

Faculty Senate

MEETING MINUTES – APPROVED

Regular Meeting

September 27, 2019

Meeting called to order: 2:30 PM

Attendees

- Rich Bennett
- Charlotte Connerton
- Brooke Mathna
- Mary Doerner
- Bartell Berg
- Thomas Weber
- Al Holen
- Adrian Gentle
- Peter Cashel-Cordo
- Rex Strange
- Andrea Wright
- Chuck Conaway
- David Cousert
- James Beeby
- Steve Gruenewald
- Kenny Purcell

I. Approval of Minutes

- A. Motion made
- B. Motion seconded
- C. Discussion
- D. Motion passed

II. Chair's Report

- A. Vice President of Enrollment Management Andy Wright will be visiting with us on October 18, 2019 (2nd half)
 1. Questions (esp. those with answers that would include #s) to Kenny by 10/11
- B. Honorary Degree Committee
 1. Dr. Jeff Seyler – Professor of Chemistry
 2. Dr. Tamara Hunt - Professor of History and MALS director
- C. At-large Promotions Committee
 1. One nomination – Dr. Brent Summers Associate Professor of Biology
 2. No need for election
- D. Town hall
 1. Wednesday, October 2 at 2:30 p.m. in Mitchell Auditorium. Mr. Steve Bridges, Vice President for Finance and Administration
 - a. He'll have 5-10 min to address the group then Q&A
 2. Currently scheduling the second townhall

- a. Dr. Khalilah Doss, VP of Student Affairs
 - b. Mid-November (13th at 3:00??)
 - c. More details to come
 - d. Encourage fellow faculty to attend
- E. Provost's Office will have updates regarding charges we have sent them (Nov 15)
- F. Provost's Council (9/3/2019)
 - 1. Proposed changes in LLCs
 - a. Mix of theme- and major-based
 - b. Housing materials must be printed by Oct 1
 - c. Issues are still being sorted out
 - 2. Care reporting form has been updated
 - a. Don't delay reports of self-harm
 - b. Be aware that instances of self-harm are increasing in number
 - c. Care reports are not 24-hour response. If it is an emergency call campus security
 - 3. Strategic Plan
 - a. Info about the steering committee should be coming soon
- G. President's Council (9/24/19)
 - 1. Enrollment
 - a. OPRA was working on census data
 - (i) Deans should have that data
 - b. 1st to 2nd year 66.8% (down 5%) – we are normally retaining in the low 70% area
 - (i) This was predicted by the retention predictor software (SRP?)
 - (1) Green (likely to be successful) student groups usually make-up 12-14% of the entire student population, but only accounted for 5% of the student body last year
 - c. Test optional admission is being entertained
 - (i) Ball State started this year with great results so far
 - (ii) They are also doing other things, 26% yield vs. our 36% - our yield has typically been about 40%
 - (iii) Western Kentucky University is now test option and their Merit Scholarship does now not require ACT/SAT tests
 - 2. Midwest Student Exchange is moving forward Fall 2021
 - a. Approved by the provost and president's council
- III. Honorary Degree Committee Election
 - A. Motion made to hold election
 - B. Discussion
 - C. Secret ballot election held
 - D. Results – Tamara Hunt elected
- IV. Provost's Report
 - A. Indiana Data Partnership (IDP)
 - 1. <https://hub.mph.in.gov>
 - 2. This is a component of the State of Indiana's Management Performance Hub
 - 3. Established to create a secure, replicable, and sustainable framework for sharing and viewing common data about the State's most complex challenges
 - 4. USI has been invited to join this group
 - a. Two membership options
 - (i) Partner – involves providing substantial data or subject matter expertise to the IDP

(ii) Affiliated Stakeholder – does not require data sharing, but provides access to the databases compiled by the IDP

