Dept. Chair Spring Forum

Thursday, May 18, 2023
10am-1pm
Agenda

10:00 - 10:30  Academic Personnel Office Year in Review
10:30 - 11:30  Academic Labor and Employee Relations
11:30 - 12:00  Lunch
12:00 - 12:30  Teaching Evaluation Implementation Committee (TEIC) Update and Discussion
12:30 - 12:45  Faculty Mentoring Update
12:45 - 1:00   APO Response to Feedback Received from 2022 Chair Spring Forum
Agenda

A. Data-driven Initiatives
B. M/P Reviews
C. Faculty Development
D. Office Challenges
E. Communications
F. Spring Chair Forum 2022 Follow-up
A. Data-Driven Initiatives

1. Chair compensation equity
2. Salary equity
   1. Implementation of AY22-23 equity adjustments
   2. Look-in analysis of resulting adjustments
3. Retention rates
4. Ongoing
   1. Progression rate study
   2. Senate climate survey
ALL Departments – Workload Metrics by Cluster

SUGGESTED CLUSTERS

Cluster 1: CSE, CHEM, PHY
Cluster 2: EEOB, PSYCH, MATH
Cluster 3: ECE, BOPS, ENT, MPP, CEE, ME, MCSB
Cluster 4: HIST, SOCI, ECON, POLS, CRW, ENG, STAT, CLL, ANTH, PHIL, ENVS, EPS, BIOC, BIOE, NEM, ETHS, HISP, DANCE, RLGS, MUSI, TFDP, MCS, ART, GSST, ARTH
Matched Pairs Comparison of AY22-23 Salaries

Assistant Professor Matches

Associate Professor Matches

Full Professor Matches

Female Salary (K) vs Male Salary

- BCOE
- CHASS
- CNAS
- SOE
- SOM
- SPP
- BUS
Matched Pairs Comparison of AY22-23 Salaries

Assistant Professor Matches

Associate Professor Matches

FOC Salary (K)

nonFOC Salary

FOC Salary (K)

nonFOC Salary

FOC Salary (K)

nonFOC Salary

BCOE
CHASS
CNAS
SOE
SOM
SPP
BUS
Analysis of Retention Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Women</th>
<th>Percent Men</th>
<th>Fisher’s Exact Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Gender Analysis of Departures AY18-19 thru AY19-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Women</th>
<th>Percent Men</th>
<th>Fisher’s Exact Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>716 (?)</td>
<td>966 (?)</td>
<td>1682 (?)</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Gender Analysis of Departures AY20-21 thru AY21-22 (The cohort data in this table is being reused and therefore does not match the AY20-21 thru AY21-22 period the UCR data comes from.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOC</th>
<th>Not FOC</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent FOC</th>
<th>Percent Not FOC</th>
<th>Fisher’s Exact Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Ethnicity Analysis of Departures AY18-19 thru AY19-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOC</th>
<th>Not FOC</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent FOC</th>
<th>Percent Not FOC</th>
<th>Fisher’s Exact Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>620?</td>
<td>1033?</td>
<td>1653?</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Ethnicity Analysis of Departures AY20-21 thru AY21-22 (The cohort data in this table is being reused and therefore does not match the AY20-21 thru AY21-22 period the UCR data comes from.)
B. M/P Reviews

1. File Throughput
2. Observations from Reviews
   a. Combining accelerations with new o/s
   b. Justification for placement
   c. Justification for promotion retropay
   d. Candidate statements
   e. Department research statements
3. Areas of CALL to Improve
   a. Use of book chapter accommodation
   b. Reconciliation of teaching load in the file
   c. Additional waiver for Dean’s letter
   d. More on the AY23-24 CALL at the 5/24 Chairs/VPAP Meeting
4. Possible administrative changes
   a. VPAP letter to the file
   b. VPAP final
Tracking Progress of M/P File Completion
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Academic Personnel Office
C. Faculty Development

1. New Faculty Orientation
2. Department Chair Leadership Training
3. UCR Coro Program
4. Faculty Mentoring
5. Contributions to SEA Change application
6. Associate Professor Consultations (?)
7. ARO Workgroup
8. Hellman Fellowships
9. CPFP/PPFP Review and Appointments
10. AFD Proposal Reviews
11. Path-to-Tenure / Path-to-Full workshops
D. Office Challenges

