

Question 4:

For senate:

Dr. Russell Lowery-Hart stated at the December 2015 Faculty Senate meeting that the Faculty Commitments were “not set in stone the way they are currently written. Faculty just need to tell him what needs to be changed” before they are rolled into the Pay for Performance evaluation process.

See Dr. Lowery-Hart’s statements at the Faculty Senate meeting below (from the Faculty Senate minutes):

They are not set in stone the way they currently are written. Faculty just need to tell him needs to be changed. For example: The commitment regarding knowing student names in the first week is totally open to change - what do faculty think is the most appropriate? Is there anything else that needs to be changed?

The statements in the commitments are things we are doing already. This is just putting it to paper.

Senator question- What’s the accountability factor? What if someone doesn’t sign?

Answer- Instead of signing, Values, commitments, and goals will be rolled into the Pay for Performance evaluation process.

Dr. LH likes the current evaluation system, but is aware it will be changing. These commitments will be written into the new faculty evaluations that are being created by Dr. Vess and Reem Witherspoon.

Update: Faculty Senate President Nancy Forrest and other Senate officers such as Emily Gilbert took up the charge to rewrite these faculty commitments to make them more appropriate, realistic, and academically-oriented for faculty, and they will be used in the Pay for Performance process. They are the I CARE values. The former Faculty Commitments were extremely problematic. It would be impossible to commit to meeting with every student since we have many online students and some out of the area, and we have students who don’t show up for scheduled conferences. Also, requiring faculty to memorize each student’s name has equity issues since some faculty have a total of 50 students while others have a total of over 200 students. Who would monitor this memorization and how? Faculty should not be asked to commit to promises they can’t keep--this is not ethical and makes faculty feel very uncomfortable. However, faculty do approve of the I CARE values. I would think that these revised Faculty Commitments should now be used in posted faculty job descriptions and future trainings since faculty have actually created these as charged, approved these, and will now be evaluated on these. Having one set of commitments on job descriptions and trainings and another set in the evaluation process that faculty will actually be bound to is problematic. Can we expect the revised Faculty Commitments to be incorporated into job descriptions and trainings soon?

