

Faculty Organization Executive Committee Meeting
February 1, 2019
Library 110
12-2 pm
Minutes

In Attendance: Susan Zinner (President), Sharon Pratt (SOE), Scott Hudnall (Library), Bill Dorin (COAS), Surekha Rao (SOBE), Kristin Huysken (Vice President), Marshelia Harris (CHHS), Dorinda Sattler (CHHS), Crystal Shannon (Nursing), Andrea Griffin (UFC), William Allegrezza (COAS), Mark Baer (COAS), David Parnell (Secretary)

1. Called to order at 12:01pm.
2. Approval of minutes: January 11, 2019
 - a. Approved without amendment.
3. Susan Zinner, President
 - a. Chancellor Lowe is not available to see us today, but Vicki will be here at 1:00.
 - b. Representative for Chancellor's Innovation Fund Award Committee: Susan asked Iztok Hozo, the most senior member of the Grants' Committee, who recommended someone from a COAS PIG. Dean Hoyert recommended Harold Olivey, who has agreed to serve on the committee. There will be about 100,000 dollars available, which can be divided up multiple ways. It will be awarded for proposals that could increase recruitment or retention. Faculty Question: Where is this money coming from? It's from the chancellor's discretionary fund and is not coming from any one academic unit. Faculty Question: Is this money for just one year? It might award projects that last longer than one year. Faculty Question: Are losing something else because of this? No, this is in the budget as part of the chancellor's discretionary fund.
 - c. Spencer Cortwright, the chair of Academic Affairs, has taken up several important issues in his committee. One is the administrative withdrawal policy, which allows professors to remove students who do not attend classes. Some faculty want to see this policy removed. Another issue is a draft of a dismissal policy, which the committee is discussing. A third issue is that there is no campus policy for combining an undergraduate class with a graduate class – at what level can this be done? There is a proposal that only 300-level classes and higher can be combined with graduate classes. The committee also is considering an email grade appeals process during the summer – as long as the issue is described in detail and supporting documentation is provided, the committee thought this was okay.
 - d. Mary Ann Fischer brings forward the issue of teaching evaluations and a meta study that shows 1) teaching evaluations display a bias against female instructors and 2) there is no correlation between teaching evaluations and teaching effectiveness (see Attachment 1). Faculty Question: How is teaching effectiveness

measured in the studies? Not certain. Faculty Comment: Our evaluation system is broken beyond repair. The method of delivery does not result in statistically significant data. Faculty Comment: One way to improve our student survey would be to require all students to complete student evaluations before they get graded. Faculty Comment: If we're not going to allow student evaluations, then there has to be some way we evaluation teaching, particularly for cases of tenure for excellence in teaching. Faculty Comment: Weighted evaluation where student evaluations are included but also evaluations from experts, but who are the experts? Those who won teaching awards, department chairs? Faculty Comment: We did this with online classes for a time, where faculty served as peer reviewers for each other's online classes. Faculty Comment: Perhaps a student survey with more written comments would be helpful. Faculty Comment: How do we get students to fill out student evaluations? Offering extra credit seems inappropriate and would skew results. In face to face classes, can ask students to complete student evaluation in class, just as was once done with paper evaluations. Faculty Question: Can students be assured of anonymity of their evaluations if the evaluation is tied to their grades? Faculty Comment: It seems like the Blue system may already tie individual evaluations to individual students. Faculty Comment: We should send this to the Faculty Affairs committee for consideration. It is possible that tying a grade to an evaluation may be a legal issue. Faculty Comment: We would like the group to address the issue of how our student evaluations are used on our campus and what other factors they are weighed against. Faculty Comment: We also want the group to consider the gender bias within student evaluations. Faculty Comment: What matters if student evaluations do not matter? Faculty Comment: This is a really big job for one academic semester.

- e. Yesterday, Susan had a videoconference with Bill McKinney at IUPUI. Two regional faculty were selected to join the university-wide committee on university policy and neither are from IUN.

