

Minutes

Faculty Standards Committee of the University Senate

Monday, September 9, 2024 (2:00 – 3:30 PM, Hybrid – Student Union 324 and Microsoft Teams)

1. Welcome & Introductions

- *Betsy McCoach, Chair, Neag School of Education
- *Bede Agocha, CLAS, Africana Studies Institute (Fall 2024 only)
- *Robert Bird, Business
- *Scott Campbell, CLAS
- *Joseph Crivello, CLAS
- *Kimberly Cuevas, CLAS (Waterbury Campus)
- *Horea Ilies, Engineering
- *Elizabeth Jockusch, CLAS
- *Anastasios Tzingounis, CLAS
- Gladis Kersaint, Office of the Provost (Ex-Officio)
- Kylene Perras, College of Engineering
- John Richardson, Fine Arts
- Martina Rosenberg, CETL, Faculty Development

*Senate Member 2024/2025

2. Review and Adoption of Minutes from [04/01/2024 Meeting](#): The minutes were approved with two abstentions.
3. SET Instrument Review and Revision- Setting a plan and timeline for review of current SET instrument and potential revision of the SET instrument.: Betsy McCoach introduced this topic and summarized the difference between SET and ATE. She described the need to institutionalize and standardize the review, and added that changes may be needed due to the fact that more classes are online since the pandemic (is this tool relevant to those modalities?) Gladis Kersaint added additional information from the perspective of the Provost's Office. It was suggested that we look at outside data, peer institutions and collect feedback from both faculty and students. Betsy McCoach added that we can analyze our own data from past SETs. John Richardson suggested that we also look at the instrument itself to see if it can serve us better by having a functionality to analyze data (perhaps a dashboard). Joseph Crivello raised several different points of analysis to compare. Discussion continued and Betsy McCoach suggested forming a Taskforce to work on this project, emphasizing that the work will take some time. Elizabeth Jockusch suggested subcommittees of Faculty Standards to focus on specific areas. Betsy McCoach summarized the focus areas raised by the Committee: (1)Faculty (2) Students (3) Historical Data (internal) (4) Benchmarking/External Research. The goal of these four things would be to determine (a) if it looks like we should be

engaging in revision of the current SET and (b) if yes, then the data that we gather and are able to evaluate from these four sources will inform us to determine how we want to move forward with those revisions. It was suggested that we also look at how the SET figures are used in faculty performance or evaluation, and whether the process is consistent and fair. Martina Rosenberg also shared that some departments are using peer evaluation as a measure, which is also a potential concern, in regard to consistency and fairness.

It was suggested that we review the form, not the whole process. Do faculty use it for anything? Do students feel like they have a voice? How do admin use the form? For what? The name change means that we may need to change the instrument. There was a discussion of the inappropriate and threatening open ended comments that some faculty have received. In one case, one of the comments contained a violent threat. When students are promised anonymity, is that just to the instructor, or does that extend to the institution? Should we change the rules to try to cut down on traumatizing comments?

After much discussion regarding the best way to proceed with the review and potential revision of the SET, the group tabled the topic and agreed to discuss the topic during the October meeting. Betsy McCoach asked members to informally discuss the topic with colleagues over the coming month, with the goal of being able to formalize a plan for how to move forward with the review of the current system and revisions to the instrument (if that is deemed necessary.)

4. Updates from the Provost's Office – Gladis Kersaint

- Update from the Provost's Office on Dean's reporting of merit recommendations / awards - We should let Vice Provost Kersaint know if Deans in our school are not providing contractually required information about Dean's merit.
- Update from Provost's Office on CIRE Faculty Professional Development Leave Policies and Procedures- The Provost's Office has received the report and they have taken it under advisement.
- Update from Provost's Office on Courseleaf implementation and whether this will help students who desire more information about course requirements prior to the first day of classes
- NECHE Self-study-
- Faculty Workload Assignments- Vice Provost Kersaint explained the purpose of the Faculty Workload assignments (which must be developed at the unit/dept. Level.). Each unit develops a general workload assignment for each faculty title (i.e. Professor, Professor in Residence, Clinical Professor, etc.) Then, this can be used to document changes in workload assignment due to research buy-outs, or increased assignments in any one of the three areas. Although this was done previously, Dean's Office are reviewing these policies and may ask some departments to revise their plans to reflect best practices. The Provost's Office would like the plans to specify percentages of time assigned for each of the three categories (research, service, and teaching) as relevant to more appropriately represent the entirety of the scope of a faculty member's assignment. Some departments have not identified baseline workload assumptions or expectations related to service.

5. New Business: No new Business

6. Announcements

Update from the Community Engagement incorporation into PTR Task Force – Rosa Raudales (rosa.raudales@uconn.edu) will be joining our meeting in October.