

UHD Faculty Senate

Minutes recorded by: Michael Cavanaugh
April 2, 2019 2:32-3:58 pm
UHD A-300

Senate: Hsiao-Ming Wang, Michael Duncan, Michael Cavanaugh, Beverly Alford, Maria Benavides, Ray Cao, Kristen Capuozzo, Stephanie Coleman, David Epstein, Shannon Fowler, Angela Goins, Felicia Harris, Pamela Hurley, Karen Kaser, Cynthia Lloyd, Steve London, Laura Mitchell, Mitsue Nakamura, Rachna Sadana, Joseph Sample, Johanna Schmertz, Jace Valcore, Pat Williams, Zehai Zhou

Absent: Susan Baker, Susan Henney, Stephen Miller, Andrew Pavelich, Rebecca Quander, Vida Robertson, Nell Sullivan, Ting Zhang.

Guests: Eric Link, Provost/VPAA; David Bradley, VPAF; Sandra Dahlberg, Faculty Ombuds; Lucy Bowen, Director SI; Darlene Hodge, FS Admin; Pat Ensor, Library Director; Chris Rodney, Executive Director Academic Administration and Operations; ; Amanda McClendon, Electronic Resources Librarian; Lisa Braysen, Assistant Director Library Planning and Assessment; Ed Cueva, Professor; Michael Benford, Chief of UHDPD; Daniel Villanueva, AVP/Registrar; Justin Burton, Adjunct Professor; Claude Rubinson, Associate Professor.

Call to order: The Senate was called to order at 2:32 pm by Senate President Hsiao-Ming Wang.

Minutes

Minutes of the March 19th, 2019 meeting were approved unanimously.

Reports

Mr. David Bradley gave a presentation on the update for the TXDOT Highway project (see attached presentation).

Q – How serious is the community pushback?

A – Mr. Bradley indicated that the pushback is just starting to happen now, and is just coming from small communities and neighborhoods. The momentum is behind the project and it is very likely to move forward.

Q – We are going to be losing land (about 10.5 acres) to TXDOT, but are we getting back something?

A – Mr. Bradley explained that this had been discussed a bit already among leaders at the university. There are no guarantees, but it is likely that we will be able to purchase land back from TXDOT.

Q – When the old I-10 is decommissioned it will come down?

A – Mr. Bradley said that would occur and it could cause some more problems short term for us when it happens, although the long-term prognosis is positive.

Mr. Daniel Villanueva came to Senate to give an update on the splitting of the commencement ceremony. He provided a handout (see attached) which was based on a recommendation from the Commencement Taskforce to split the ceremony and spring 2019 would be the first time this occurs.

One comment from the Senate was that everyone was excited to see the ceremony reduced.

Chief of UHD Police Michael Benford came to Senate to give an update on the UHDPD Segway program currently in use. He thanked Faculty Senate for the invitation and explained that UHDPD is full service 24/7 police department, which provides safety and security to the whole university community. The department is always looking for innovative ways to help in this mission and the Segway program is one of these ways. Segway programs are quite common around the nation and in Houston, as Metro, Lonestar, Spring ISD are just a few of the departments in the area utilizing this type of program.

Chief Benford explained that UHD is a great location for a Segway program because of its small geographic footprint and it allows officers to respond much quicker than being in a car. The Segway also allows officers to engage in community policing by interacting more with students. The officers are more visible and more approachable on a Segway when compared to a vehicle. Currently there are 2 Segways in operation with the possibility of adding more after an evaluation of its current effectiveness.

Q – Have you heard about the concerns about the police Segway use? I have heard concerns about the police being more threatening and militaristic, less accessible. Students may not see it as a positive.

A – Chief Benford said it is not seen as a tool of intimidation. It does give police officers an advantage of seeing over crowds (especially in hallways) as they stand about a foot over everyone while on the Segway. Typically, the officers are standing on the Segways against the walls in the hallways during major traffic times. He has heard rumors of officers speeding on Segways through the halls and if that is happening he will address that.