1. COVID Vaccine Policy tracking
2. UAW Strike and Contract
3. Expanding workload with represented groups
4. Staffing
   a. APO analyst staffing level down 50% since Jan 1st
   b. Change in ELR specialist (was vacant for 6 months)
   c. Change in APO EA (was vacant for a few weeks)
   d. Extended vacancy and ultimate departure of Data and Technology Analyst (new person for last 6 months)
   e. Unfilled dedicated ITS developer (being addressed)
E. APO Communication Channels

1. Quarterly Newsletter (4 issues)
2. Halftime Show (Mid Year Faculty Mixer)
3. Faculty Awards/Promotions event
4. Recurring
   a. VPAP office hour (weekly)
   b. VPAP/Chairs (monthly)
   c. VPAP/Deans (quarterly)
   d. APO Path-to-tenure and path-to-full (annual/by college)
   e. APO/AP College Staff (monthly)
   f. APO/AP Directors (monthly)
   g. AP SMEs (monthly)
   h. APO/LR (biweekly)
   i. APO/CSC with SSCs (weekly)
   j. All Faculty & VPAP Caucus
5. Policy changes and other announcements via email
Academic Personnel - Role

- Academic Personnel is the central employment office for all Academic Employees
- Academic Employees are governed by a separate set of policies (APM),
- Shared Governance
- Academic Freedom
- Employment Processes: Reviews, compensation, leaves, local policy and procedure governance
- Employee and Labor Relations
Labor Relations

› Managing the University’s relationships with Unions and their members

› Stewarding grievances and coordinating responses; ensuring compliance with MOUs

› Our 6 current Academic Contracts:

  › IX (AFT Unit 18) – Lecturers, other NSF instructors
  › RA (UAW) – Academic Researchers
  › LX (AFT Unit 17) – Librarians
  › BX (UAW) – ASEs (Academic Student Employees)
  › PX (UAW) – Postdoctoral Scholars
  › BR (UAW) – Graduate Student Researchers
Employee Relations

- The term 'employee relations' refers to an organization’s efforts to:
  - Manage relationships between employers and employees (manager-employee, employee-employee)
  - Provide fair and consistent treatment to all employees so they remain committed to their jobs
  - Prevent and resolve problems arising from situations at work, often interpersonal
  - To minimize risk
- Philosophy: People-focused effort

Source: https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-employee-relations-definition-lesson-quiz.html
High Volume Questions/Assistance

- Assistance on difficult communication with an employee (general, coaching, counseling)
- When you need to give corrective action; going through the progressive disciplinary process; performance improvement plans
- Conflict – Between any level of employee
- Navigating Employment issues with GSRs
- Clarification on APM / Local Procedures / MOUs
- Appointment, Review, and Compensation Questions
Labor Relations

Michelle Calanchini
Employee Relations Representative
Topics

1. Labor Relations Overview
2. Academic Bargaining Units
3. Mandatory Subjects of Bargaining
4. New Contract Highlights
LABOR RELATIONS OVERVIEW
Role of Labor Relations

- Managing the University’s relationships with unions and their members
  - Bargaining system-wide employment contracts in coordination with UCOP, campus locations, and unions
  - Negotiation activities to resolve differences
  - Contract interpretation
  - Coordinating grievance responses
  - Responding to Unfair Labor Practice Charges
How Many UC Employees Are Represented?

UC Systemwide Labor Relations at a Glance

134,369+ represented employees
15 systemwide contracts
22 local contracts
37 total union contracts
17 union relationships

10 campuses
5 medical centers
1 national laboratory
What is a Bargaining Unit?

- A bargaining unit is a group of employees with titles and job duties that are sufficiently aligned to make it an appropriate grouping for purposes of collective representation by a union.

- The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) presumes that an appropriate unit is one that is "systemwide."

- It includes all employees within an occupational group at all UC locations in California.
Who Oversees the Collective Bargaining Process?

California’s Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) administers the statutes governing public sector collective bargaining. PERB conducts elections, handles representation and unit modification cases, and investigates and makes decisions regarding Unfair Labor Practice (ULP) charges filed by employees, labor organizations, and public entities.

