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Minutes of the Senate

November 22, 2013

Members Present:  Badia Ahad, Lisa Burkhardt, Emily Burton, Timothy Classen, Shawna Cooper-Gibson, Leanne Cribs, Alanah Fitch, Lisa Gillespie, Tyler Hough, Pamela Johnson, Claudio Katz, Thomas Kelly, Vicki Keough, Teri Kilbane, Joyce Knight, Ronald Martin, Niamh McGuigan, Bren Murphy, Alice Perlin, Darcy Peters, Christopher Peterson, Thomas Serena, Noah Sobe, Dian Squire, Anne Sutter, Mary Van Houten, Sarkis Morales-Vidal, David Yellen

*Ex-Officio* Members Present: John Pelissero

Members Absent: Cass Coughlin,

Guests: Dean, Chairs and members of the faculty. Staff council chair and members.

Senate meeting November 22 2013  
  
Meeting was called to order at 3:05  
  
Due to Technical issues, minutes for October will be sent prior to the February meeting.  
  
Discussion on Proposal for Faculty Evaluation drafted by Deans Andress (CAS), Heider (SOC) Getz (QSB), and Vice Provost Prasse. Fr. Garanzini had invited chairs of depts. to attend the University Senate meeting through Senate Chair Dr. Katz.

Dr. Katz Introduced senate members dean Keogh from Nursing and dean Yellen from the School of Law as additional attending deans. Visitors who are chairs and faculty council members were welcomed as well  
  
Provost Pelissero had requested a review with revisions and comments to be sent from chairs and faculty council

In August the document was sent to University Senate. Faculty and staff affairs reviewed and forwarded their comments to Dr Sobe, chair of that committee.

The chair introduced Dr. Sobe and thanked his committee for their work. He invited Dr. Sobe to lead the discussion on the topic. Before Dr. Sobe took the podium, the Chair asked everyone to be mindful of time and to allot no more than 20-25 minutes discussion to review each of the 4 points in question. The secretary, Ms. Knight, asked those speaking to announce themselves for the record.

**Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee Report and discussion:**

Dr. Sobe took the podium. He proposed that since that the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee Report had been sent out in advance we would immediately jump into a discussion. He further noted that the goal of today’s meeting was discuss and come up with some recommendations that could be passed as Senate resolutions.   
  
The FSAC report drew information from chairs and departments as well as school level input (totaling over 150 pages of commentary). The committee centered on the question, one, of what kinds of things does the current draft incentivize, and two, what do we as a university want to incentivize?

**I. Concern 1: Ensuring that faculty evaluation further Loyola's teaching mission.**

The following discussion ensued:

N. Sobe stated that a primary concern was to avoid an overreliance on student course evaluations, something which the faculty were strongly concerned about. IDEA itself recommends that the student course evaluations be weighted between 30-50% in the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching. IDEA suggests that teaching be evaluating using multiple, triangulated data points. The concern is that Loyola not create system where an excessive weight is placed on student course evaluations. And thus the FSAC was recommending the adoption of a resolution recommending that “University-level policy should direct each academic unit / department to develop systems and multiple mechanisms/measures so as to ensure that the weight given to student course evaluations in the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching not exceed 50%. [Recommendation A]”  
  
K. Getz stated that there was not enough concrete evidence to show that teaching was not taken as seriously at the university as it should be, and the data did not support this other than anecdotally.

C.Katz expressed a concern that IDEA was "taking over" teaching and it does not address the complexity of teaching at Loyola.  Hence the need for recommendation A  
  
D. Yellen asked if the draft policy prompted these concerns about course evaluations.

N. Sobe stated that the draft policy seems to put student teacher course evaluations “front and center” though a specific weighting is not indicated.

K. Getz said that the thought was to reduce the weight of student teacher evaluations in document, but she does not object to clarifying exactly what that weight should be.

C. Katz remarked that the Faculty assessment summary focuses on enrollment, and number of sections, but other vital assessment information is missing.  He added that only 30 words are allotted for the description of innovations. He further commented that the status quo varies across departments. He raised the issue that peer evaluation is not included and that there is not enough room in the document for narrative information.

K. Getz suggested that we might add more words for descriptions of innovations.

N. Sobe stated that this concern about the inclusion of qualitative data was something the Senate would shortly discuss in relation to Part 2 of the FSAC report.

D. Prasse said that FAS is software based platform, which the university has decided to use. He pointed out that it is the evaluation process we are concerned with rather than the platform. He reminded us that “our goal is to find ways to elevate teaching, not to denigrate it. So the question is, how do we raise the value of teaching?”

C. Katz- agreed with this but he maintained that the bullet points in the proposal show that teaching has dropped in value. 

K. Getz disagreed with this and stated that the bullet points in document don’t indicate a drop in the value of faculty teaching

D. Yellen agreed with the spirit of the recommendation that evaluations must include more than student teacher course evaluation, however he did not think that weighted teacher course evaluations can be enforced.