- V. Charge 2019.27 – Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) in Promotion and Tenure Decisions
 - A. Motioned to move from table
 - B. Motion seconded
 - C. Discussion
 - 1. APA issued a position – See attachment
 - D. Amended Motion to send the charge to the Assessment Committee to come up with recommendations on how SETs (course perception surveys) are used to evaluate teaching in P&T decisions and recommend alternatives and define evidence of effective teaching.
 - E. Seconded motion
 - F. Discussion
 - G. Motion Passed
- VI. Charge 2019.28 – USI Dental Option Benefits
 - A. Introduction of charge by David Cousert
 - 1. USI Dental Options are by far less extensive than other university dental plans
 - 2. Asking senate to send this to EBC
 - B. Motion made to send to EBC
 - C. Seconded
 - D. Discussion
 - E. Motion passed
- VII. Charge 2019.29 – Long Term Care
 - A. Introduction of charge by David Cousert
 - 1. David has been trying for 20 years to get this approved
 - 2. EBC reported on this in Spring 2019
 - a. Found that at least 25% would need to purchase a plan
 - b. About 33% of faculty showed an interest in purchasing long term healthcare
 - c. HR is moving forward with
 - B. Motion for EBC to stay in contact with HR concerning this issue and report their finding at their end-of-year report
 - C. Second
 - D. Motion passed
- VIII. Charge 2019.30 – TIAA-CREF Options
 - A. Introduction of charge by David Cousert
 - 1. Wanted to find a higher-yield option in the last years before retirement
 - 2. Contract was setup on the conservative side
 - 3. TIAA-CREF representatives indicate that USI is more restrictive than other university programs
 - B. Motion made to send this to EBC to review the contract and explore options/changes
 - C. Motion seconded
 - D. Discussion
 - E. Amended motion for EBC to initiate dialogue with national TIAA-CREF representatives about possible options, investigate best practices in other universities, and suggest changes to current TIAA-CREF contract
 - F. Motion seconded
 - G. Motion passed
- IX. Charge 2019.31 – Promotion Process for Contract Assistant and Associate Professors
 - A. Charge introduced by Peter Cashel-Cordo

- B. Motion to send charge to Faculty Affairs
 - C. Motion Seconded
 - D. Discussion
 - E. Motion passed
- X. Charge 2019.32 – Faculty Convocation Survey
- A. Charge introduced by Brooke Mathna
 - 1. Many faculty have expressed unfavorable opinions of it
 - B. Motion made to reconsider the survey portion of the previous charge
 - C. Seconded
 - D. Motion passed
 - E. Motion made to amend the original charge to only discuss the survey portion of the charge
 - F. Seconded
 - G. Discussion
 - 1. Brooke volunteered to design the survey
 - 2. This work will be submitted after the 2019 convocation
 - H. Motion passed
- XI. Charge 2019.33 – Issues with New Faculty Orientation
- A. Charge introduced by Bart
 - 1. Charge was hand-delivered anonymously
 - 2. Introduced New Faculty Networks survey given to new faculty (See attached document)
 - 3. Faculty member was upset by the welcome they were given – feels like they should likely go back on the market
 - B. Motion to table motion until next active meeting
 - C. Motion seconded
 - D. Motion passed
- XII. Charge 2019.34 – Distinguished Professor Award
- A. Charge introduced by Wes Durham
 - B. Motion made to accept charge and send to Faculty and Academic Affairs
 - C. Seconded
 - D. Discussion
 - E. Motion passed
- XIII. Charge 2019.35 – Student Travel Reform
- A. Charge introduced by Wes Durham
 - 1. Chrome River is a hindrance for student travel
 - 2. Would like to have a more streamlined process
 - B. Motion made to send EBC
 - C. Motion seconded
 - D. Motion amended to send the charge so that student travel aspect go to student affairs and the nuts and bolts of chrome river go to EBC
 - E. Discussion
 - F. Motion passed
- XIV. Charge 2019.36 – Amendment to Article I of the By-laws of the Faculty Constitution
- A. Charge introduced by Kenny
 - B. Motion made to accept the charge
 - C. Seconded
 - D. Amended motion – change quorum (Section 3) to be defined as “Sixty percent of the voting members of the faculty representatives will constitute a quorum.” And Section 1 will read “and its subcommittees” after the faculty senate portion of the section.

- E. Discussion
- F. Motion passed
- XV. Charge 2019.37 – Amendment to Article II Section 1B of the By-laws of the Faculty Constitution
 - A. Charge introduced by Kenny
 - B. Motion made to table motion
 - C. Seconded
 - D. Discussion
 - E. Motion passed
- XVI. Action Items
 - A. Next meeting on 10/18/19
 - B. Email constituents for questions for Andy Wright’s visit on 10/18 and get questions to Kenny by 10/11.
 - C. Invite constituents to Steve Bridge’s town hall meeting on 10/2
 - D. Invite constituents to Khalila Doss’s town hall meeting in November
 - E. Tell constituents about changes in the Care Report Form

Meeting adjourned: 4:46 PM



Statement on Student Evaluations of Teaching

American Sociological Association

September 2019

Most faculty in North America are evaluated, in part, on their teaching effectiveness. This is typically measured with student evaluations of teaching (SETs), instruments that ask students to rate instructors on a series of mostly closed-ended items. Because these instruments are cheap, easy to implement, and provide a simple way to gather information, they are the most common method used to evaluate faculty teaching for hiring, tenure, promotion, contract renewal, and merit raises.

