

## **SUMMARY OF UAS BUSINESS FOR OCTOBER 25, 2019 MEETING**

The Executive Committee of the Senate (ECS) met twice in October to discuss business of the University Academic Senate (UAS). These meetings were held on the following dates: October 4 and October 11. At these meetings, ECS either acted on behalf of UAS or supported motions with recommendation to UAS.

### **A. ACTING ON BEHALF OF UAS:**

ECS reviewed the following and acted on behalf of UAS ([per SG 1.01 Section 3.1](#)):

- A new charge dealing with Reassignment Time for University Committee Chairs was added to the Faculty Personnel Policy Committee (FPPC) charges for 2019-2020. According to the charge for Reassignment Time for University Committee Chairs, FPPC is charged with the following: (1) Develop criteria and a process for determining appropriate reassigned time for Chairs of University Committees; and (2) Recommend Faculty Handbook language.
- The final report from the Laker Impression of Faculty Teaching Management Committee (LIFT-MC) was accepted and the recommendations discussed. ECS agreed, in principle, on the main recommendation of LIFT-MC that workshops are needed to help deans, unit heads and faculty interpret and use LIFT results. ECS will still revisit the LIFT-MC final report and will work with LIFT-MC and the Pew FTLC in the development of the workshops.

### **B. PENDING UAS ACTION:**

ECS made specific motions on the following business items with a recommendation of support to UAS:

- HERI Faculty Survey: The ECS refers to UAS the recommendation of participation in the HERI Faculty Survey pursuant to SG 1.01.2.3.
- General Education Committee (GEC) Memo ([SHORE Log Number: 1099-2019](#)). The proposal for the GEC Faculty Handbook change was supported. In the proposal, the wording in SG 1.02.f.iv.e and SG 1.02.f.iv.e.3 were changed to reflect a move from three-year cycle to four-year cycle.
- “Cleanup of Research Policies” Memo: Faculty Handbook (FH) and Senior Leadership Team (SLT) Policies ([SHORE Log Number: 1130-2019](#)).
- Laker Impression of Faculty Teaching Management Committee (LIFT-MC) Memo: Proposal for Revision to SG 1.03.B.6.iv ([SHORE Log Number: 1131-2019](#)).
- FPPC Memo: Proposal on Definition of Teaching (Effective and Excellent). ([SHORE Log Number: 1024-2018](#)). You can get more information on the history of this charge to FPPC by checking out FPPC’s memo found in the SHORE System ([SHORE Log Number: 1024-2018](#)). In addition, here is some context on why *Faculty Governance* is working on the definition of teaching.

As you know, according to our Shared Governance Policies (SG 3.01) and the Board of Trustees Policies (BOT 4.2.9), effective teaching must be documented by the following:

1. Self-evaluation
2. Peer Evaluation
3. Student Evaluations

Student Evaluations are now standardized throughout the university through the use of the LIFT system and there is a University Governance Committee that manages the LIFT system, the LIFT-MC. Self-evaluations are somewhat standardized through the FAR in Digital Measures. However, there is a lot of discrepancy across the university on how Peer Evaluations are used and what it truly means. Some think

Peer Evaluations mean classroom visitations, others think it means looking at a candidate's teaching materials, while others think it means some combination of the two. The bottom line is that there is no consistency as far as the implementation of Peer Evaluations across the university. Indeed, if effective teaching is not documented through Self-evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Student Evaluations, then we are in violation of our policies as stated in SG 3.01 and BOT 4.2.9.

In order to make sure we are following our university policies related to the evaluation of effective teaching, the University Academic Senate (UAS), and the University Personnel Review Committee (UPRC) have been working on "fixing this problem" for the past two years. The Executive Committee of the Senate (ECS) charged the Faculty Personnel Policy Committee (FPPC) and the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center Advisory Committee (FTLCAC) in 2018-2019, to come up with recommendations for standardizing the peer review of teaching (similar to the standardized evaluation of online courses that is currently being recommended for universal implementation). Based on a Pilot Peer Observation Proposal that was developed by FTLCAC and shared with faculty in April 2019, the feedback from faculty survey was shared with the chairs of FPPC and FTLCAC. The FPPC has now proposed a definition of effective teaching and a differentiation of effective vs. excellent teaching, and is now seeking for approval from ECS/UAS. This approval will allow FPPC to continue working on an instrument (using the framework definition of effective and excellent teaching) that will be available for review by ECS/UAS this 2019-2020. Please, take some time and read through FPPC's proposal carefully and share your thoughts.

It is important that we come up with an instrument that will be reliable and can be consistently applied across the university, albeit, it is possible that it could be multiple variations of an instrument that is tailored to specific disciplines.