4. Dean's Review Committee Proposal – Surekha Rao (see Attachment 2)

- a. Two main parts of the proposal: reasons for policy and procedures to be followed. The review will take place every fifth year. There will be co-chairs from the faculty and the administration. Faculty in review committee should be tenured. The proposal describes the process for selecting the members of the review committee. The proposal also describes who shall complete the survey of the dean and who will receive the results of the survey after.
- b. Faculty Question: Is it possible to provide anonymity to the committee members so the dean does not know who is reviewing them? It seems hard to have anonymity, because we want the process to be as transparent as possible. Faculty Question: What is the role of the committee? Do they make up the questions for the survey? The committee puts together the survey and the co-chairs of the committee would get the detailed results. The committee is not voting to retain or not retain a dean, or to say a dean is bad or good, but is there to make faculty voices heard and then these opinions are shared with the EVCAA, who is the

dean's immediate supervisor. Faculty Comment: I don't know if untenured or associate faculty members would be comfortable serving on the committee. Faculty Comment: Why would they need protection or anonymity if there is no evaluation process and the committee is just gathering data? If the process is clear and transparent, then hopefully faculty and deans will know this. Faculty Comment: Committee members and the deans are held responsible for ethical conduct towards one another in this situation because of the Faculty Code of Conduct. Let's make it very clear to everyone that the committee is not in the position of making a decision. Faculty Question: What is the role of the committee if they are simply passing along survey results? The committee makes the survey and comments upon the summary report. Faculty Comment: When presenting a faculty organization, it would be good to emphasize the process and transparency. Faculty Comment: It seems that the summary report is where the rubber hits the road. The summary report is not just a paragraph; it will include more substantial information.

- c. The proposal also includes twenty questions, but these are just proposed questions for a draft survey instrument. The committee will be responsible for using these questions or customizing them or creating new ones for the survey for the dean in question. Faculty Question: Will there be a place for open-ended comments at the end? Yes.
- d. Dean Bankston is planning to retire in May 2020, so would it be worthwhile to conduct a review of him? Faculty Comment: What is purpose of evaluation? Does it help to give this information if person is retiring? Faculty Comment: Someone coming after him will have seen the results of the process and that the review will establish a precedent that this is something the faculty take seriously. Faculty Comment: I think the new dean that takes place afterward would care about the results. Faculty Comment: The review is also a chance for faculty and staff to say their piece about the dean and they should not be denied the opportunity. Faculty Comment: This would also allow the members of the school to clarify their thinking and prepare to hire a new dean. The overall sentiment of the Executive Committee seems to be that there should be a review of Dean Bankston.
- e. The Executive Committee seemed to be in approval that the proposal be sent on to the Deans' Council for review.

5. Vicki Roman-Lagunas, EVCAA

- a. We have facility issues in Marram and Savannah: there is no heat in either building, and there is serious flooding damage to the chemistry and biology labs in Marram. A pipe froze and burst and then water broke through the ceiling tiles above the labs. One of the heaters in Marram is operational but the other will not be working for several more hours. Faculty Question: When was this problem noticed? Early this morning someone noticed the heat was off, but the labs were not noticed until later in the morning. Faculty Comment: Perhaps we could have some sort of periodic reviews or patrols of the buildings to catch problems like this early because time is of the essence. The Chancellor has asked Andy Kapocius to have people engage in this kind of patrol.