Despite the ubiquity of SETs, a growing body of evidence suggests that their use in personnel decisions is problematic. SETs are weakly related to other measures of teaching effectiveness and student learning (Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016; Uttl, White, and Gonzalez 2017); they are used in statistically problematic ways (e.g., categorical measures are treated as interval, response rates are ignored, small differences are given undue weight, and distributions are not reported) (Boysen 2015; Stark and Freishtat 2014); and they can be influenced by course characteristics like time of day, subject, class size, and whether the course is required, all of which are unrelated to teaching effectiveness.

In addition, in both observational studies and experiments, SETs have been found to be biased against women and people of color (for recent reviews of the literature, see Basow and Martin 2012 and Spooren, Brockx, and Mortelmans 2015). For example, students rate women instructors lower than they rate men, even when they exhibit the same teaching behaviors (Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016; MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt 2015), and students use stereotypically gendered language in how they evaluate their instructors (Mitchell and Martin 2018). The instrument design can also affect gender bias in evaluations; in an article in *American Sociological Review*, Rivera and Tilcsik (2019) find that the range of the rating scale

(e.g., a 6-point scale versus a 10-point scale) can affect how women are evaluated relative to men in male-dominated fields. Further, Black and Asian faculty members are evaluated less positively than White faculty (Bavishi, Madera, and Hebl 2010; Reid 2010; Smith and Hawkins 2011), especially by students who are White men. Faculty ethnicity and gender also mediate how students rate instructor characteristics like leniency and warmth (Anderson and Smith 2005).

A scholarly consensus has emerged that using SETs as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness in faculty review processes can systematically disadvantage faculty from marginalized groups. This can be especially consequential for contingent faculty for whom a small difference in average scores can mean the difference between contract renewal and dismissal.

Given these limitations, the American Sociological Association, in collaboration with the scholarly societies listed below, encourages institutions to use evidence-based best practices for collecting and using student feedback about teaching (Barre 2015; Dennin et al. 2017; Linse 2017; Stark and Freishtat 2014). These include:

1. Questions on SETs should focus on student experiences, and the instruments should be framed as an opportunity for student feedback, rather than an opportunity for formal ratings of teaching effectiveness. For example, two universities – Augsburg University and University of North Carolina Asheville – recently revised and renamed their instruments to the “University Course Survey” and the “Student Feedback on Instruction Form,” respectively, to emphasize that student feedback, while important, is not an evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

2. SETs should not be used as the only evidence of teaching effectiveness. Rather, when they are used, they should be part of a holistic assessment that includes peer observations, reviews of teaching materials, and instructor self-reflections. This holistic approach has been in wide use at teaching-focused institutions for many years and is becoming more common at research institutions as well. For example:

- University of Oregon has undertaken a multi-year process to develop a holistic framework for assessing teaching effectiveness, including peer review, self-reflection, and student feedback. Extensive research and resources are available on the Office of the Provost [website](#), including guidance on how to interpret SETs
- University of Southern California has instituted peer review of teaching for faculty evaluation. Their [Center for Excellence in Teaching](#) provides resources for how to use peer review effectively and addresses common concerns.
- University of California Irvine requires faculty to submit two types of evidence to document teaching effectiveness. In addition to SETs, faculty can submit a reflective teaching statement, peer evaluations of teaching, and other evidence like a [Teaching Practices Inventory](#), developed by physicist Carl Weiman.
- University of Nebraska Lincoln has articulated [best practices for faculty evaluation](#) that state, in part, “it is recommended that student evaluation scores should not be given undue weight in faculty evaluations, since these scores are easily manipulated and reflect many attitudes that extend beyond the successful accomplishment of the faculty member’s teaching duties.”
- The University of Michigan’s Center for Research on Teaching and Learning recommends that student ratings should

never be used in isolation and should be part of a broader assessment of teaching effectiveness. They have developed [resources](#) that include a summary of research findings on SETs, a handout for students on how to make their feedback most helpful to instructors, and best practices for using SETs in personnel decisions.