Q – What about the use of bicycles?

A – Chief Benford explained that UHDPD does use bicycles too and it is one of the many tools in use by UHDPD.

Provost Link came to the Senate to give two reports on IDEA and Bureaucracy.

For IDEA, Provost Link gave the Senate a handout (see attached) as a follow up to last meeting's report. Ms. Lucy Bowen was able to put together a full year's data for the handout.

For the Bureaucracy issue, Provost Link indicated that he has received feedback (see attached handout), but has yet to analyze it. However, that process should start soon.

Senate Updates

Dr. Duncan gave an update on the faculty elections. He explained that the elections were over and they would soon be certified. Overall, the elections ran smoothly with the process implemented last year. There were a couple of small issues but they were quickly fixed. There will be a couple of run-offs soon.

For the faculty awards ceremony, it will be held April 16th in the TDECU Tour Room in the Welcome Center (see attachment). Dr. Duncan (the President-Elect for the Faculty Senate) will serve as master of

ceremonies for the event. The Faculty Award winners will receive the new medallions and the winners will be notified and invited prior to the ceremony as there has been some confusion on that issue in the past.

Dr. Wang also mentioned the issue of Faculty Expert Sources. He explained that during a full professors meeting, President Munoz brought this topic up. University Advancement currently has a list of faculty sources, although it is not comprehensive (it is voluntary). Please contact Mike Emery (emeryp@uhd.edu) if you would like to have your name and expertise included on the list.

Old Business

The first topic was the evaluation of full time faculty teaching and IDEA.

Dr. Claude Rubinson gave a presentation on his research into student evaluations (see attached presentation).

Q - Any expectations for further research?

A - Dr. Rubinson said that he was not planning to conduct future research on this topic but did not rule it out.

Q - Anything really shocking?

A - Some students thought that course evaluations were read by other students. Dr. Rubinson also really liked when the students said that they wanted to feel like they learned something.

Q - Do your findings confirm other studies?

A - Dr. Rubinson explained that he is not an expert in student evaluations and what he studied was different than what the majority of other studies looked at. The bulk of research on this topic examines racial and gender bias while the current UHD student did not.

Dr. Wang explained that now we have quantitative data from the Provost's office and Qualitative data from Dr. Rubinson's report. How can we improve response rate and utilize IDEA? Now that we have data, what should we do?

Discussion ensued.

Go back to paper and pencil surveys.

Can't do that with one-third of our classes online.

Is the Marilyn Davies College of Business doing something different?

Some of us use class capture. We use class time, and have students fill out the survey while sitting in class.

I send out emails once a week asking for feedback, explaining to the students that it is extremely important. I tend to get about a 70% response rate for FTF and 50-60% response rate for online. I really try to get involved with my students.

I've also tried class capture and it has worked. Maybe we can include a time/day in the syllabus for this. Maybe there is something different between students? I do similar things and don't get good rates.

Maybe it is related to Masters versus Undergraduate - better rates for better students. Are there different rates between the levels?

Is the timing some that we can change? I do midterm evaluations for extra credit and get 100% participation. I get very rich data on those. Perhaps we can discuss more about holistic faculty review and things like peer teaching reviews.

At my previous institution, the university would release grades earlier for students who filled out student evaluations. They had much higher rates.

Dr. Wang explained that he had a personal viewpoint in that FSEC could help to develop a standardized statement.

Before moving forward, maybe we should take a step back. Why are we discussing ways to increase response rates? Yes, everyone could utilize all of these strategies, however, we also need to discuss the other side of the issue -we need more than just student evaluations to measure teaching performance.

Even with 100%, we still need multiple measures of teaching effectiveness.

Maybe have the department look at the issue and determine what weight to give to student evaluations.

We should probably separate the two issues - student response rate and multiple measures - and take a position.

Other universities have gotten rid of the evaluations because of the problems associated with them. We seem to be beating a dead horse.

