

## Minutes

### Faculty Standards Committee of the University Senate

Monday, November 1, 2021 (2:00 – 3:30 PM, WebEx)

1) Attendance

Lisa Holle, Chair, Pharmacy Practice  
 Valarie Artigas, School of Nursing  
 Preston Britner, CLAS, Human Development & Family Sciences;  
 Dan Burkey, Engineering, Associate Dean  
 Masha Gordina, CLAS, Mathematics  
 Elizabeth Jockusch, CLAS, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology  
 Betsy McCoach, Neag, Educational Psychology  
 George McManus, CLAS, Avery Point  
 Kathleen Holgerson, Women’s Center  
 Linda Pescatello, CAHNR, Kinesiology  
 Jack Powell, Undergraduate Student Government Representative  
 Martina Rosenberg, CETL, Faculty Development  
 Jeffrey Shoulson, Senior Vice Provost, Ex-Officio member  
*Unable to attend:* Bede Agocha, CLAS, Africana Studies Institute; Vicki Magley, CLAS, Psychological Sciences; Douglas Degges, Art and Art History; graduate student representative and another USG representative unassigned

2) Welcome and Introductions

- Guests Associate Vice President of Budget, Management and Institutional Research, Dr. Lloyd Blanchard, along with Dalton Hawie from the Undergraduate Student Government
- Dalton presented 3 suggestions for improving the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) instrument

Student Concerns	Problem	USG Approved Solution	Suggested Next Steps
<p><b><i>Addressing Bias Against Minority Faculty Within Set Survey Data</i></b></p> <p><i>Students want the faculty teaching them to be selected for their roles passed upon merit and do not want any bias affecting who teaches and mentors them</i></p>	<p>Faculty belonging to minority demographics have reported that SET survey feedback they receive is negatively impacted by bias, microaggression and microaggression. These biased reports negatively impact faculty’s ability to seek promotion (tenure)</p>	<p>SG suggests an appeals board/committee be created which will hear cases brought forth by faculty. Faculty who wish to appeal to have specific SET Survey comments and data removed from their records may make their case before the appeals board/committee.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An appeals board should be established as either a subcommittee of an existing Senate Committee (faculty standards perhaps).</li> <li>• ODI should have representation on this appeal board/committee and provide guidance on bias to the members.</li> <li>• Clear perimeters be drafted for what a faculty member can appeal and how process for appeals should proceed.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Addressing Class Modality</b></p> <p><i>Student experience in any given course is greatly affected by the modality of that course. Navigating these new environments will require specific survey feedback to faculty tasked with teaching in a post-COVID19 world</i></p>	<p>Students experience the same course in vastly different ways depending on modality. It is currently very difficult to judge how modality is effecting courses and what the student experience is within specific modalities</p>	<p><b>Short Term:</b> A question asking what the modality of the course is added to the SET survey which will divide the data into modality types if necessary.</p> <p><b>Long Term:</b> Modality specific SET surveys be added overtime to ensure more specific feedback be given for future exploration and improvement into these new teaching environments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single question be added to the SET survey prompting students to answer what modality their course was taught in be added.</li> <li>• New SET implements be created, tested and proven over the long term to create modality specific surveys/questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In coordination with institutional research/CETL and faculty standard.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Addressing Student's Ability to Completely Respond To Set Surveys</b></p> <p><i>Students must be given the time and information necessary to complete the SET surveys in order for this feedback to be honest, accurate and useful to faculty.</i></p>	<p>SET surveys prompt students at answer questions regarding grading fairness. With the current deadline for SET surveys being BEFORE students receive final grades AND before many receive final exam grades. students cannot fully answer this question, thus resulting in incomplete feedback to teaching faculty. <i>Many students only receive 3-4 grades throughout the entire semester, the most important being the final exam, how can students answer this question fairly if not given these grades?</i></p>	<p>Deadline for a student to submit a SET survey be extended until the day AFTER final grades are due</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• institutional Research adjust timelines for their workload.</li> <li>• When SET surveys be made available and being encouraged in classes should remain the same</li> </ul> <p>The deadline extension being noted as an OPTION for students who wish to what until after grades are complete</p>

Discussion ensued regarding the relative merits or potential pitfalls of each of these proposed changes to SETs. One theme was that these are not necessarily new issues and have been discussed in previous years. Discussion occurred related to response rates were higher with paper SET vs online SET and should we consider paper SET again; that only faculty see comments (not Dept Heads, Deans, Provost, PTR committees) but these can be harmful not only to individual faculty member' morale if biased or inflammatory (crosses Code of Conduct line) but if faculty member wants to share (eg, future job search).

Action items:

- Lloyd to craft some language about the email to students accompany the SETs that would encourage constructive comments only; remind students of code of conduct and the importance of the student experience feedback.
- Lloyd will craft language that asks student in initial demographic questions about primary instructional mode (eg, in person or online) and if online (synchronous or asynchronous)
- Lloyd will also work with Community Standards to develop a process for handling any comment that doesn't adhere to the Code of Conduct
- Jeffrey will look into whether an incentive; such as completing SET before receiving final grades or receiving final grades earlier if SET completed can be legally done at UConn, which would allow a longer time for SET completion and possibly higher completion rates

2) Approval of October 2021 Minutes - approved

3) Old Business

- Letters of Support Workgroup: Jeffrey Shoulson provided 2 documents that provide guidance and boilerplate for soliciting external letters for PTR process (one for tenured faculty and one for CIRE faculty. These were revised based on feedback from Deans and Dept heads. Masha Gordina, chair of workgroup indicated that the workgroup had also created some drafts, with some different suggestions. Members indicated that they think it is important for indicating potential conflicts of interest and that some guidelines exist, such as NSF roles etc.
  - Action item: Lisa to send out workgroup documents after meeting and committee members asked to review these and those sent by Jeffery; provide comment via email and discuss at next meeting
- Permanent CIRE positions – Lisa contacted AAUP and Michael Bailey is reviewing documentation that Dan Burkey provided.
  - Action item: Lisa and/or Dan will f/u.

4) New Business

- Request to consider issues with software license access for Emeritus professors – SEC inquired about this with Vice President & Chief Information Officer Michael Mundane. The limitations are imposed by software licenses that are offered to UConn.
  - Action item: Lisa to follow-up with Michael for any potential changes to this.