T. Kilbane stated that research intensive faculty are valued higher. She asked if there was a possibility for a two tier system. One would be faculty teaching the mainstream classes, and the other tier would be for those who do the research intensive classes. She recommended that there be historical vitae. FAS requires listing of grades e.g. how many A grades and so on. She questioned what the value is and how what is seen as too many high or low grades will be interpreted.

N. Sobe raised the concern that it is unclear in the draft policy how grade data and course enrollment numbers are to be used in evaluating faculty teaching.

A. Sutter stated that FAS and Faculty Workload proposal are separate for discussion, but in practice they will be integrated.

J. Pelissero stated that every faculty member has a portfolio in FAS. Data will be drawn from various sources. Locus information feeds the grade info. Vitae will be in FAS and can be updated by faculty. In short more there is more than one source of data

N. Sobe recommended that the Senate return to a concrete recommendation discussion of FSAC recommendation A.

V. Keough stated that the proposal only talks about the percentage in the teacher course evaluation and no other numbers in the rest of the report. 

N. Sobe stated that the number of not more than 50% of teaching evaluation come from student course evaluations comes directly from IDEA recommendations.

V. Keough maintained that the weight of the evaluation needs to show for all areas, e.g. teacher evaluations, peer evaluations or no weight should be shown. She further maintained that the concept is OK, but the numbering method is not.

T. Classen asked what else other than student teacher evals is used or weighted?

A. Fitch stated that faculty will understand document based on how faculty upload data and they will upload what is significant to them.

N. Sobe redirected the group back to the discussion at hand which concerned the FSAC Recommendation A

D. Yellen recommended that a useful clarification could be introduced via the insertion of “ordinarily” so that the recommendation read “ordinarily not exceed”.

**MOTION:**

N. Sobe then introduced a Motion on the Senate Floor, that

**“The Senate recommends that university-level policy should direct each academic unit / department to develop systems and multiple mechanisms/measures so as to ensure that the weight given to student course evaluations in the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching ordinarily not exceed 50%.”**

**The motion was seconded by T. Serena.**

**There being no further discussion, N. Sobe called for a vote and**

**the motion was approved by a vote of 24 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.**

**II. Concern 2. Ensuring the significance of qualitative factors and peer input  
(Recommendation B and C)**

The following discussion ensued:

N. Sobe expressed the concern that the proposed policies place too much emphasis on quantification and don’t afford a place for peer input. He presented the following recommendations from the FSAC to the senate: “The FAS System should be revamped so that in each section (service, research and teaching) the first item that faculty members furnish is a substantive narrative report of annual activity [Recommendation B].” and “University-level policy should direct each academic unit / department to establish procedures for peer input in the annual evaluation of faculty members’ teaching and research – inclusive of peer observations of teaching as appropriate [Recommendation C].”

K. Getz noted that FAS is designed to capture qualitative data.

C. Katz-Recommended that the 30 word limit be dropped and more room given to more comment.

D. Yellen added that recommendation B is fine and agreed that the word limit should be removed. However, he felt that recommendation C is not fine. Peer review is fine for those up for tenure, but should not be a rule as part of annual evaluation.

N. Sobe redirected the group to look at recommendation B first.

J. Pelissero added that the platform will be need to be changed to reflect changes.

L. Burkhart noted that we need to show the course evaluations response rate as well.

**MOTION:**

N. Sobe then introduced a Motion on the Senate Floor, that

**“The University Senate recommends that the FAS System should be revamped so that in each section (service, research and teaching) the first item that faculty members furnish is a substantive narrative report of annual activity.”**

**The motion was seconded by J. Knight.**

Discussion on the motion:

B. Ahad- noted that she agreed that we remove word limit. She asked if the removal is to increase qualitative data and strike a better balance between quantitative and qualitative data.

D. Heider added that the spirit of the committee of dean’s draft is that more information is better.

B. Ahad asked how this information will be provided, and how the information will be weighted or evaluated.

D. Heider said he would want faculty to give more information in order to be able to have a constructive discussion with faculty. He stated that more information than a sentence or two would be needed. For example, the statement “served on a committee” What does that mean? How much time is invested, how many meetings, and how much work? Having more information is better.

N. Sobe called the Senate’s attention back to be motion at hand. Even without additional nuances, he felt that the spirit of recommendation is sufficient to address most of these concerns.

N. Sobe called for a vote and

**the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**

Recommendation C discussion:

A. Fitch stated that the peer review component of tenure and promotion review takes time, but one could recommend that each department have some time so that the peer input in evaluation continues to occur after tenure. She recommended that this not be done annually.

C. Katz recommend that the word annually be stricken. He added that if teaching is important, then time needs to be taken to improve it as needed. Procedures can be established within the departments.