PERB administers the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), the state law that regulates labor relations among UC, their employees, and the unions that represent their employees.

HEERA gives employees the right to form, join and participate in the activities of employee organizations for the purpose of union representation on matters governing wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment.

Employees are protected from reprisals, discrimination, coercion or interference when exercising the rights guaranteed by HEERA, including the right to form, join and participate in union activities.
What is a Grievance?

A grievance is a dispute over the interpretation, application, or enforcement of the terms of the collective bargaining agreement (CBA). The CBA typically defines what qualifies as a grievance. For example, some of the University's contracts define a grievance as a formal allegation that the University has violated a specific provision of the CBA. The CBA also defines what elements should be contained in a formal grievance, including:

- Statement of the facts/actions/inactions giving rise to, or relevant to, the grievance;
- Allegation of how such facts/actions/inactions resulted in a violation of the CBA, including citation of the specific articles or provisions which are alleged to have been violated;
- Request for one or more remedies.

The grievance process and mandated timelines are outlined in the grievance article of the applicable CBA. The grievance process generally consists of three steps. After those steps are exhausted, the union may file an appeal to arbitration.
What is Arbitration?

• Arbitration is the dispute resolution process used to decide grievances brought under the CBA.

• The arbitrator is a neutral third party who hears the grievance case and renders a final and binding decision.

• The CBA defines the scope of the arbitrator's authority and the procedural steps required to bring a grievance to arbitration.

• Under the University's collective bargaining agreements, an appeal to arbitration generally must be filed within 20-45 calendar days of the issuance of the University's Step 3 grievance decision.

• It must follow any requirements outlined in the arbitration article of the applicable CBA.
What is an Unfair Labor Practice (ULP)?

An unfair labor practice is an action by an employer or a union that violates the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA).

There are six categories of unfair labor practices for employers that are prohibited under HEERA:
• Discriminate, retaliate, interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees because of the exercise of their HEERA rights;
• Deny employee organizations their rights under HEERA, such as rights to information, to access facilities, and to represent employees;
• Refuse or fail to meet and confer with the union;
• Dominate or support an employee organization, or show a preference for one employee organization over another;
• Refuse to participate in good faith in statutory impasse procedures;
• Consult with advisory groups on matters within the scope of representation for exclusively represented employees.
Direct dealing is a type of unfair labor practice where the employer bypasses the union.

One type of direct dealing involves a situation where the employer (a supervisor, department head, appointing authority, etc.) deals directly with individual employees to make a change in the terms and conditions of employment instead of dealing with the employee’s collective bargaining representative.

An employer may not bypass the union and deal directly with employees on matters that are properly the subject of negotiations with the bargaining unit’s exclusive representative.

The second type of direct dealing involves an employer communicating directly with employees to undermine the union’s authority to represent the bargaining unit.
Labor Relations Team

Karen Logue

• Postdoctoral Scholars (PX) – 226 positions
  • United Auto Workers (UAW)
• Librarians LX (AFT Unit 17) – 19 positions
  • American Federation of Teachers (AFT)

Tiffany Hawkins

• Non-Senate Instructional Lecturers (IX) – 261 positions
  • American Federation of Teachers (AFT)
Labor Relations Team

Michelle Calanchini

- Academic Researchers (RA) – 166 positions
  - Academic Specialists
  - Project Scientists
  - Professional Researchers
  - Coordinators of Public Programs
- Academic Student Employees (BX) – 1,650 positions
  - Teaching Assistants
  - Tutors
  - Readers
- Graduate Student Employees (BR) – 725 positions
  - GSRs
  - Fellows
  - Trainees

- United Auto Workers (UAW) represents each of these bargaining units
MANDATORY SUBJECTS OF BARGAINING
Mandatory Subjects of Bargaining

• Wages
• Hours
• Terms & Conditions of Employment
  • Responsibilities and benefits associated with the job
  • Examples include Retirement, Policies, Leaves, Telework, Termination
Contract Durations

• Librarians:
  • CBA in effect through **March 31, 2024**
  • Negotiations to commence by September 2023

• Academic Student Employees and
• Graduate Student Researchers:
  • CBA in effect through **May 31, 2025**