- Ryerson University has gone even further and is no longer using SETs for tenure or promotion decisions (Farr 2018). Instead, Ryerson asks faculty to compile a teaching dossier that includes a statement of teaching philosophy, evidence of curricular engagement, and self-reflections.
3. SETs should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other or to a department average. As part of a holistic assessment, they can appropriately be used to document patterns in an instructor’s feedback over time.
 4. If quantitative scores are reported, they should include distributions, sample sizes, and response rates for each question on the instrument (Stark and Freishtat 2014). This provides an interpretative context for the scores (e.g., items with low response rates should be given little weight).
 5. Evaluators (e.g., chairs, deans, hiring committees, tenure and promotion committees) should be trained in how to interpret and use SETs as part of a holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness (see Linse 2017 for specific guidance).

Gathering student feedback on their experiences in the classroom is an important part of student-centered teaching. This feedback can help instructors to refine their pedagogies and improve student learning in their courses. However, student feedback should not be used alone as a measure of teaching quality. If it is used in faculty evaluation processes, it should be considered as part of a holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Endorsements

American Anthropological Association
American Dialect Society
American Folklore Society
American Historical Association
American Political Science Association
Archeological Institute of America
Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
Canadian Sociological Association
Dance Studies Association
International Center of Medieval Art
Latin American Studies Association
Middle East Studies Association
National Communication Association
National Council on Public History
Rhetoric Society of America
Society for Cinema and Media Studies
Society for Classical Studies
Society for Personality and Social Psychology
Society of Architectural Historians
Sociologists for Women in Society

References

- Anderson, Kristin J., and Gabriel Smith. 2005. "Students' Preconceptions of Professors: Benefits and Barriers According to Ethnicity and Gender." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 27(2):184-20.
- Barre, Elizabeth. 2015. "Student Ratings of Instruction: A Literature Review." Reflections on Teaching and Learning: The CTE Blog. Rice University Center for Teaching Excellence. Retrieved from <https://cte.rice.edu/blogarchive/2015/02/01/studentratings>.
- Basow, Susan A., and Julie L. Martin. 2012. "Bias in Student Evaluations." Pp. 40-49 in *Effective Evaluation of Teaching: A Guide for Faculty and Administrators*, edited by Mary E. Kite. Washington, DC: Society for the Teaching of Psychology. Retrieved from <http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/evals2012/in dex.php>.
- Bavishi, Anish, Juan M. Madera, and Michelle R. Hebl. 2010. "The Effect of Professor Ethnicity and Gender on Student Evaluations: Judged Before Met." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 3(4):245-256.
- Boring, Anne, Kellie Ottoboni, and Philip B. Stark. 2016. "Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness." *ScienceOpen Research* (DOI: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AETBZC.v1).
- Boysen, Guy A. 2015. "Significant Interpretation of Small Mean Differences in Student Evaluations of Teaching Despite Explicit Warning to Avoid Overinterpretation." *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology* 1(2):150-162.
- Dennin, Michael, Zachary D. Schultz, Andrew Feig, Noah Finkelstein, Andrea Follmer Greenhoot, Michel Hildreth, Adama K. Leibovich, James D. Martin, Mark B. Moldwin, Diane K. O'Dowd, Lynmarie A. Posey, Tobin L. Smith, and Emily R. Miller. 2017. "Aligning Practice to Policies: Changing the Culture to Recognize and Reward Teaching at Research Institutions." *CBE—Life Sciences Education* 16(5):1-8.
- Farr, Moira. 2018. "Arbitration Decision on Student Evaluations of Teaching Applauded by Faculty." *University Affairs* August 28. Retrieved from <https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/new s-article/arbitration-decision-on-student-evaluations-of-teaching-applauded-by-faculty/>.
- Linse, Angela R. 2017. "Interpreting and Using Student Ratings Data: Guidance for Faculty Serving as Administrators and on Evaluation Committees." *Students in Educational Evaluation* 54:94-106.
- MacNell, Lillian, Adam Driscoll, and Andrea N. Hunt. 2015. "What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching." *Innovative Higher Education* 40(4):291-303.
- Mitchell, Kristina M. W., and Jonathan Martin. 2018. "Gender Bias in Student Evaluations." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 51(3):648-652.