Dr. Benavides makes a motion to "separate the issue of student response rate in IDEA course evaluations from teacher evaluations in Senate discussions." Dr. Fowler seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously.

The second issue in Old Business that Senate discussed was the Qualtrics qualitative data on bureaucracy.

Q - Why were only 32 faculty surveyed and only 10 respondents?

A - Dr. Wang explained that only senators were surveyed with the expectation of reaching out to their faculty about the issues. The survey was intended to give context to the Provost's office on these issues and the experiences of the faculty and senators who answered were helpful.

According to Dr. Wang, there were 3 themes that emerged in a quick reading of the results.

1) Structure of the organization - There are too many layers of the organization. A flat organization is suggested.

2) One stop source - Faculty have been told to go to too many different places. Just have a one stop shop.

3) Procedure - There seems to be a Catch 22 with a number of things around the university. Take for example study abroad. The work for study abroad needs to be done before the cost is calculated, but if it is too much then students will not go and the work will have been wasted.

Another example is internal grants. The process has to go through 4-5 steps whereas it can go directly to the source cutting out the steps. We should change the policies.

Dr. Wang closed discussion on the bureaucracy issue as time was running low and he had a question for the faculty. He explained that the 3rd Tuesday in April is the Faculty Awards ceremony and the 1st Tuesday in May is during finals (May 7th). Because we have 5 Tuesdays in April, he suggested that we have an Out of Cycle Faculty Senate Meeting on April 30th instead of the usual meeting on the 1st Tuesday in May.

Dr. Epstein made a motion to meet Out of Cycle April 30th instead of May 7th and Dr. Goins seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Benavides made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Dr. London seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 3:58 pm.



Commencement & Orientation Schedule

Spring 2019

- CEREMONY -		
Saturday, May 18 th 2019		
CEREMONY 1 - Minute Maid Park – MDCOB/CPS (695 students)		
Time	Action	Constituent
7:30 am	Minute Maid Park doors open for set-up	Registrar's Office and Event Staff arrive
8:30 am	Check-In	Students arrive and begin to check-in for commencement
8:30 am	VIP Reception/Photos	Stage platform and invited guests arrive
10:00 am	Commencement ceremony 1 begins	All graduates within the College of Business and College of Public Service. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes undergraduates and graduate students Graduate students will be honored first and hooded on stage
12:00 pm	Commencement ceremony 1 ends	
BREAK		
12:30 pm 2:00 pm	Lunch at Jackson Street B-B-Q (tentative)	VIP Guests, Registrar's Office, Events Staff, & Volunteers depart for lunch
CEREMONY 2 – Minute Maid Park – CHSS/CST/UC (728 students)		
2:30 pm	Check-In	Students arrive and begin to check-in for commencement
2:30 pm	VIP Reception/Photos	Stage platform and invited guests arrive
4:00 pm	Commencement ceremony 2 begins	All graduates within the College of Humanities & Social Science, College of Science & Technology, and University College. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes undergraduates and graduate students Graduate students will be honored first and hooded on stage (CHSS and CST only – no UC graduate students)
6:00 pm	Commencement ceremony 2 ends	
7:00 pm 8:30 pm	Tear down and load up	Registrar's Office, Event Staff, and volunteers tear down and clean up

**Tentative | Subject to change | 3/18/2019 | Projected numbers exclude certificate students*



Commencement & Orientation Schedule

Spring 2019

- ORIENTATION -		
Saturday, May 4th 2019		
Orientation Session 1 - UHD - MDCOB/CPS		
Time	Action	Constituent
9:00 am	Check-In	Students arrive
9:30 am	Orientation Presentation	Dean's welcome, Registrar presents
10:30 am	Cap & Gown Distribution/Activities	Bookstore distributes cap & gowns, cap decorating, photo booth, video "shot outs"
11:30 am	Commencement Orientation 1 ends	
BREAK		
11:30 am 12:15 pm	Lunch for staff	Registrar's Office, Events Staff, & Volunteers depart for lunch
Orientation Session 2 - UHD - CHSS/CST/UC		
12:30 pm	Check-In	Students arrive
1:00 pm	Orientation Presentation	Dean's welcome, Registrar presents
2:00 pm	Cap & Gown Distribution/Activities	Bookstore distributes cap & gowns, cap decorating, photo booth, video "shot outs"
3:00 pm	Commencement Orientation 1 ends	