- b. The Chancellor did the best he could with the information he had on Monday morning. He found the roads to be clear on Monday morning when he drove in. But the snow fell very quickly on Monday morning on campus and facilities could not keep up with the snowfall, so he had to close the campus. He feels badly about how this went and apologizes. Faculty Comment: The facilities' crew is doing a good job of keeping our parking lots clear. Faculty Question: How does the Chancellor make the determination about closing campus? He and Andy Kapocius watch the weather channel for the forecast, and also consult with Louie Gonzalez (the Ivy Tech campus president), and they also consider the closing of high schools around the region. Hours of consultation are involved. He takes this decision very seriously and safety is his primary concern. Faculty Comment: Remember that there are night classes, too. The wind chill was very cold on Tuesday night but campus was still open. Faculty Question: Is the Chancellor looking only at northwest Indiana, or also at Illinois and Michigan? Not particularly, but he consults with administrators at campuses in Munster and Valparaiso.
 - c. No further questions or comments for Vicki.
6. Agenda items for February 15, 2019 Faculty Org meeting
- a. A second reading of the Faculty Org Constitution revision
 - b. Spencer Cortwright will talk about the things we mentioned from Academic Affairs
 - c. Surekha will present the Dean's Review Proposal
 - d. Earl Jones will talk about the 50th anniversary of the creation of the minority studies department.
7. Old Business
- a. Surekha returned to the Dean's Review Proposal to ask what should be presented to the Faculty Organization. This will be presented as an "FYI" to Faculty Organization and the faculty will be allowed to comment, but there is no voting or approval required. Faculty Question: Can this be saved so it can continue to be used? It will be saved in the minutes of this meeting. Faculty Question: Whose job is it to save this process? Academic Affairs should be interested in saving this as well. Faculty Comment: Maybe there should be a separate Box folder that serves as a Faculty Organization or Executive Committee handbook where processes like this can be saved. Perhaps we should acknowledge that these things exist and we should create a place to save them going forward. Faculty Comment: The secretary could keep a list of deans and when they are up for review. Faculty Question: Do we have to accept alterations made by the deans to this document if we find them unreasonable? Faculty Comment: The deans may be concerned with more mechanical issues. Faculty Question: What is the plan for saving our processes? The secretary will make an extra folder in the Faculty Organization box folder to save processes and the first saved will be the "new school policy" from earlier this academic year. The Deans' Review Policy will be added when it

is finalized and approved. Faculty Comment: Having some note on the website would be useful as well. Faculty Question: Can this be added to the Faculty Handbook? No, because it is a university-wide handbook. Faculty Comment: The constitution refers to faculty oversight, so it would be nice to link it to a policies sheet that could be amended without constitutional amendment.

8. New Business

- a. Faculty Question: Do we have an honorary degree committee at IUN? The Academic Ceremonies Committee. How does one nominate someone for an honorary degree? Past policy: Chancellor nominates someone to the Faculty Organization President. Last several honorary degrees have come from top down. A request went out from UFC to all campuses for nominations for an honorary degree. Can we send any nominations? Susan will charge the chair of the Academic Ceremonies Committee to seek nominations for honorary degrees.

9. Adjourned at 1:51pm.

Attachment 1:

Concerns about Student Evaluations (from Mary Ann Fischer)

To: Provost's Office
From: Philosophy Department, Christopher Zurn chair
Re: Student teaching evaluation summary template request
Date: April 11, 2018

This memo is intended to express the Philosophy Department's serious concerns about a recent request for inclusion of template summaries¹ of quantitative data from student teaching evaluations, specifically both means for candidates in personnel actions and comparisons to departmental means, issued from the Provost's office, but relayed through a CLA Dean's email on March 30.²

We applaud the Provost office's attributed insistence that it "remains fully committed to evaluating teaching holistically, taking into account not only quantitative data, but also qualitative student comments, the candidates' statements of their teaching philosophies and practices, quality of syllabi and other teaching materials, mentoring and advising contributions, and contributions made to curricular development."³

However, we have grave concerns about collecting and providing the requested quantitative data. When we ask the basic relevant questions—How might these data add to or detract from accurate holistic evaluations of teaching?—the answers we come up with are not at all reassuring. Briefly:

1. The data *do add* discriminatory bias to the case.
2. The data *do not add* information about teaching effectiveness.
3. The data *detract* from an appropriately critical evaluation of relevant information.

