Secretary	x
<b>CHSS</b>			
5	Ayden Adler	A&C	x
6	Carolyn Gascoigne	HHL	x
7	Katrina Rufino	SOS	x
8	Natalia Matveeva	A&C	x
9	Nell Sullivan	ENG	x
10	Paul Fortunato	ENG	x
11	Raquel Chicquillo	HHL	x
12	Stephanie Babb	SOS	x
13	Travis Crone	SOS	x
14	Luke Fedell*	CHSS	x
<b>CPS</b>			
15	Diane Miller	UE	x
16	Franklin Allaire	UE	x
17	Heather Goltz	CJSW	x
18	Kevin Buckler*	CJSW	x
<b>CST</b>			
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
<b>MDCOB</b>			
25	Arpita Shroff	ACCI	x
26	Austin DeJan	FNIS	
27	Paul Fulbright	GMSC	x
28	Prakash Deo	FNIS	x
29	Scott Davis	GMSC	x
30	Don Holmes	ACCI	x
31	David Epstein	MGT	x
<i>*Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members</i>			