- Reid, Landon D. 2010. "The Role of Perceived Race and Gender in the Evaluation of College Teaching on RateMyProfessors.com." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 3(3):137-152.
- Rivera, Lauren A., and András Tilcsik. 2019. "Scaling Down Inequality: Rating Scales, Gender Bias, and the Architecture of Evaluation." *American Sociological Review* 84(2):248-274.
- Smith, Bettye P., and Billy Hawkins. 2011. "Examining Student Evaluations of Black College Faculty: Does Race Matter?" *The Journal of Negro Education* 80(2):149-162.
- Spooren, Pieter, Bert Brockx, and Dimitri Mortelmans. 2013. "On the Validity of Student Evaluation of Teaching: The State of the Art." *Review of Educational Research* 83(4):598-642.
- Stark, Philip B., and Richard Freishtat. 2014. "An Evaluation of Course Evaluations." *ScienceOpen Research* (DOI: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AOFRQA.v1).
- Uttl, Bob, 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* 54(1):22-42.
- Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL). 2018. Local CIRTL Program Evaluation Resource Guide. Michigan State University. Retrieved from <https://www.cirtl.net/resources/708>.
- Kite, Mary E., ed. 2012. *Effective Evaluation of Teaching: A Guide for Faculty and Administrators*. Washington, DC: Society for the Teaching of Psychology. Retrieved from <http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/evals2012/index.php>.
- Stark, Philip B. 2018. "Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness." Presentation given as part of the Teaching Assessment Working Group Speaker Series, Valuing Teaching: Challenges and Strategies to Value Effective Teaching. Simon Fraser University. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5haOjlfjDb8&feature=youtu.be>.
- Van Valey, Thomas L., ed. 2011. *Peer Review of Teaching: Lessons from and for Departments of Sociology*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Vasey, Craig, and Linda Carroll. 2016. "How Do We Evaluate Teaching? Findings from a Survey of Faculty Members." *Academe*, May-June. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/article/how-do-we-evaluate-teaching>.

Additional Resources

- Association of American Universities. n.d. *Aligning Practice to Policies: Changing the Culture to Recognize and Reward Teaching at Research Universities*. Retrieved from <https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/STEM-Education-Initiative/Aligning-Practice-To-Policies-Digital.pdf>
- American Educational Research Association. 2013. *Rethinking Faculty Evaluation: AERA Report and Recommendations on Evaluating Education Research, Scholarship, and Teaching in Postsecondary Education*. Retrieved from [http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/Education Research and Research Policy/RethinkingFacultyEval_R4.pdf](http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/Education%20Research%20and%20Research%20Policy/RethinkingFacultyEval_R4.pdf).

New Faculty Networks

As a new faculty member at USI, you are valued and an important contributor to our mission and goals. You bring your expertise and experiences to the USI community, and along with the networks that you already have and the additional connections that you will develop, these can be valuable to your professional goals.

You are invited to share your perspectives on your networks and discipline. This information will help us get to know you better and identify potential opportunities.

Your information:

First Name

Last Name

Department or
Program

Part 1: The following questions ask about your networks *outside of USI* that you feel comfortable accessing.

To what areas of expertise do you have access outside of USI?

In which field(s) or sector(s) are the expertise do you have access outside of USI?

Where are the geographic location(s) of the expertise that you have access outside of USI?

This question asks about your initial USI networks. Did you know or interacted with [new faculty members](#) in your cohort *prior* to joining USI?

	Yes	No
Chuck Armstrong, Graphic Design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mina Asghari Heidarlou, Engineering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Laura Bernhardt, Rice Library	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rob Carroll, Teacher Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tae Rang Choi, Public Relations & Advertising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sara Christensen Blair, Art & Design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Heather Cook, Statistics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Susan Ely, Engineering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Julie Eyink, Psychology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Xue Han, Computer Science	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Xavia Harrington-Chate, Teacher Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kristin LaFollette, English	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quentin Maynard, Social Work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rosalie Moffett, English	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alexandra Natoli, French	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tereesha Patterson, Accounting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Matt Powless, Psychology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Katie Russell, Nursing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeremy Smith, Radiologic & Imaging Sciences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Laura Soderberg, English	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deb Sullivan, Nursing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jacob Sunderlin, English	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Michelle Wakefield, Nursing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Zack Ward, Health Administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shane White, Rice Library	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ilfa Zhulamanova, Teacher Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Part 2. The following questions ask about your perspectives about your discipline and USI.

What do you find most interesting about the discipline/area of study of your highest degree completed or being pursued?

What is an appealing feature about the discipline/profession/program in which you teaching as a new faculty member at USI?

What about the faculty position and/or USI appealed to you as you made your decision to join USI?