Notes:

- Link for Registration:
- Finals will be occurring on Saturday, May 4th
- Students will be directed to participate in assigned timeslots but are welcomed to attend either session due to conflicts
- Communication to students
- Sessions will be recorded and will be distributed after orientation, students will not receive prior communication about the recording option until orientation is completed in person
-

Project Schedule

Milestone	Anticipated Date
Issue Request for Qualifications (RFQ)	December 2018
Issue draft RFP to short-listed proposers	June 2019
Issue final RFP to short-listed proposers	September 2019
Proposer submission of proposals in response to final RFP	March 2020

- Running at least six months behind this schedule.
- Encountering a new wave of community pushback.
- Will be time-consuming to evaluate proposals, make selection, and get contracts in place.
- Maybe on-site mid-2021, or into 2022.

UHD Future Campus No TXDoT Project



UHD Future Campus With TXDoT Project



UHD Parking Map



Parking

Current Conditions – Parking Inventory - Stable

- Student
- Faculty/Staff
- METRO – Subsidized (Growing)

Near-Term Changes – Parking Inventory

- Student - Improving
 - S&T Building impact – Daly, Dunham, construction trailers

Longer-Term Changes

- TXDoT project
 - Secure rights to under-freeway parking
- Wellness & Success Center (eliminates Bayou Lot)
- Garage(s) – Question of where
- Overall Program (under consideration)
 - Perhaps shift to more *Pay-As-You-Go*

On-site Enrollment Downtown Campus Fall 2014 - Fall 2018

Semester	Unduplicated Headcount	SCHs
Fall 2014	11,815	103,437
Fall 2015	11,314	96,256
Fall 2016	11,208	93,768
Fall 2017	10,879	90,774
Fall 2018	10,787	88,785

Questions



Efficacy of Student Course Evaluations: A Qualitative Study of (and by) UHD Students

*Presentation to UHD Faculty Senate
April 2, 2019*

Claude Rubinson
Associate Professor of Sociology, UHD

Research Team

Alejandra Garza, Lauren Bissless, Thomas Canny,
Reese Finley, Louis Gonzales, Radelle Lofton,
Jennifer Mendoza, Lorena Montoya, Emmy Musoni,
Martha Valdez, and Jesse White

Research Design

- Semi-structured interviews conducted with 71 UHD undergraduates during Spring 2016 by students enrolled in Rubinson's Social Research Methods (SOS3204).
- Non-representative convenience sample of (a) currently enrolled UHD undergraduates who had (b) taken at least 2 courses at UHD during Fall 2016
- Interviews consisted of approximately 5 questions that addressed two research questions:
 - 1)What characteristics do UHD students, themselves, think make for a good or bad course?
 - 2)What distinguishes those UHD students who consistently complete course evaluations from those who do not?
- Major limitations of study
 - Non-representative results cannot be generalized to UHD student population (therefore: percentages are not reported)
 - Sample ended up skewed toward social science majors

“Good” vs “Bad” Courses

Good courses

- “Engaging” instructor (most important; often identified by students as necessary for their success)
- Well-organized course structure with clear and achievable expectations
- Accessible material, manageable reading load, and/or relatively few assignments and exams
- Enjoyable/appealing content
- Student accomplishment and learning

Bad courses

- “Boring” instructor (most important; contrast aloof/unclear and strict instructors)
- Disorganized course structure
- Challenging/boring material (math and science frequently mentioned), high expectations, many assignments
- Note: lack of learning *not* identified as characteristic of bad courses