K. Getz added that peer evaluations help those who are struggling or who are new. She did not see the value of this for master teachers.

S. Ross added that the language of the document is broad enough to allow for peer evaluations that may not have to be annual.

A. Grauer stated that peer evaluations in Anthropology are used for for pedagogy and conversation, but are not evaluative. Peer evaluations are a kind of mentorship.

D. Yellen agreed that peer evaluation is useful, but doesn't feel it belongs in a place that can ultimately affect salaries.

A. Fitch stated that master teachers and all  need peer evaluation if the evaluation procedure is to help us to become a culture that values teaching. She added that really good teachers are still in the process of learning .

C. Katz added that evaluation is not always punitive, but should be developmental.

A. Grauer asked if peer evaluation participatory across the departments.

A. Sutter stated that the value of evaluations is the process itself, not the resulting report

C. Peterson added his assent to A. Sutter’s statement.

R. Andress stated that the approval of recommendation B requires the approval of recommendation C. It seemed to him that they needed to be approved together.

R. Williams stated that peer reviews can be done every 3 years, rather than annually.

N. Sobe suggested that the word annually be removed from Recommendation C.

A. Sutter stated that peer evaluation, while relevant, should not be a part of the evaluation.

K. Getz stated that the document shows other ways of using peer evaluation.

V. Keogh said that her biggest concern is that peer evaluation is mandated. Peer evaluation should be an opportunity or tool without time impositions

T. Classen stated that this should not be a big concern as larger state schools require peer evaluation and such is not odd.

**MOTION:**

N. Sobe introduced a Motion on the Senate Floor that

**“The University Senate recommends that University-level policy should direct each academic unit / department to establish procedures for peer input in the evaluation of faculty members’ teaching and research – inclusive of peer observations of teaching as appropriate”**

**A. Sutter seconded the motion.**

Discussion on the motion:

D. Yellen maintained that we need to keep annual.

A. Sutter stated that notation that peer evaluations "happen" is enough

E. Burton stated that professors have different ways of teaching. She asked if peer evaluation could affect pedagogical diversity

L.Burkhart agreed this is a concern.

N. Sobe called for a vote and

The motion passed by a vote of 15 in favor, 7 opposed and 3 abstentions.

**III. Concern 3. Ensuring a Sustained Emphasis on Faculty Growth and Development. (Recommendation D + E)**

**MOTION:**

N. Sobe introduced a Motion on the Senate Floor that

**“That the University Senate recommend that the annual performance evaluation scale should be changed to be a five-point scale running from 5 to 1. Three should be set as the normative midpoint, not as “satisfactory” but as “meets expectations” with additional specification to be provided by each academic unit / department.”**

**C. Katz seconded the motion**

Discussion on the Motion:

K. Getz-agrees that this recommendation is a good idea.

There being no further discussion, N. Sobe called for a vote and

**the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**

Recommendation E discussion:

N. Sobe introduced the FSAC recommendation that “University-level policy should mandate substantial space be accorded for the evaluation of work-in-progress.”

D. Heider agreed that more space was needed to address this category.

N. Sobe stated that the concern is that we don't want to incentivize narrow research but want to be able to talk about a range of research.

R.Andress recommended adding to "narrative space"

C.Katz stated that this issue is that books, journals, articles may not be equal. Capturing a year at a time, it is hard to see the progression of faculty work. So the "space" isn't space in document but is to show time.

D. Heider agreed and said there is no perfect system

D. Prasse added that space is not issue, but how we review on-going work. For example the period of time required to work on a book. He agreed with C. Katz. How to quantify this is hard to do, but the intent is not to diminish the importance of this

N. Sobe said there is a concern that not capturing work in progress might incentivize faculty only to undertake quick-to-publish work

A. Sutter added that the Department of Psychology looks at the last 3 year for on-going scholarship.

J. Larson stated that3 year window only picks up quantifying work, such as did you submit the work, did a chapter get done. For this, a narrative is more helpful. It is important to see both year to year changes (or goals) and to see if these goals were accomplished.

K.Getz agreed adding that it is important to see that progress is being made.

R. Williams states that often outcome rewarded but not effort. He added that effort is important to show work in progress.

R. Bucholz cautioned against having a faculty member’s one golden moment shines, without looking at the various milestones along the way

C. Katz asked if recommendation E is good enough?

R. Bucholz added that the spirit is captured.

D. Yellen added that finished work will incur more credit and the concern is valuing both. He added that he is cautious of works in progress that don't get done.

B. Ahad interjected that works in progress, may be accepted for publication but may be held up in that process by publishers. Asked if more narrative space makes a difference

A. Sutter asked the question that if a faculty member has 10 publications in one year and 0 in the next would he or she be considered as still working hard.

