

UHD

Faculty Senate

Minutes recorded by: Trevor S. Hale

Date and Time: December 2, 2014 2:30 PM

Room Number: A300

Attendance: Susan Henney (President), Ryan Pepper (President-Elect) Trevor Hale (Past-President/Secretary), Kirk Hagen, Susan Baker, Hsiao-Ming Wang, Dvijesh Shastri, Jillian Hill, Jane Creighton, Katharine Jager, Utpal Bose, Jonathan Davis, Steven Coy, Steve Zhou, Kendra Mhoon, Plamen Simeonov, Maria Benavides, Rachna Sadana, Ruth Johnson, Mary Portillo, Claude Rubinson, Cindy Stewart, Angela Lopez Pedrana, Bernardo Pohl

Guests: Pat Williams, Sergiey Koshkin, Jerry Johnson, Gene Preuss, Ed Hugetz, Bill Flores, Bill Waller, Faiza Khoja, Michelle Moosally, Punam Gulati, Pat Ensor, Greg Getz, Phil Lyons

Regrets: N/A

Absent: Beverly Rowe, Sam Penkar, Judith Quander

Call to Order: 2:34 PM

Meeting minutes: Motion to table adoption of November 18 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes until next Faculty Senate meeting accepted unanimously with one abstention.

Review of previous action items: N/A

Meeting Proceedings:

Announcements from Senate President Henney:

1. Faculty Senate President Henney and Faculty Senate President-Elect attended UFEC meeting of UH System Faculty Senate presidents. Common themes included:
 - a. Crafting statements and policy on Intellectual Property, especially with respect to online education.
 - b. In an effort to spread service workload evenly, faculty on all committees across campus should go through Faculty Senate election procedures.
 - c. Who should perform annual evaluations for faculty and whether that should include the Faculty Senate.
 - d. Collegiality.
 - e. Faculty workload with respect to service.
2. Faculty Climate Survey
 - a. Report is done every two years.
 - b. Will need volunteers to analyze the data.
3. Faculty Annual Performance Evaluations

a. The role of Deans in the process.

Current policy: Chairs report to Deans.

Proposed policy: Chairs report to Deans but Deans can change scores.

Ensuing discussion included noting that chairs report to Deans as it is.

One senator lamented that the proposed increased level of workload and bureaucracy for the Deans is unsustainable.

Another questioned the logic of adding the Deans to the process.

***Answer:** Deans are held accountable for the performance of the college. Therefore, they need to be able to control performance evaluations of individual faculty (Hugetz).*

Another Senator proposed an amendment that would allow Deans to review and suggest changes to chair.

Another Senator commented that any Dean *not* reviewing the scores is not good business.

A Senator reminded the body that forced means and/or forced distributions (with allowances for outliers) would effectively solve the problems of too many high scores or too many low scores.

Another Senator reminded the body that the Faculty Senate fought for control of the Annual Performance Evaluations and this was, in a sense, a give back.

A Senator lamented that he did not know what the word “review” would mean in this context.

A guest at the meeting reminded the body that some chairs are elected by less than half of the faculty in a particular department (e.g., the MMBA Department had three people vie for the position in 2011).

Another Senator suggested the following change to the proposed policy: Instead of insisting the Dean review all of the Annual Performance Evaluations, change to, ‘If there is disagreement of a particular then the Dean must review the APE.’

Another Senator went further and suggested changing “must” to “can” review all the Annual Performance Evaluations.

The chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee noted that there was support in Academic Affairs Council for the department chairs to have the final say.

A Senator suggested that instead of the Dean’s evaluating individual scores, the Dean should/could monitor and review statistics (e.g., sample mean, range, etc.) of the scores overall. This suggestion was met with wide ranging support.

A guest in the audience told a cautionary story of Dean's at another university using statistical averages needing to temper their changes with the issue of fairness.

Another guest commented that some of the problems people are worried about (e.g., too many high scores, connection of APEs to Rank and Tenure decisions) are ironed out by the new rubrics.

President Henney asked the chamber what they wanted to do.

Answer: FSEC to identify a process to solve the problem.

A motion was put forth for FSEC to send FAC a sentence detailing the proposed process (Motion Hagen / Second Stewart. Motion carried with 17 in favor, 4 in opposition, and three abstentions.

A motion was put forth to ask FAC to send their response to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Motion Rubinson / Second Hagen). Motion carried with 23 in favor and one abstention.

4. General Education: FSEC, as a whole, has issue with:
- i. The level and type of input the faculty as a whole have had in the process
 - ii. People looking at the Gen Ed proposal in piece-meal parts
 - iii. The responses from the eleven departments being indecipherable

Statement: The Gen Ed proposal has been sent to the departments and the Gen Ed Committee is awaiting feedback. The initial question was of the form, "Do people want more beyond what is already in the core?" (Gen Ed Committee Chair).

A Senator asked, "What percent of faculty are in favor of the proposal as it stands?"

Answer: A faculty response rate is unclear as the proposal was sent to the departments and not the individual faculty.

A motion was put forth to send a request to the Gen Ed Committee to re-visit the input by the departments and the faculty (Motion Hagen / Second Coy). Motion carried with 17 in favor, 2 in opposition, and 4 abstentions.

Next meeting:

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be January 20.

Action Items:

	Activity	Responsibility	Date of Completion
1	Have a safe holiday!	Everyone	
2			
3			
4			

Adjourn:

Motion to adjourn at 4:05 (Motion Coy / Second Pepper). Approved by acclamation.