Reasons for Completing Course Evaluations (or not completing them)

- To express oneself
 - “that’s our voice”; “we pay for this, so why shouldn’t our voice be heard?”
- To help others (university administration; the instructor; other students)
 - evidence that students don’t understand how course evaluations are used
- When they remember to
- When required to/for extra credit (— ?!?)
- To reward excellent instructors and punish bad ones
 - “unless a professor is extremely good or bad...they don’t need the feedback”
 - “if the class was really terrible. I wouldn’t say revenge towards the teacher, but I feel the school should know.”
 - “Because I liked the professor.”

Welcome

Senate President Elect – Dr. Michael Duncan

Remarks from UHD President

Dr. Juan Sánchez Muñoz

Senate Report

Faculty Senate President – Dr. Hsiao-Ming Wang

Faculty Awards

Dr. Elizabeth Hatfield, Chair

Faculty Awards Committee

Faculty Development Leave Awards

Dr. Stacie Craft DeFreitas, Chair

Funded Faculty Leave Awards Committee

Distinguished Faculty Award

Dr. Ohaness Paskelian, Chair

Distinguished Faculty Awards Committee

Recognition of Faculty Years of Service

Provost & SVP Academic and Student Affairs

Dr. Eric Carl Link

RESULTS: SURVEY ON BUREAUCRACY ISSUES

Ten participants responded to the survey on bureaucracy issues. Questions and answers are listed below. Every participant did not answer all questions. Responses are listed by survey number.

Survey #	Participant Responses
General Concerns	
a. Too many layers (or parties) of approval are required	
<i>Survey 1.</i>	To propose a new course, or even to change the name of an existing course, requires approval from the following: Department CC, Department chair, dean, UCC, Provost. This means that the process regularly takes more than one semester. To apply for an ORCA grant requires review by four committees. To change a policy requires at least four steps, and usually more. Not all of these steps matter.
<i>Survey 2.</i>	There are several things like travel and reimbursement that can be handled well by departments and colleges but then run into problems when sent to One Main. Why can't colleges be responsible for these kinds of things? Why can't Deans be trusted with their budgets and allowed to handle faculty-related expenses? UHD needs to flatten out its system and catch-up to the 21st century forms of effective and efficient bureaucracy.
<i>Survey 4.</i>	The Dean's approval is needed for too many routine, noncontroversial matters, which encourages micromanagement.
<i>Survey 5.</i>	Often, the dean does not need to be involved in departmental decisions, like curriculum. Additionally, there are unnecessary layers that have no firm deadlines. The chair can have it for a week, the dean for two weeks and the travel office for 3. Firm deadline could help
<i>Survey 6.</i>	Sure. I think my DBA would appreciate it if things like travel, stipend payments, etc. could be less burdensome.
Automated Approval Process Needs Improvement	
<i>Survey 5.</i>	Some things should be automatically approved at certain levels, especially when they have no idea what it means and they are just signing paperwork. Also, firm deadlines with automatic approvals after the deadline passes would make sure that people do their jobs.
<i>Survey 6.</i>	I am not sure what this means.
<i>Survey 8.</i>	From my constituents: We need often need things signed off by our chairs (and often deans) when there's no need for this. I'm particularly thinking about things like internal grants, but there's a host of things that could go straight to the relevant committee or department without having to first go through your chair.
<i>Survey 9.</i>	Need layers of approval for simple repeating questions.
<i>Survey 10.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With four-six different signatures required for contracts, some more than once, hold-ups and delays are inevitable. 2. When a change is required, such as date for an event, or a minor issue is found, the initiator can be asked to start the process over and hence move through the queue a second time. 3. When dealing with external contracts, one is asked to complete the contract through process before OGC will offer advice on stumbling blocks inherent from the beginning. This creates loads of work for initiator and external party with whom the contract is sought (and UHD staff and administrators) to iron out all details before it is known if inherent insurmountable issues are apparent. Inevitably this creates tension between the UHD and the external party and within UHD administration/faculty/staff as make or break decisions move close toward the event date. 4. When changes are made, consultation with event initiators may mitigate the effect such changes might have on their time and ability carry out programming. 5. There can be conflicting responses/interpretations to procedures from various areas.
E-signing is Unavailable	
<i>Survey 4.</i>	This should be standard for all UHD documents. In-person signature should only be a backup.
<i>Survey 5.</i>	We wouldn't have issues chasing people down for a physical signature.
<i>Survey 6.</i>	I have not had an issue with this. I am able to e-sign via adobe in most instances.

