Senate Agenda Tuesday,
November 16th, 2021 3-5pm, ZOOM

Present: Adegoke, Ball, Bethman, Bhat, Boots, Chatterjee, DeSimone, Gottman, Grieco, Grimes, Hiett, Hunt, Kador, Keeton, Kilway, Lynch, Mardikes, Shiu, Thompson, Torres, Turla, Van Horn, Wellemeyer, Wooten, and Zhu
Torres, Thompson, Wooten, Olsen, Riggers-Piehl, Patterson, Leiter.

Excused: NA
Absent: Davis, Ferguson, Fields,and Godley.
Guests: Blanton, Filion, Hankins, Newby, and Popoola.

1. OPENING BUSINESS:
    a. Call to Order & Approval of November 2nd, 2021 minutes – Grieco
        i. Motion passes
    b. Approval of Agenda – Grieco
        i. Motion Passes
    c. IFC Report – Leiter & Shiu (15 minutes)
        i. IFC met Friday before last. They discussed policies for faculty and administrative review. They are trying to figure out how to go about evaluating the President and the Chancellor.
        ii. Shiu provided the Taskforce Update, which is currently conducting an intensive review of the Collected Rules and Regulations and existing policies and guidelines outlined by the American Association of University Professors.
        iii. Executive Director for Government Relations Dustin Schneiders provided an overview of federal and state legislative issues and sought faculty feedback to help craft the University's message and response to legislative issues of importance to academic affairs.
        iv. IFC continued its discussion on CRR 320.030, Delegation of Authority, Section F, Criteria-Based Salary Reductions for Tenured Faculty. Discussed the language of the policy in depth, and plan to discuss the subject further with University leaders in the coming weeks.
        v. The IFC continued an ongoing discussion relating to faculty morale at the four University of Missouri System institutions.

2. DISCUSSION:
    a. Teaching Evaluations and Teaching Enhancement (TETE) Task Force – Grieco (20 minutes; 3:20 – 3:40)
        i. We need to provide input at this moment and make our recommendations concerning the TETE Task force, particularly the end of the year evaluations.

ii.   There were concerns regarding questions that were restated or repeated. Our template will replace the existing template. It will be a campus-wide template that Units can modify to include specific questions for their unit.

iii.   There were concerns over the question about student outcomes because it wasn't clear if it was related to assessment or not. It's been confirmed that this is not an assessment instance. We can suggest that these questions be deleted, if we feel that students won't be able to answer them easily.

iv.   We had some concerns about whether the evaluations can be read on all screens. It has been confirmed that these evaluations are screen friendly. We've been told to tell students to turn their phones sideways when doing the evaluations, but that's the only issue concerning the evaluations' screen-friendliness.

Comment: Someone also stated that it was not particularly OS or OA friendly. - Kilway

Comment: We have to be sure the evaluation is anonymous. And that's difficult to do when awarding points. Anonymity is important to get honest answers. - Patterson

Comment: That's a tricky issue. You can create surveys that give credit for completion. - Grieco

Comment: You can do it through RooEval - Kilway

Pg 2 #5 is too vague. I suggest we reword it so that it doesn't reference the classroom site. Pg2. #6 We need to give the students some guidance on what a "timely manner" means - Riggers-Piehl

Comment: We need to define what a timely manner is - Shiu

Q. How do we set up an anonymous course evaluation survey within Canvas? -Torres
A: I think Kathleen mentioned you can do anonymous via RooEval -- and it's not necessarily in Canvas itself. - Patterson
A: Yes - for online courses you are expected to have a timeline listed for responding to exams (and it's a good practice for all of us for sure).
I like the question - I just want it to be a little more precise - Riggers-Piehl

Comment: Stating a timeframe for grade turnaround is becoming a common practice. One that I support. I think that question needs to be reworded - Grieco

Q: There was a comment about giving points to students who complete surveys. Isn't that capricious grading? - Bhat

A: Everyone is extended the same opportunity. And this would, ultimately, be up to the instructors. Suggestions include talking to the student throughout the semester about the evaluations and feedback. I've started doing mid-semester evaluations myself. But, if you don't want to do them, don't do them. These are opportunities that instructors can shape to their own needs - Grieco

Comment: As long as the points for completed surveys are clearly presented in the syllabus. I'm also concerned with students who don't attend class who fill out the surveys and drag the evaluations down. I'm concerned about student evaluations from biased students - Bhat

Comment: The evaluations of teaching are more complex than these end of term evaluations. This is just one instance. We're trying to make all the instances fair, clear and comprehensive so that they can be a mechanism for providing positive feedback - Grieco

A: There are schools that don't release grades until students complete their evaluations - Grieco

Comment: Pharmacy school does that. mandatory evaluations - Patterson

Comment: I really have a problem with giving students points for a completed evaluation. I worry about the point system introducing bias to the system. I also want to caution against too much weight being put onto these evaluations. I'm also concerned about being punished for low-response rates from students. In the past it's been implied that poor evaluations could work against us - Turla