In short, the social scientific evidence shows that quantitative data from student teaching evaluations measure discrimination, but do not measure teaching effectiveness. Further, their presence in personnel cases is quite likely to short circuit well-known techniques for overcoming standard cognitive biases. We

1

Template attached as Appendix 1 below.

2

Email from Louise Putnam / Dean David Terkla attached as Appendix 2 below.

3

Ibid.

believe they have no place in dossiers used to evaluate candidates for personnel actions. (We are not surprised to learn that there are now increasing calls for legal action against institutions using these data for purposes of personnel actions.⁴⁵⁶)

The UMB Philosophy Department has a special concern, in the light of our discipline's particularly pronounced diversity deficits, about the use of such information in personnel actions, especially given our departmental commitment to diversity hiring, promotion and retention, articulated in point 4 below.

4

Victor Ray (2018). Is Gender Bias an Intended Feature of Teaching Evaluations? *Inside Higher Ed*, February 9, 2018. <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/02/09/teaching-evaluations-are-often-used-confirm-worst-stereotypes-about-women-faculty>

5

Kristina Mitchel (2018). Student Evaluations Can't Be Used to Assess Professors. *Slate*, March 18, 2018. <https://slate.com/human-interest/2018/03/student-evaluations-are-discriminatory-against-female-professors.html>

6

Carol Hay (2018). When Students Discriminate Against Their (Female) Professors. *Boston Globe*, March 30, 2018. <https://www.bostonglobe.com/ideas/2018/03/30/when-students-discriminate-against-their-female-professors/JJRpwa7HbG5QGt2M511DRJ/story.html>

1. We now have good evidence that student evaluations of teaching measure students' gender and other biases, as well as their grade expectations. This is really worth emphasizing: there is now a large and growing body of evidence that show that student evaluations of teaching are *systematically biased against women*.⁷
 - a. The gender bias manifests itself in objective, not merely subjective, measures of teaching effectiveness. For example, in a recent study, MacNell and colleagues used online courses to mask the gender of the instructor, and, like others, she found that the male identity received higher scores across all the questions that students answered on evaluations. Notably, one statistically significant variable was the measure of promptness. Despite the fact that the study was designed to ensure that instructors matched their grading schedules so that students in all groups received feedback at the same rate, students gave the instructor they perceived to be male 4.35 out of 5 for promptness and the instructor they perceived to be female a mere 3.55 out of 5.⁸ Other studies have replicated the finding, using different experimental techniques, of higher ordinal rankings of male over female instructors on student teaching evaluations.⁹
 - b. Student evaluations of teaching measure gender bias, not teaching effectiveness. For example, Anne Boring and colleagues recently considered whether men receive better overall scores because they're better instructors, by analyzing the relationship between instructor gender and students' average final exam score. They note that "The average correlation between instructor gender and student evaluation of teaching (SET) is statistically significant -- male instructors get higher SET -- but if anything, students of male instructors do worse on final exams than students of female instructors."¹⁰ Boring found similar results in a natural experiment—higher scores for SET sections taught by male instructors than those taught by females, but equivalent scores on final exams for all sections regardless of gender of the instructor.¹¹

7

We also have serious worries about other forms of discriminatory bias here—along the lines of race, ethnicity, national origin, sexual identity and native language use—but we have not had the time to properly investigate the relevant research literatures.

8

MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2015). What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40 (4), 291-303. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269288475>

9

Kristina M. W. Mitchell and Jonathan Martin (2018). Gender Bias in Student Evaluations. *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 1-5. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ps-political-science-and-politics/article/gender-bias-in-student-evaluations/1224BE475C0AE75A2C2D8553210C4E27>

10

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. (2016). Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*. <https://www.scienceopen.com/document?vid=818d8ec0-5908-47d8-86b4-5dc38f04b23e>