Study Abroad	
	a. Disjunction between contract negotiation, administration and/or the academic planning process
<i>Survey 3.</i>	The new study abroad coordinator began on 3/11/2019. He was an internal hire so he may already be familiar with the way things work around here. This may be a time to bring him into the conversation. My sense is that the problem with contracting is that some people do not do their jobs very well, and any conversation about "workflows" needs to start with the names of people who stop the flows. Performance shortcomings are different in kind from "bureaucracy issues."
<i>Survey 7.</i>	Students need to know the cost well in advance of a trip in order to make plans and decisions. In addition, the lag between when the company submits a bid and when UHD's contract office signs off on the contract often means we lose the lower-cost bid, so students end up having to pay more--and sometimes cannot afford it. Thus, they don't sign up for the course/trip, and the course/trip doesn't make even though there is a demand for such study-abroad opportunities.
<i>Survey 8.</i>	One constituent reported concerns with the Study abroad office (there is no director).
<i>Survey 9.</i>	Overly complex and no guidelines for completion. Little help in completing the paperwork.
Travel Requests	
	a. A cumbersome process which often results in additional costs and additional work for staff and faculty.
<i>Survey 2.</i>	It takes too long for requested flight and hotel arrangements to be made that ends up unnecessarily increasing the cost of travel and taking too much money out of a limited faculty travel budget. I cannot afford to be putting these things on my personal credit card but feel I basically have no choice.
<i>Survey 3.</i>	There is no need to use a Travel Office to arrange flights and hotels. Tell your department you are going to a conference, go, rent, stay, attend, present, and return, and then submit receipts for reimbursement.
<i>Survey 4.</i>	It's mostly the speed. If done quickly, it works. If not, it costs UHD money.
<i>Survey 5.</i>	The Travel office has double booked rooms for me, cancelled my room, tried to pay for my whole stay (even though I had a roommate), and forgot to book and then pay for my hotel. I book airfare outside of the office because I can find a cheaper flight quicker and I have heard horror stories from colleagues about their experiences
<i>Survey 6.</i>	I actually do not find the process cumbersome. However, this might be because I am fairly involved in the process of booking travel at all levels. I tend to work directly with the travel agency
<i>Survey 7.</i>	The travel office is slow to respond sometimes. This means cheap airfares and sometimes the Conference rate at hotels are lost.
<i>Survey 9.</i>	Reimbursements are processed slowly.
Room Requests	
	a. The process is unnecessarily complex and time-consuming particularly when it involves food or other special requests
<i>Survey 2.</i>	Each college should have a full-time event planner that can handle all of it- faculty should not have to take on any of this work
<i>Survey 4.</i>	There should be a single point of contact for this, not three.
<i>Survey 5.</i>	Very time consuming especially when trying to figure out how to do anything for an event
<i>Survey 6.</i>	Again, I have never had an issue. I normally schedule via the internal reservations link online and have always had a quick reply from the office.
<i>Survey 7.</i>	Even when just requesting a meeting room for a committee, the response time is really slow and sometimes there is no response at all, requiring follow-ups and sometimes just renegade squatting in a room that hasn't been officially secured.
Invited Speakers	
	a. Bringing in speakers from out of town is a complex contractual process
<i>Survey 4.</i>	There should be, again, a single point of contact for this with a fixed timeline for approval
<i>Survey 5.</i>	Overly complicated for a fairly straightforward request