Comment: All the points you've made have been addressed by the task force. I'm happy to share those documents. Assigning points is optional. Since going online my response rates have suffered. We have tools that put these evaluations into context. These evaluations won't be the one and only reference point for teaching evaluations. We have an opportunity to provide input to this particular instance that is part of a bigger picture made up of many instances - Grieco

Comment: Some recommendations: Must be less than 8 questions max.; Instructor Qs #2,3 overlap; #5,7 could be combined; jettison student Q#1; - Van Horn

Comment: I agree with throwing out Instructor Question #1. I don't think it will render valid info b/c students won't necessarily know how to answer it. - Patterson

Q: Will there be training for folks using the data from the surveys? -Turla
A: We can decide that at each unit - Grieco

Comment: I agree with David. There need to be less questions. I agree with Mark about Question #1 and David Van Horn about combining questions. When students are completing evaluations, they're doing it before grades are released. I think from their perspective there is going to be some mistrust. Maybe individual teachers could choose whether or not they want to include these question - DeSimone

Comment: We might want to revisit the scope and purpose of this. If these questions are meant for instructor evaluation, we want to tailor it, so that it'll be useful for growth and development in the classroom. Evaluations from small classes are never going to be statistically relevant because the sample size is too small - Chatterjee

Comment: I agree with throwing out Instructor Question #1. I don't think it will render valid info b/c students won't necessarily know how to answer it. - Patterson

Comment: We have to work with what we have as far as class sizes are concerned. I value the feedback I get, even if it's from a small number of the students. I agree that a low return can lead to quite meaningless evaluations. But, we do have incentives to help address that. I'm less inclined to believe that students will choose to lie on the surveys. Questions can be condensed but I don't think we need to eliminate them entirely - Grieco

Comment: if the goal is to get a sense of student engagement-- then yes, student participation questions are relevant. But is student engagement an important aspect of quality of teaching? Maybe yes, maybe no… - Patterson

Comment: I agree with Mark's comments above. - DeSimone

Q: I second Van Horn's question. What is the purpose for the student participation in course evaluations? What do we want to know about that? The questions seem more to evaluate how active students are rather than how professors perform. I would remove these questions. Or decouple them. We have difficulty getting students to participate in evaluations. But

all these questions seem to discourage students from the evaluation - Zhu

Q: What do we get from learning what grade the student expected to get out of the class? - DeSimone

Comment: Yes - I think the "student participation questions" should be decoupled. It does not really reflect on the instructor's teaching in that specific class. Especially when we don't know who the specific students are in answering the questions. Perhaps we can strengthen our attendance policies from this data or something, but otherwise I think this is data that needs to be collected in other ways. - DeSimone

Comment: *student participation* can serve an important purpose; but not for the quality of teaching...- Patterson

Q: What is our yardstick? Once you get the data how do you compare it? -Bhat
A: I believe each school needs to discuss their expectations - Grieco

Comment: Each school should think about their own policies and how to use the data qualitatively and quantitatively. - Bhat

Comment: I think these questions are valuable and you can make connections between self-assessment and the data you procure from instructor evaluations. It helps to take the temperature of the student evaluations. I especially like #6 it should be higher. My only real issue is with #1. - Shiu

Comment about student participation. I think we should get rid of it/ If we had data. We can't count on students answering honestly. I say we get rid of it. - Keeton

Comment: I'd like to create a motion we can send to the provost office. - Grieco

Comment: Evaluations need to consider online modalities. - Kilway

Here are our amendments. Delete question #1, #5 and #6 from the instructor evaluation questions. #5 need to emphasize outside structure time. Decoupling the student participation in course questions. Some senators want to delete it, others want to retain it. Instructor evaluations need to contemplate different online modalities. - Grieco

Comment: NEW BALLOT - Mardikes

Comment: Motion passes - Grieco

b.   Hiring practices; discussion & senate recommendations – Shiu
    i.   A possible motion to support the inclusive hiring practices presented at senate. It should be noted that there is a difference between the strategies and outcomes. The strategies aim at casting a wider net while the outcome is unknown and undetermined.
    ii. Search committee meeting with search support team. Empathizing source strategies (i.e. wording of advertising, equitable review/bias training; pool certification.