11

- c. Evidence from teaching teams that were mixed in terms of gender and ethnicity also indicates a negative effect on student teaching evaluation scores of being a female instructor, especially when the teaching teams had both males and females.¹²
2. There is a great deal more evidence that student teaching evaluations simply *do not measure teaching effectiveness*, and so do not add any probative evidence to personnel dossiers about whether candidates are good teachers and providing pedagogical benefits to their students.
- a. The most recent meta-analysis (2016) of studies—including both re-examining previous meta-analyses and a comprehensive new meta-analysis of some 51 different multisection studies—investigating the purported correlation between scores on student teaching evaluations and teaching effectiveness is clear and damning in its conclusions: “Our up-to-date meta-analysis of all multisection studies revealed no significant correlations between the SET ratings and learning. These findings suggest that institutions focused on student learning and career success may want to abandon SET ratings as a measure of faculty’s teaching effectiveness.”¹³ Just to expand on these remarkable findings: “students do not learn more from professors with higher SET ratings ... Re-analyses of previous meta-analyses of multisection studies indicate that SET ratings explain at most 1% of variability in measures of student learning ... [and] New meta-analyses of multisection studies show that SET ratings are unrelated to student learning.” It is hard to put too fine a point on these findings: whatever else SET’s are measuring, they are not measuring pedagogical benefit to the students.
 - b. Michela Braga and co-authors conducted a striking experiment with students at the Bocconi University Department of Economics.¹⁴ There, students were given a cognitive test on entry, which established their basic aptitude, and then were randomly assigned to professors. The paper compared the student evaluations of a particular professor to another measure of teacher quality: namely, how those students performed in a subsequent course. In other words, if I have Dr. Muccio

Anne Boring. (2107). Gender Biases in Student Evaluations of Teaching. *Journal of Public Economics*, V. 145, 27-41. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047272716301591>

12

Natascha Wagner, Matthias Rieger, and Katherine Voorvelt (2016). Gender, Ethnicity and Teaching Evaluations: Evidence from Mixed Teaching Teams. *Economics of Education Review*. V. 54, 79-94. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272775716301030>

13

Bob Uttl, Carmela A. White and Daniela Wong Gonzalez (2017). Meta-Analysis of Faculty’s Teaching Effectiveness: Student Evaluation of Teaching Ratings and Student Learning Are Not Related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, V. 53, 22-42. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191491X16300323>

14

Michela Braga, Marco Paccagnella and Michele Pellizzari (2014). Evaluating Students’ Evaluations of Professors,” *Economics of Education Review* V. 41, 71-88, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0272775714000417>

in Microeconomics I, what's my grade next year in Macroeconomics II? Here's what they found: the better the professors were, as measured by their students' grades in later classes, the lower their SET ratings from students.

3. We understand and agree with the commitment to holistic evaluation of teaching effectiveness for tenure and promotion. However, we're worried about whether this is possible when comparative department data is included in the all-things-considered judgement. We now have a slew of psychology studies that tell us a lot about decision-making and cognitive biases. Not only do "hard" quantitative data points loom large in our deliberations given *anchoring biases*, we have good evidence that they shape or frame the way in which we interpret "soft" qualitative data. The *framing effect bias* and its pernicious effects are well established, and so it is not sufficient to reassure us that these comparative departmental data are part of an all-things-considered judgement. We need evidence-based reassurance that they will not shape the interpretation and weight of other relevant evidence of teaching effectiveness. It might be tempting to emphasize the competence of those involved in personnel decisions, but notice that the kind of cognitive biases we're referring to are consistently observed in otherwise competent and diligent deliberators. These biases are incredibly hard to oust, not least because of the *overconfidence bias*—that is, the perception that *we* are not susceptible to these biases and *we* are more than capable of making holistic decisions in which all data points are weighed appropriately. Ideally, diligent evaluators would interrogate bias by the use of contextual checks—for example, by comparing the raw numbers against the textual content of individual student evaluation forms. But the requested template form strips the comparative data of its context, making such checks impossible. Instead, the raw numbers are allowed to speak for themselves and shape the conversation. We should not allow this if we are sincerely committed to evaluating candidates' teaching effectiveness holistically.