• Lecturers:
  • CBA in effect through **June 30, 2026**

• Postdoctoral Scholars and
• Academic Researchers:
  • CBA in effect through **September 30, 2027**
New Non-Senate Instructional Lecturers Contract

• Compensation for fiscal years 2023-26:
  • UC is offering 3% guaranteed salary scale adjustments for each year of the CBA
  • Minimum 9% increase when a Continuing Lecturer is promoted to Senior Continuing Lecturer
New Academic Researchers Contract

• Compensation:
  • Range Adjustments to Salary Scale
    • July 1, 2023 – 4.5%
    • July 1, 2024 – 3.5%
    • July 1, 2025 – 3.5%
    • July 1, 2026 – 3.5%
    • July 1, 2027 – 4%
  • Academic reviews and merit increases continue per respective Series Articles

• Leaves
  • Pay for Family Care and Bonding (PFCB) – 8 weeks 100% pay for eligible employees (matches policy-covered academic appointees)
    • Must be eligible for Family Medical Leave
  • Bereavement leave up to 10 days with existing sick/vacation leave (matches APM)
    • Expanded family member definitions
New Postdoctoral Scholars Contract

- Appointments: Two-year initial appointment (up from one year) followed by one-year reappointment

- Compensation:
  - Implementation of new salary scale April 1, 2023, which resulted in average salary increases of 8 percent for all Postdocs
  - Annual pay increases each October, with approximately 7.5% increase in the first year and 3.5% in each of the remaining years
  - Annual experience-based pay increases of 3.7% for eligible Postdocs

- Childcare: Up to $2500 annual reimbursement for childcare expenses with flexibility to use funds for childcare expenses related to professional travel

- Paid Family Leave: 8 weeks leave at 100%
Respectful Work Environment Article

• New contract provision to address Abusive Conduct in CBA

• Provision is in all UAW contracts
  • Academic Researchers
  • Postdoctoral Scholars
  • Academic Student Employees
  • Graduate Student Researchers
Management and Academic Rights Article

- Provision is in all UAW contracts
  - Academic Researchers
  - Postdoctoral Scholars
  - Academic Student Employees
  - Graduate Student Researchers
ASE Contract - Workload Article

• Revisions to the Article require ASE to initiate discussion with their supervisor as soon as they anticipate any workload-related issues.

• Intent of the Article revisions is to resolve issues at the lowest level prior to contract violation or formal grievances.
ASE and GSR Contract - Leaves

• Short Term Leave
  • Salaried ASE at 50% - 2 days per quarter
  • Bereavement Leave increased from 3 days to 5 days

• Long-Term Leave
  • 8 weeks of paid leave per academic year for:
    • ASEs own serious health condition
    • Care for family member with serious health condition
    • Pregnancy, childbirth or related medical condition
    • To care for and bond with newborn or adopted/foster care child

• Pregnancy Disability Leave runs concurrently with Long-Term Leave

• Additional Long-Term Leave may be granted, but no pay associated
ASE and GSR Contract - Wages

- Significant wage increases each year of the contract
- Experience-based increases effective October 1, 2023
- New grad student cohort should be placed on the new scale based on experience
- Existing grad students should be paid more than previous year
- The new scale was created to recognize and experiment-based promotion
ASE and GSR Contract - Grievance & Arbitration

1. Informal – Step 1 – *filed with supervisor* – goal of resolution
2. Formal – Step 2 – (must be filed 30 days from the event) – *filed with campus Labor Relations* – requires meeting and formal response
3. Formal – Step 3 – *filed with Office of the President*

• Arbitration – Hearing with a neutral third party
GSR Contract – Recognition Article

EXCLUSION FROM THE UNIT:

Students who receive funding, including financial aid awards, to pursue a course of study with no or de minimis service expectation imposed by the University, and whose receipt of these funds does not require the performance of service at the direction and control of the University.
GSR - Appointment Security

If an individual receives and accepts appointments to a GSR position(s) for one or more term (i.e., quarter or semester) in a fiscal year, and the position offered and accepted is no longer available, the University will ensure that the individual is placed in an alternate student appointment with substantially similar compensation.