Comment: With FSST team meetings, the one hiccup is that it's practically impossible to get the committee and FSST team all together in the same room. I support the effort but we need to think of a more efficient process of meeting with FSST. It's been a barrier. Conservatory searches have been delayed. - DeSimone

Q: What does "potential commitments from the senate" mean? Are these going to be deemed desirable attributes for new hires or are they viewed as requirements? If they are requirements I would object to them. - Keeton
A: I don't think this is a set of criteria that excludes anybody. I view this similarly as candidates teaching statements and a tangible example of one of these would suffice. - Shiu

Comment: Perhaps I'm the only one concerned about it. My other concern was steps in the hiring process that includes "certification of the pool." I want to be sure we're not endorsing the idea that the FSST has veto power over who makes up the pool or language of the job announcement. that should be up to the search team. I want to make sure they don't have veto power. - Keeton

Comment: I agree with Bill that from question #3 on to the end are really difficult to imagine as criteria for inclusive hiring. It will be hard to hire at the rate we want to. Don't we already have an inclusivity policy that's already being applied? I don't know what we're trying to accomplish with pool certification. - Bhat

A: It's the additional layer at the semi-finalist level. We can get clarification. One thing I'd suggest is to entertain the possibility that there is some reasoning behind it. These are extremely important measures we need to mull over and consider endorsing. We may have concerns and

anxieties, but certification also allows information to be gathered about the effectiveness of advertising - Shiu

Comment: I've been to several of these presentations now. I want to say this was one of the best sessions I've ever attended. This page says the criteria of the San Diego state faculty. This is more of a guide. We have very few faculty of color and a growing population of diverse students. - Torres

Comment: This is not new. Many universities have already adopted these policies along with releasing statements. They pick and choose what they would like to include. This is an opportunity for us to endorse policies that have a record of increasing diverse hires. The more I get immersed into these policies the more I think we need strong HR support. I suggest we ask that the committee have strong HR support when performing these searches. - Grieco

Comment: There is a discussion in the task force report about cluster hires. Cluster hires have also been used to attempt to hire a more diverse faculty. Perhaps we ask the faculty to focus on that a bit more. Especially as we move into conversations about retention. - Shiu

Q: Is there desire to graft and pass a motion today? - Shiu
Q: We need to clarify if we're drafting a motion that shows support for FSST's path, or if we're talking about specifics from the presentation? - Wellemeyer
A: Right now, I have 4 things I'd like to address. Cluster hires, stronger HR support, pool certification vet power and fewer FSST members required for team meetings. - Shiu

A: Pool hires are done through the affirmative action office. If they deem the pool to lack diversity, they reach back out to try to figure out what strategies the search committee used, whether they wanted to keep searching. Those decisions are based on a number of factors. I don't believe they can veto, but they may suggest they continue their search. I can also speak to the coordination of the meeting. We're trying to be as flexible as can be. We don't require every search committee member to be at every meeting- Fillion

Comment: First, we should ask for a certain amount of funding to be put aside for expanded searches in more diverse populations. Second, we need to make the motion that we support the ideals, but we don't want this list to become a requirement. - Kador

Comment: My department's committee attended several different FFST meetings. We attended two different meeting sessions. So, you do not have to all be at the same meeting. One suggestion might be to have a recorded session count, if someone cannot make the workshop session - Torres

Comment: Theresa, that's good to hear. We were told back in September that all of us had to be at the same meeting and that there was no flexibility. But it sounds like they've already changed things, which is great. - DeSImone

Comment: Yes, there was a strong push in the beginning but it changed. Anthony, these were from a Community College Equity Assessment as a guide for other universities/colleges. Not a requirement. The language in the job announcements are set by the unit/division and the university HR office. - Torres

Comment: Agree! HR support / alignment helps with implementation. - Patterson

Comment: I think the faculty senate can generate a generic statement like "The faculty senate strongly supports the inclusiveness policy in the hiring practices at UMKC". - Bhat

Comment: "The faculty senate strongly supports the inclusive hiring practices initiatives at UMKC" - Shiu

Comment: What would really attract candidates would be highlighting programs the department is involved with in the advertising. This would show that we're interacting socially and culturally - Van Horn

Comment: To clarify, you're suggesting highlighting programs at the department level? - Shiu

Comment: Some sample language would be "we're interested in candidates interested in joining our research effort, our interactions with *Alianzas*, this other plan, etc. - Van Horn

Comment: I'm in favor of a general statement. And I think broadening the net is a fantastic idea, but I do have a few problems with some of the specifics. One of which is the list of criteria for candidates. That list might actually nix a lot of non-Americans, which would be counterintuitive. I'd say "the faculty senate strongly supports inclusive hiring practices at UMKC". I prefer this language because it's less specific. -Lynch

Q: Is there a requirement this year of job searches that candidates submit a diversity statement? - Shiu
A: No. All strategies discussed with search committees are suggestions only. I don't think that list is in our slide deck. They're just among the strategies that could be used. - Filion

Comment: I agree with the revised sentence. I think it reflects better the conversation we've just had. - Patterson

Q: Can we add another item to the suggestions. To ask for funding help for increasing advertising to get a more diverse pool? - DeSimone

A: Yes, you can. Regarding the diversity statements in the two searches I chaired, one of the cover letters addressed the issues that we're discussing today. In my experience, FSST suggestions have not been used as an excuse to disqualify applicants - Grieco

Comment: Possible motion "The faculty senate strongly supports inclusive hiring practices at UMKC".

Comment: Motion Passes. - Shiu

4. ADJOURNMENT:
    1. Motion passes