Compensation	
	a. Requests from faculty that relate to our compensation, workload, or additional work, grants, etc., should not be denied after the semester starts and once faculty have already began working in good faith
Survey 4.	Once work has started, funding should be guaranteed and not delayed. A policy might be necessary for this.
Survey 6.	I have never experienced this but I can understand the frustration.
	b. Updated budget reports are not made available to grant principal investigators
Survey 4.	There is no good reason for this save lack of staff support.
Survey 6.	I have never had an issue with this. Whenever I need to see budgets, IDC, etc. I have been able to get it either from my DBA or the OSRP
Survey 9.	I was initially denied overload pay in Fall 2018. After a month delay, I finally received the money. Frankly, I was prepared to leave the university since changing the rules about work pay in midstream seemed an extreme violation of worker's rights.
Evaluation of Chairs and Deans	
Survey 2.	Agreed, have no clue what happens with those Deans evaluations and whether that have any impact
Survey 4.	Quantitative results should be made available to faculty, at minimum. I understand if comments are not.
Survey 5.	Currently the feedback goes up and not back to the faculty who actually provide the feedback.
Survey 7.	I've been at UHD through multiple Provosts, and never once in that time have the results of the Deans' or the Chair's evaluations been shared with faculty. Also, there is no sign that the Provosts have ever read, acted on, or in any way incorporated these evals into the Deans' performance evaluations.
Annual Evaluations	
	a. The annual evaluation process creates an overwhelming amount of work for faculty, the faculty evaluation committee, and the chair
Survey 1.	HHL has streamlined the process pretty well, while other departments seem to have onerous requirements. This should be up to the department, but there are definitely models where things are easier
Survey 2.	WAY TOO MUCH WORK for little to no reward, and generally void of any useful feedback
Survey 3.	This strikes me as a departmental issue and not something the FS should be concerned with.
Survey 4.	It's a lot of much ado about nothing to produce three single-digit numbers. CV+observations+meeting with chair, generating a memo with scores. That's really all we need.
Survey 5.	Much too much work for everyone involved. The process should be a simpler more straightforward exercise. Spending a couple of weeks to put together an annual evaluation packet seems like a waste of time. Likewise, the committee spending hours reviewing the files seems like a waste, so does the chair having to write the letters to each person. The whole process seems riddled with inefficiency
Survey 6.	It is a hassle but I don't see any way around it.
Survey 7.	There are never any pay raises, and yet every year we have to prepare reports with documentation that run a 100+ pages per faculty member. What gives?
Survey 9.	I have been through this process many times and the amount of work is burdensome. Further the actual annual evaluations are burdensome to faculty who may submit 60 pages
Rank and Tenure Process	
Survey 1.	Most decisions can be made fairly easily. The vast reports are only actually required in the rare cases where the decision is not easy. It might be worthwhile to think about a system that involves a simple application with additional material upon request
Survey 4.	We need a simple policy change to move to a single 3rd year report, not a 2nd and a 4th. It creates unnecessary work for all R&T committees, and the 4th report is too late to 'warn' faculty, which leads to grievances in close situations... generating again, more service, drama, and angst...
Survey 5.	Having never served on University Rank and Tenure, I don't know what they do, but at the department level, a number of the materials included were not even looked at. I spent weeks upon weeks getting everything together and I really think that time could have been better spent in other pursuits. Condensing the format seems necessary.
Survey 7.	I do not agree that the R&T process is overly burdensome. The candidate is seeking a lifetime job. The reviews SHOULD be thorough. I do not agree with Dr. Pavelich's argument that it should be a minimalist document. There are too many different audiences to consider, and we should be rigorous and thorough when reviewing candidates for tenure