4. The concerns we have raised about these comparative departmental data are not specific to philosophy. That said, the Philosophy Department has engaged in diversity-sensitive hiring for several decades. Our department is an outlier in the discipline in this respect. The lack of demographic diversity in philosophy is so woeful that in 2013 the New York Times published a series of essays on the problem. Despite garnering international attention, the discipline is only just waking up to its homogeneity, and acknowledging it as a problem that needs to be rectified. Others have looked to our department for guidance. In fact, The UMB Philosophy Department's PIKSI collaboration with MIT—a diversity initiative—came about because of our diverse student body and faculty. Given how important we think it is for the discipline and for our students to have a diverse faculty, attending to diversity issues does not end when the hiring process does. We need those faculty to succeed—and we know that many more women and people of color leave the profession than white men. This means that we are particularly sensitive to barriers that people from underrepresented groups might face in the tenure and promotion

process. We cannot and will not ignore the large and growing body of evidence that show that these student evaluations do actually measure bias, but unfortunately do not measure teaching effectiveness. They cut against the very kind of diversity-sensitive practices that we support and, quite frankly, a department like ours depends upon for its existence.

In summary, our department draws four implications from the totality of evidence on student teaching evaluations. These implications impel us to respectfully request that the Provost's office rescind from its request that we (and all departments) provide candidate summary and comparative department data of teaching effectiveness as part of personnel cases:

- a. First, these data are discriminatory, and so have no place in personnel decisions.
- b. Second, these data do not measure teaching effectiveness, and so have no place in an all-things-considered judgement of teaching effectiveness.
- c. Third, despite these significant concerns about these data, we have good reason to think that their presentation in summary, comparative and decontextualized form as requested in the Provost's office template will undermine effective critical scrutiny, given what we know about cognitive biases in decision-making. This is likely to magnify, rather than diminish, their discriminatory impact on personnel evaluations and promotion and retention decisions.
- d. Fourth, we are concerned that collecting and reporting such comparative statistical data will undercut our efforts in attracting, hiring, promoting, and retaining a diverse philosophy faculty.

Appendix 1

“Course Eval Summary Table TEMPLATE FOR FUTURE PERSONNEL CASES.doc”

Table 1

Mean on Summary Question: “Overall, how would you evaluate this instructor?”

Mean on Summary Question: “Overall, how would you evaluate this course?”

SEMESTER ENROLLMENT	Mean: Instructor	Mean: Course
Fall 20XX Course Number		
Fall 20XX Course Number		
Department Mean		
Spring 20XX Course Number		
Spring 20XX Course Number		
Department Mean		
Fall 20XX Course Number		
Fall 20XX Course Number		
Department Mean		
Spring 20XX Course Number		
Spring 20XX Course Number		
Department Mean		
Fall 20XX Course Number		
Fall 20XX Course Number		
Department Mean		
Spring 20XX Course Number		
Spring 20XX Course Number		
Department Mean		

Appendix 2

From: Louise Putnam <Louise.Putnam@umb.edu>

Date: Friday, March 30, 2018 at 4:57 PM

To: Aaron S Lecklider <Aaron.Lecklider@umb.edu>, Stephen Silliman <Stephen.Silliman@umb.edu>, Corinne Etienne <Corinne.Etienne@umb.edu>, David Areford <David.Areford@umb.edu>, Terry Kawashima <Terry.Kawashima@umb.edu>, Kenneth Rothwell <Kenneth.Rothwell@umb.edu>, Jennifer L Gregg <Jennifer.Gregg@umb.edu>, Adugna Lemi <Adugna.Lemi@umb.edu>, Leonard Von Morze <Leonard.VonMorze@umb.edu>, Tim Hacsí <Tim.Hacsí@umb.edu>, Susan Gauss <Susan.Gauss@umb.edu>, Claudia Esposito <Claudia.Esposito@umb.edu>, David B Pruett <David.Pruett@umb.edu>, Christopher Zurn <Christopher.Zurn@umb.edu>, Leila Farsakh <Leila.Farsakh@umb.edu>, Jane Adams <Jane.Adams@umb.edu>, Paul Benson <Paul.Benson@umb.edu>, Elora Chowdhury <Elora.Chowdhury@umb.edu>