- Placement is at the University’s sole discretion

- GSRs requiring placement after position is no longer available may be placed in available ASE title
GSR Contract - Personal Time Off

• GSRs are provided “one day per month” of PTO when appointed for at least 25%

• For a full fiscal year appointment, a GSR receives 12 days of PTO, available at the start of the appointment

• For GSRs with less than 12 months, the PTO is prorated – one day per month

• PTO allotment is communicated in the appointment letters

• PTO does not roll over – it is a “use it or lose it” benefit
The GSR’s workload will be commensurate with the appointment percentage and title/classification:
- reasonable and related to the program’s research needs
- meeting the responsibilities assigned to the position
- on making progress toward their research goals
- on demonstrating their intellectual capabilities

Workload may fluctuate in a given time period (e.g., workweek, month, academic term)
- Workload includes: required training, orientation, required meetings, required conferences
- For Trainees and Fellows, applicable grant/fellowship applies and may require different levels of effort
## Resources

[ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/index.html](https://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/index.html)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemwide Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Researchers</strong> — RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Auto Workers (UAW) 5810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Student Employees</strong> — BX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSE/United Auto Workers (UAW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerical &amp; Allied Services</strong> — CX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamsters Local 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Student Researchers</strong> — BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Auto Workers (UAW) 2865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Care Professionals</strong> — HX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professional and Technical Employees (UPTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Senate Instructional (Lecturers)</strong> — IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Federation of Teachers (AFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient Care Technical</strong> — EX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physicians, Dentists and Podiatrists</strong> — DX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Physicians and Dentists (UAPD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Officers</strong> — PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated University Police Officers Association (FUPOA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You
Frequently Asked Questions

Patrick Napier
Student Financial Support
Oversees graduate student employment and postdoctoral studies
Questions Answers
Lunch

Menu

Fresh Sliced Fruit and Berries

Vegan Chipotle Potato Salad

Assorted Sandwiches
   Napa Valley Chicken Baguette
   Traditional Deli Sub (Turkey or Roast Beef)

Roasted Veggie
Teaching Evaluation Implementation Committee (TEIC) Update & Discussion

Ken Baerenklau
Associate Provost & Chief of Staff
Teaching Evaluation Implementation Committee (TEIC) Update for Chairs and Directors

May 2023
Timeline

• February 2018: Senate ad hoc committee convened to review policies, procedures, and mechanisms for how teaching is evaluated.
• Establish policies and procedures for accurate and reliable evaluation
• Review iEval for its efficacy and recommend changes to maximize student participation and provide faculty with constructive feedback
• January 2021: Ad hoc committee report submitted to Senate.
• May 2021: Senate feedback collected, shared with Provost.
• October 2021: Provost charged joint Senate-admin committee (TEIC) to implement the ad hoc recommendations.
• Implement specific recommendations in these areas:
• Immediately address bias in student evaluations of teaching (SETs) (2)
• Re-design the current SET to produce a more equitable and useful tool for evaluation of teaching effectiveness and pedagogical improvement (13)
• Require that more than one kind of evidence of teaching effectiveness must accompany each academic personnel file submitted for review (3)
• Review Senate committee feedback and determine which suggestions also should be implemented.
• Clarify shared governance responsibilities for teaching evaluations.
TEIC membership

• Co-chairs: Yingbo Hua and Ken Baerenklau
• 11 Senate appointees
• Chair of ADT: Jack Eichler
• Director of Evaluation and Assessment: Omar Safie
• Director of XCITE: Richard Edwards
• Director of GradSuccess: Hillary Jenks
• Undergraduate and graduate students
Timeline

• January 2022: TEIC membership finalized, committee convened
• January 2023: TEIC report submitted to Senate for feedback
TEIC report summary

• Full report available here: [https://senate.ucr.edu/issues](https://senate.ucr.edu/issues)

• New SET structure and questions that focus on specific, observable actions by the instructor; and avoid vague, personality-based judgments

• Early-term survey: *Is it present -yes or no?*

• **Course foundations check (10):** learning goals, course topics, expectations, policies, course materials, modes of communication

• Late-term survey: *Was is provided? Was it useful?*

• **Course foundations check:** replaces early-term results

• **Class experiences (3):** connecting experiences to learning goals; providing opportunities for student engagement; creating a respectful classroom environment