	and promotion.
<i>Survey 9.</i>	We have ambiguity in our approach to rank and tenure. There is a wide divergence with regard to intellectual contributions and a fear of retribution if tenure is denied.
Other Concerns	
<i>Survey 1.</i>	The biggest hurdle with making a lot of changes will be the process of changing policy itself. Any serious attempt to make processes easier must start with the process for changing process.
<i>Survey 2.</i>	Lack of staff support has been a major complaint of mine since I was hired. My college dean has made significant attempts to remedy this, but now the University needs to do the same.
<i>Survey 5.</i>	The curriculum process is overly burdensome. It seems to take a year to make program changes. As a scheduler, the Northwest campus creates problems for me. Class enrollment is poor causing me to cancel classes late. I end up having to take away classes from adjuncts. Not sure if that issue goes in here though.
<i>Survey 6.</i>	If anything stands in my way or causes me trouble it is the confusion about the way in which we can be funded in the summer. I have heard different things regarding whether we can be paid by a grant and for teaching in any given summer month. It would be great to get someone to come and explain the restrictions on faculty summer pay--especially with respect to grants.
<i>Survey 7.</i>	Student evaluation mechanism. IDEA sucks!!! Why are we spending so much money on instruments that students do not complete and that, even when students do complete them, provide no valuable feedback to the individual instructor. Why does IDEA withhold results? It's unfair to students who do complete their evals not to at least let the instructor see what the student said. The IDEA contract was obviously a boondoggle for someone. It does not provide useful feedback to instructors and doesn't lead to pedagogical improvement. Why are we paying for it?
<i>Survey 8.</i>	From my constituents: We need often need things signed off by our chairs (and often deans) when there's no need for this. I'm particularly thinking about things like internal grants, but there's a host of things that could go straight to the relevant committee or department without having to first go through your chair. One constituent reported that the length of time UHD used to process a contract meant that the data for a research project were not obtained until after the course release expired. One program has suffered from issues with the financial aid office (they misinform students often), the Study abroad office (there is no director), the marketing department (they're great when they have time for us, but often they have contracts with the business school and are maxed out of manpower), with Continuing Education (they are an independently-funded department which causes tensions when money is involved). In general, we need more support. This program also needs more administrative support in its daily operations, as well as with student advising, recruitment, and marketing.
<i>Survey 9.</i>	1. Difficulty creating courses. 2. Difficulty updating learning objectives. 3. Hiring process.

IDEA DATA

Winter 2017 thru Fall 2018

(Total: 4248 sections surveyed)

Of the 4248 sections:

19% of sections did not meet the cut-off threshold for obtaining response data;

7% of these sections had low enrollment (1-9 students);

and 2% of these sections only had 1 or 2 students enrolled.

ALL of UHD		
Response Rate	Number of Sections	Percentage of Sections
0-20%	1587	37%
21 – 40%	1297	31%
41 - 60%	617	14%
61 – 80%	450	11%
81 – 100%	297	7%

College of Business		
Response Rate	Number of Sections	Percentage of Sections
0-20%	110	10%
21 – 40%	312	28%
41 - 60%	297	27%
61 – 80%	219	20%
81 – 100%	171	15%

College of Humanities & Social Sciences		
Response Rate	Number of Sections	Percentage of Sections
0-20%	775	46%
21 – 40%	571	34%
41 - 60%	184	11%
61 – 80%	123	7%
81 – 100%	36	2%

College of Public Service		
Response Rate	Number of Sections	Percentage of Section
0-20%	274	55%
21 – 40%	141	28%
41 - 60%	21	4%
61 – 80%	25	5%
81 – 100%	33	7%

College of Sciences & Technology		
Response Rate	Number of Sections	Percentage of Sections
0-20%	378	44%
21 – 40%	248	29%
41 - 60%	104	12%
61 – 80%	79	9%
81 – 100%	54	6%

University College		
Response Rate	Number of Sections	Percentage of Sections
0-20%	52	50%
21 – 40%	28	27%
41 - 60%	19	18%
61 – 80%	4	4%
81 – 100%	4	4%