Cc: Stephanie Hartwell <Stephanie.Hartwell@umb.edu>, Pratima Prasad <Pratima.Prasad@umb.edu>, David Terkla <David.Terkla@umb.edu>

Subject: New template for teaching evaluation reporting from Provost's Office

Dear Chairs,

Please see the attached template from the Provost's office, which the Provost would like to see completed in future TT personnel cases beginning next academic year. This is not an uncontroversial request and the Provost has asked us to emphasize that while she is requesting that you provide these common data points for all candidates, she remains fully committed to evaluating teaching holistically, taking into account not only quantitative data, but also qualitative student comments, the candidates' statements of their teaching philosophies and practices, quality of syllabi and other teaching materials, mentoring and advising contributions, and contributions made to curricular development. A couple of you have already confronted these issues with current tenure cases.

This will certainly be an item for discussion at our next Chairs meeting, but since some of you are already forming DPCs and thinking about next year's personnel cases I wanted you to have this right away. Many departments will not have an issue with this as they currently report these numbers now. Others will find this more challenging either administratively, philosophically, or both. Many of you are aware of the literature on quantitative course evaluation biases (and you may have seen a recent article that argues women, in particular, are hurt by over reliance on these types of data). I believe the key term here is "overreliance" and I think it will be helpful for all of us to discuss, particularly how departments, such as my own, counter this danger of simplifying evaluation of teaching to a quantitative metric that has been proven to be biased and difficult to interpret if used as a singular measure. I also wish to note that we, in the Dean's office, have been frustrated by the different presentations of teaching data and in some cases the different amounts of information that are made available to us, both quantitative and qualitative and the difficulties sometimes in interpreting the data so we would be bringing this to the

forefront anyway. I should also add that I was on the Provost's committee several years ago that developed these two questions and implemented the universal application of them on a uniform scale across the university, which at the time was a compromise against a push for what many places have (a common quantitative teaching evaluation instrument across the college/university). Therefore, I can share some insight on our discussions on that committee.

I am sure we will have a lively discussion. For now, please do not shoot the messenger, but as always, I am happy to engage in dialogue with any of you before the Chairs meeting (or after of course) on this topic.

David

--

Sent by:

Louise C. Putnam

Assistant to David Terkla

Dean of the College of Liberal Arts

and

Interim Manager, Visual Resources Collection

Art Department

University of Massachusetts Boston

100 Morrissey Boulevard

Boston, MA 02125

[*louise.putnam@umb.edu*](mailto:louise.putnam@umb.edu)

<Course Eval Summary Table TEMPLATE FOR FUTURE PERSONNEL CASES.docx>

Faculty Org Deans' Review Committee

Charge: Develop Process and Procedures for Deans' Review

Scope

1. As of the effective date, this policy applies to the following Deans
 - A. Dean of the School of Education
 - B. Dean of the School of Business and Economics
 - C. Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences
 - D. Dean of the College of Health and Human Services
 - E. Dean of the School of Arts

Reason for Policy

Review provides a formal, systematic mechanism for faculty to have input into assessment of administrators. Well-designed reviews at regular intervals also provide opportunities for input and feedback for the improvement of administration, provide opportunities to acknowledge successful administration, and encourage both the administration generally and the individual administrator to set appropriate goals for the unit in question and to assess the administrator's success in reaching those goals.

Review extends beyond the review of the individual administrator because, in general, it stimulates internal review of the units for which the administrator is responsible, and it allows those most directly affected (i.e., the faculty, students, and staff) to study the administrator's responsibilities.

How frequently should review be conducted:

All College/School Deans shall have their performance and that of their offices reviewed every five years. The review will begin to be conducted early in the fifth year.

