



University Governance  
Faculty Council  
[https://www.umb.edu/faculty\\_staff/faculty\\_council](https://www.umb.edu/faculty_staff/faculty_council)  
Monday, September 19, 2022  
1:00-3:00 PM  
Chancellor's Conference Room  
3<sup>rd</sup> floor, Quinn Administrative Bldg.

## Agenda

### I. Resolution from Marlene Kim and Joel Fish

#### **RESOLUTION ON TEACHING EVALUATION MODALITY AND SUPPORT AND AFFIRMATION THAT DEPARTMENTS CHOOSE TEACHING MODALITY.**

**Whereas** many students do not complete online teaching evaluations since the change to online evaluations approximately three years ago, and

**Whereas** the sample size from these evaluations can be very low and the results skewed for teaching, and

**Whereas** fewer comments and thus qualitative information are obtained from these results, and

**Whereas** these evaluations are used not only to help instructors teach better but also in our promotions review, and

**Whereas**, everyone has an interest in having high response rates and better evaluations, and

**Whereas**, departments are the units who decide on how to evaluate teaching, and

**Whereas**, some departments are unhappy with the low response rates and low qualitative outcomes and want to go back to paper or in-class evaluations or otherwise increase response rates, and  
**Whereas** the Academic Technology Committee (ATC) recommended that "ALL course evaluations be completed using either Evaluation Kit or Qualtrics—hence no paper evaluations" (ATC power point presentation to faculty council on December 6, 2021), but that these software fail to meet the needs of all faculty and all departments as discussed above, and

**Whereas** the Academic Technology Committee (ATC) met in May 2022 but still are encouraging departments to use electronic course evaluations (EK or Qualtrics) despite problems with low response rates and (for some) the inability to increase these rates with the suggestions made by IT, and

**Whereas** Provost Berger affirmed in Faculty Council on February 7, 2022 that departments choose how to evaluate teaching, including the modality of teaching, so that departments, not the administration, decide whether to use paper or online evaluations, but

**Whereas** the Provost's office worked with IT to put into place a paper evaluation through Gradescope for spring 2022 so departments can use paper evaluations again, but

**Whereas** the email that went out to department chairs in spring 2022 that instruct them on how to increase response rates for online evaluations and provide a timetable for these evaluations, and only after two pages, in a small paragraph, is a statement saying that paper-based evaluations are also being made available but that department units must administer these (much as in the online courses), so that this option seems burdensome and some department chairs may not have read this part of the email, so

**Whereas**, some faculty are unaware of the availability of paper evaluations and almost none know that departments can use multiple methods, so that some faculty can use paper evaluations through Gradescope and others the online evaluations, and departments can calculate analytics such as averages and frequencies for all faculty even if some use online and others use paper evaluation methods, and

**Whereas**, IT has so far provided very little information about paper-based evaluations to departments and faculty and is only stating that a manual paper-based teaching evaluation option is available but that this will be handled by individual academic units overseeing course evaluations and IT will provide the necessary training, but

**Whereas** it is unclear what the implications are if ATC is stating it will continue to offer, support and encourage departments to use the electronic course evaluations (EK or Qualtrics) when departments must administer and oversee online evaluations; stated this way on email messages to faculty may sound burdensome to departments for paper evaluations when departments must conduct similar overseeing and administrative work for electronic evaluations and seems to prejudice departments in favor of online evaluations to an unnecessary extent,

**Be it resolved** that the Faculty Council affirms departments' ability to decide on how to conduct teaching evaluations, including the modality (such as using paper evaluations, online evaluations, or both), and

**Be it further resolved** that the ATC communicate its decision from its April 2022 meeting to Faculty Council at the October or November Faculty Council meeting and respond to inquiries concerning the implications of that decision; and

**Be it finally resolved** that the university administration clearly inform all faculty and department chairs without prejudice that

1. Paper evaluations through Gradescope are a viable alternative to electronic evaluations;
2. Paper evaluations have significantly increased response rates compared to electronic; and
3. Faculty can use both paper and electronic evaluations in a department, and analytics (means, frequencies) across paper and online evaluations can be calculated for faculty and departments.

## **II. Resolution from the Faculty Council Executive Committee**

### **RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE DAYS**

**Whereas**, the COVID-19 pandemic created unprecedented disruption and stress in the lives of people throughout the world, and

**Whereas**, [evidence](#) indicates that American youth experienced an increase in mental health-related distress in recent years, and

**Whereas**, the Boston Intercollegiate Government, in collaboration with the UMB Undergraduate Student Government and Graduate Student Association, proposed the creation of a “mental health care days” excused absence policy that would allow each student to miss up to three non-consecutive, non-exam or laboratory assignment class days without penalty, and

**Whereas**, the UMB USG and GSA are lobbying the Provost to implement a mental health care days policy at UMB,

**Be it resolved** that the Faculty Council encourages all faculty to include in their course attendance policies the option for each student to miss at least one class at the student’s discretion without the need to submit formal documentation or disclosure and without academic penalty, subject to appropriate restrictions that are consistent with [existing university attendance policies](#) and delineated by the instructor.

### **III. Motion from Sociology Faculty – Kevin Wozniak and Andrea Leverentz**

**Moved**, That the following “criminal and disciplinary history disclosures” questions be removed from all UMB graduate applications: “Have you ever been found responsible for a disciplinary action taken against you at an educational institution? Answer ‘yes’ if you have ever been found responsible for a disciplinary violation at an educational institution that you have attended from the 9th grade (or the international equivalent) forward, whether related to academic misconduct or behavioral misconduct, that resulted in your probation, suspension, removal, dismissal, or expulsion from the institution?”

- “Have you ever been convicted of a felony or other crime? Note: You are not required to answer ‘yes’ to the criminal history question if the criminal adjudication or conviction: (1) has been expunged, sealed, annulled, pardoned, destroyed, erased, impounded, or otherwise ordered by a court to be kept confidential. (2) was a first conviction for misdemeanor drunkenness, simple assault, speeding, minor traffic violations, or disturbance of the peace. (3) any conviction of a misdemeanor where the conviction occurred more than five years prior to the date of this application, unless you were sentenced to imprisonment upon conviction of the misdemeanor, or you have been convicted of another criminal offense within the five-year period.”

### **IV. Special Elections for Faculty Council Chair and one Executive Committee seat**

#### **V. New Business**

#### **VI. Motion to adjourn**