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Faculty morale issues

- Evidence:
  - two surveys conducted last year
  - anecdotal / informal communication

- “Great Colleges to Work For” survey

- Current areas of concern
  1. Online teaching evaluations
  2. Communication about T&P procedures
  3. Evaluation of chairs and deans
1. Online teaching evaluations

- Much reduced response rate
  - old paper-based system: ~70% responded
  - new online system: ~35% respond

- No recovery in response rate
  - had expected recovery within 3-4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semester</th>
<th>response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data: Institutional Research
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1. Online teaching evaluations

• Concerns
  ◦ questionable validity for T&P and other reviews
  ◦ even with some recovery, unlikely to return to original levels
  ◦ faculty-based incentives:
    • philosophical opposition
    • generate bias
    • undue pressure on untenured faculty
Online teaching evaluations – Recommendations 1 & 2

1) Simplify student participation
   ◦ single click from emails *
   ◦ extend opportunity through end of finals *

2) Opt-out system
   ◦ require students to either complete or actively opt-out of each evaluation *
   ◦ discontinue faculty-based incentives

* recommended by Faculty Educational Technology Committee, 2009
Online teaching evaluations – Recommendation 3

3) Report measures of data validity
   ◦ standard deviation & standard error
     • include error bars on graphs
   ◦ make available for past semesters
Why an opt-out system?

- virtual equivalent of old system
  - students presented with the evaluation but can choose not to complete it (i.e., turn it in blank)
- many schools require completion before students can access grades
- reduce need for faculty-based incentives
2. Communication about T&P procedures

- Substantial changes to T&P guidelines since 2009

- Faculty concerns (from 2011 survey)
  - 70% agreed: “the requirements for a successful tenure and promotion review are constantly shifting”
  - nearly 50% disagreed: “I have a clear understanding of the criteria one must meet to have a successful tenure and promotion review”

- Changes made in 2011-12
  - took effect this year but not finalized until after packets were due
Communication about T&P procedures – Recommendations

1) Single annual period for FAM revisions
   ◦ e.g., one month, ideally over summer

2) Stable T&P requirements for each faculty member
   ◦ e.g., evaluate each tenure candidate based on standards and process in FAM at time of their hire
3. Evaluation of chairs and deans

- Faculty satisfaction with dean varies widely by School

- FAM stipulates faculty input into evaluation of chairs (annually) and deans ("periodically")
  - has not been consistently applied across Schools

- Faculty dissatisfaction with communication with upper administration
  - especially in Schools dissatisfied with dean
Evaluation of chairs and deans – Recommendations

1) Annual, anonymous evaluations of chairs and deans by their faculty
   ◦ two-levels-up reporting for accountability
     • chair evaluations to provost as well as dean
     • dean evaluations to president as well as provost
   ◦ FWC requests input into procedures and questions

2) Mechanism to ensure responsiveness
   ◦ Academic Affairs develop a mechanism to dialogue directly with faculty in cases of dissatisfaction
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Current status and future steps

- Detailed report and recommendations
  - to Provost and President’s Office, December 2012
  - Faculty Senate archives

- Discussion?