At the first faculty org meeting of the academic year the President of the Faculty Org will report the names of the Deans who will be up for review during any given academic year.

Who should participate?

All full-time and part-time personnel reporting to the Dean should participate in the **review**. Members of the committee may recommend to the co-chairs what kind of, if any, input would be sought from students.

How should the evaluation process be administered?

A. Dean's Review Committee Composition

The committee will consist of total seven members. There will be Two Co-Chairs, one from Senior Faculty and one from the Senior Administration. It will have five additional members who will represent the following groups:

- Three full-time faculty members from the College and School of Dean being reviewed
- One full time staff member from the College or School of Dean being reviewed
- One full-time faculty from outside the College or School of Dean being reviewed

The majority of the faculty on the Review Committee are tenured.

All seven Review Committee members are voting members

B. Members and Co-Chairs Selection Process for Dean's Review Committee

- **Process of Selecting the Co-Chairs**

Faculty Co-Chair: Is appointed by Faculty Org President

The president of the Faculty Org will appoint a senior faculty member from outside of the School /College whose Dean is under review as a Co-Chair

EVCAA will name one senior administrator as another Co-Chair

Administrative Co-Chair: Is appointed by EVCAA

- **Process for Determining Members of the Committee:**

The members of the executive committee of the Faculty Org who represent the School/College of the Dean being reviewed will solicit nominations and self-nominations from the faculty members of the School/College. This list will be submitted to the Faculty Org President

The Faculty Org President, with the help of elected Faculty Org representatives, will solicit the possible names from each of the other following groups:

1. Full time staff of the College/ School of the Dean being reviewed
2. Faculty from outside the School/College of the Dean being reviewed

All full-time faculty are all eligible to be members of the Review Committee

All faculty are eligible to complete the survey instrument

“Faculty” includes: Tenured/ Tenure-Track, Clinical, Lecturer/Senior Lecturer, Adjuncts/Associate Faculty.

In case there are more than the desired number of names suggested for the Review Committee, the executive committee members will elect the requisite number of members with the help of the Election committee.

C. Who would receive the results of the Report and follow up steps

1. The Co-Chairs of the Dean’s review committee will conduct the survey as per the instrument* and the full report will be given to the Dean and the EVCAA.
2. The committee will receive a summary of the Report. At this time the President of the Faculty org will also get the summary of the Report
3. The Deans Review Committee and the President of the Faculty Org will schedule a meeting to review the summary report and prepare for a discussion of the report with the Dean. The Dean will attend the latter part of the meeting to participate in the discussion with the Review Committee regarding the outcome of the Report

***attached**

A. (Leadership and Management?) 1-11

1. Supports the development of relevant curriculum that meets student needs
2. Encourages and recognizes excellence in faculty teaching, scholarly performance, service
3. Encourages and recognizes excellence in staff position.
4. Effectively represents the College's/School's interests with all campus constituencies.
5. Understands, supports and practices university policy and the Faculty Constitution.
6. Anticipates potential problems/concerns in a timely manner and responds appropriately.
7. Equitably allocates resources (i.e. budget, space, equipment, travel).
8. Is open to innovative or creative ideas.
9. Encourages and practices the use of the shared governance model of conducting College/School's business.
10. Considers and incorporates, when feasible, input provided by faculty in the decision-making process.
11. Participates in the articulation of program needs and establishes procedures for their implementation.

B. Communication? 12-16

12. Facilitates open communication within the College/School.
13. Is available for consultation with faculty, staff, students and other relevant stakeholders.
14. . Promotes an environment of civility and collegiality within the College.
15. Encourages opposing points of view.
16. Can be trusted in confidential matters.

C. Development? 17-18

17. Encourages and supports the professional development of College/School faculty and staff.
18. Encourages College members to work together to achieve common goals.

D. External? 19-20

19. Effectively represents the College to outside agencies.

20. Promotes a positive image of the College/School to the campus and the community.