R. Williams agreed adding that taking account of vagaries in publishing etc. is important.

K. Getz stated a concern that proposal does not deal with the research intensive category.

J. Knight-Asked if the working should indicate time rather than space.

L. Cribbs said that space is also consideration

A. Sutter suggested reworking the "Consideration for substantial" wording.

T. Kilbane stressed that time is needed

N. Sobe stated this discussion was about a proposed annual review policy and that we needed to have ways of looking at what occurred in a given annual period.

A. Sutter asked if raises depend on publication during the year of review. Suggest the wording "a larger window" after “space”

T. Classen reminded everyone that this is still an annual review

N. Sobe introduced a Motion on the Senate Floor that “University-level policy should mandate substantial space be accorded for the evaluation of work-in-progress.”

C. Katz seconded the motion.

Discussion on the motion:

A.Sutter suggested adding on going work "and that the weight accorded to completed output be an average calculated over 3-5 years"

D. Yellen stated that spirit of this is ok, but cannot be mandated.

A.Sutter- withdrew her proposed amendment to take this up as a separate question.

There being no further discussion, N. Sobe called for a vote and

**the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**

MOTION:

Anne Sutter introduced a Motion on Senate Floor that

**“The University Senate recommends that although faculty receive an annual evaluation of intellectual contribution it may be appropriate that the weight accorded to completed output be an average calculated over 3-5 years.”**

**C. Katz seconded the motion.**

Discussion on the motion:

N. Sobe suggested that this idea needed additional research and additional working-out and introduced a procedural motion to Table the motion under consideration.

**By majority voice vote the Senate agreed to place the motion on the Table for consideration at a future Senate meeting.**

Recommendation F:

MOTION:

N. Sobe introduced a Motion on the Senate Floor that

**“The University Senate recommends that university-level policy should specify that the evaluating party shall meet with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation.”**

**C. Katz seconded the motion.**

K. Getz suggested that faculty need to be proactive in meeting with chairs and directors and request on going meeting with chairs and director, rather than having one required meeting.

D. Yellen recommended changing the wording to “shall offer to meet"

N. Sobe, as the author of the motion on the floor, accepted the amendment as a friendly amendment so that the motion read

**“The University Senate recommends that university-level policy should specify that the evaluating party shall offer to meet with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation.**

Discussion on motion:

A. Fitch stated that faculty should meet to discuss an evaluation.

K. Getz and D. Prasse stated that sometimes faculty elect not to meet to go over his/her evaluation.  However, a meeting eventually ought to take place.

There being no further discussion N. Sobe called for a vote and the Motion passed by a vote of 22 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions.

**IV. Concern Four: Esuring Compliance With Existing Handbook Around Termination**

**(Recommendation G)**

N. Sobe introduced the FSAC recommendation that “The University shall require each academic unit / department to develop any remediation protocols in strict conformity to the protocols established in the Faculty Handbook and outside the procedures specified in the annual evaluation policies and procedures presently under examination.”

Discussion on the recommendation:

K. Getz stated that formal or non-formal improvement plans may happen. However, if faculty member consistently has a poor performance an improvement plan is needed.

C. Katz stated that this is a bit vague and not as concrete as the Faculty Handbook.

K. Getz asked if faculty have poor performances, is that dereliction of duty?  
She asked if the committee’s concern would be addressed if the last sentence on page 5 bullet 3 under tenure track faculty be deleted.

C. Katz added that the last 2 sentences should be deleted.

R. Andress stated that he felt that C. Katz's concerns contradicted the draft policy document.

N. Sobe said that he felt that terminations if necessary ought to take place outside of an annual review process.

P. Caughie said that the Handbook is specific, but the proposed document is too broad and could lead to terminations outside of the Handbook guidelines.

N. Sobe noted that deleting the last 2 sentences would address the FSAC concerns and asked the taskforce committee of deans who drafted the document if they would agree to this change.

K. Getz noted that the dean’s taskforce committee would agree with this change and stated that she still saw that it was important that there should be consequences for poor performance.

C. Katz stated that raises can be affected and this is a consequence of poor performance.  He added that terminations should be done thru faculty guidelines not thru the evaluation process

D. Yellen added his assent.

A. Fitch added her assent agrees and added that her departmental peers agree.

MOTION:

N. Sobe introduced a Motion on the Senate Floor that

**“The University Senate recommends deleting the last two sentences in the third bullet point on page five of the proposed policy**.

**A. Sutter seconded the motion.**

**There being no further discussion N. Sobe called for a vote and the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.**

At the conclusion of the meeting Provost Pelissero noted that he would put together a small committee to clean up the document. Requests for input from the schools and colleges faculty will be sent out by December 18. Another committee of administrators and faculty will be convened to finalize the evaluation tool.

C. Katz introduced a motion to adjourn the meeting.

S. Cooper-Gibson seconded.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce D. Knight

Secretary

University Senate