• **Assessment methods (5):** connecting assessments to learning goals; providing directions, criteria, and timely feedback

• **Learning support (3):** opportunities for assistance and supplemental materials

• Invitation to provide suggestions for improving each section (open-ended)
• New preamble to help students provide useful evaluations.
• New templates to facilitate submission of additional evidence:
  • Canvas-based analysis of learning outcomes
  • Peer observation of classroom teaching and learning
  • Student self-assessment of learning gains
• Guidance for writing a student mentoring statement
• Guidance for developing a teaching portfolio
• Modifications to eFilePlusto make evidence submission easier.
• Proposal for a new student participation incentive.
TEIC report summary

• Review of Senate committee feedback on the ad hoc report:
  • Replace iEval system with a modern IT platform

• Proposal for shared governance responsibilities:
  • **APO** to oversee issues that are “rule-based”, require interpretation of the APM, and/or relate to the operation of the AP review process.
  • **Senate** to oversee issues that relate to how the campus evaluates instructional quality (currently the main purview of the TEIC).
  • **Office of Evaluation and Assessment** to oversee implementation of APO and Senate policies.
Timeline

• April 2023: Senate feedback received
  • Generally supportive but with critical comments mostly about the SET instrument and especially question wording.
  • Concerns about increasing workload for students, faculty, file-preparers.
  • Concerns about whether 10 weeks is too short for 2 surveys.
  • Desire for optional questions for instructors to select from.
  • Concerns that terms like “useful”, “appropriate”, and “timely” are subjective.
  • Suggestion to pursue a larger pilot test before full campus roll-out.

• May 2023: TEIC reviewing Senate feedback
Next steps

• June 2023:
  • TEIC co-chairs and subcommittee chairs meet with Senate EC.

• Summer 2023:
  • TEIC works on revisions
  • ITS implements iEval system replacement

• Fall 2023: tentative
  • Expanded pilot
  • Campus-wide communication and education

• Winter 2024: tentative
  • Campus-wide roll-out
  • Campus-wide communication and education
  • TEIC purview transitions to APO and Senate

• Summer 2024: tentative
  • eFile Plus changes implemented
Faculty Mentoring Update

Katina Napper
Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
AP Response to Feedback Received from 2022 Dept. Chair Spring Forum

Daniel R. Jeske
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
Response to Spring Chair Forum 2022

A. What topics and materials should be included in new faculty orientation?

RESPONSE: Redesign of new faculty orientation

B. How should chairs coach faculty when considering and preparing files?

RESPONSE: APO has designed a chairs checklist that includes this and a number of other suggestions.
Response to Spring Chair Forum 2022

C. How can we improve the rate at which files are submitted, reviewed, and announced?

• Reduce requirement for Dean’s letters ✔
• Solicit XM letters sooner – discussed but not workable
• Hire staff – beyond the scope of APO
• Delegate actions down – worked on Dean’s Final but to no avail
• Shrink/simplify CALL – recommend to read The CALL as needed
• Freeze CALL for a period of years – stunts continuous improvements
• Dashboard view of file status – Chairs have some access now
• Recap for Deans and Chairs ✔
Response to Spring Chair Forum 2022

C. How can we improve the rate at which files are submitted, reviewed, and announced?

- Have faculty start working on efile at appointment - unenforceable
- Discuss the difference between APM, The CALL, and department research statement ✓
- Put an end date on when a file has to be completed – introduces problems
- Departments are having to make more decisions about files – extra time is well spent
- Analysts have detailed timeline for files but Chairs do not – may not be true
- Split CAP into different academic disciplines for parallel processing – this is Senate’s purview
Response to Spring Chair Forum 2022

D. What are some things that the Dean’s office and/or APO could do to help you carry out your role as Chair more efficiently?

- Need faculty leaders to be decisive and standby decisions – not sure where the opening is for APO to help
- More training of policies and process for staff = what kind of training?
- Make the CALL more consistent ✓
- Separate procedure from evaluation criteria (in CALL) – we are thinking about overhauling The CALL it (bandwidth issue)
- Prepare eligibility lists earlier (by June) – we are discussing
- Deans and Chairs meeting recap (what went well, or didn’t) ✓
- Get faculty feedback to improve efie ✓
Thank you!