

Texas A&M International University
TAMIU Faculty Senate
Friday March 31, 2023
12:00 p.m.– 2:30 p.m.
WHTC Rm. 125

I. The meeting was called to order by the Faculty Senate President, Dr. Ruby Ynalvez at 12:03 p.m.

II. *Roll Call*: Dr. Ruby Ynalvez, Dr. Hayley Kazen, Dr. Marvin Bennett, Ms. Jeanette Hatcher, Dr. Li-Zheng Brooks, Dr. Seong Kwan Cho, Dr. Deepak Ganta, Dr. Ariadne Gonzalez, Dr. Kameron Jorgensen, Dr. Kate Houston, Dr. Runchang Lin, Dr. Diana Linn, Dr. Gilberto Martinez, Dr. Mehnaaz Momen, Dr. James Norris, Dr. Lola Norris, Dr. Leonel Prieto

III. *Our Guests* were given the floor:

Dr. Pablo Arenaz

Dr. Arenaz announced that this Spring's Commencement speaker will be Imelda Navarro, Chief Financial Officer for IBC bank and a past TAMIU graduate.

Budget-wise the Senate has passed Article 3 which has the higher education budget in it and both the House and the Senate will be taking up those bills in the next 2 to 3 weeks. Both the House and Senate budgets have some relief for us in terms of group insurance. Higher Education is the only state agency that has to pick up part of the funding for group insurance. For us that amounts to roughly 20% or \$800K per year. Also, it appears that both the House and Senate budgets have some relief for us in terms of Hazelwood Legacy. All of the educational institutions have requested an increase in formula funding (\$350M total) and \$80M was requested for the Comprehensive Regional University Funds, but it is uncertain whether either of these requests are in the current legislative budgets.

Dr. Arenaz also reported that there was a hearing on Senate Bill 18 yesterday and there may be a substitute bill presented, but what will be in that substitute bill has yet to be determined.

Dr. Stephen Duffy

Dr. Duffy informed the Senate of the results of the surveys regarding our future Quality Enhancement Plan. The three top picks from these surveys were:

1. Academic Advising,
2. Experiential/Service Learning and
3. Developmental/College Skills.

The next step is to move on to a set of open forums to generate feedback on these results. It was requested of the Faculty Senate to organize a forum sometime in May where faculty

would be invited to express their opinions on those three main choices. The results of this forum will then be compiled and sent first to the Executive Council for discussion and then to the President.

Dr. Peter Haruna

Dr. Haruna, as TAMIU's representative for the Fulbright Program, presented the Senate with a brief talk on the merits of participating in this program. The Fulbright Program exists to increase mutual understanding between people of the U.S. and of other countries through travel and exchange of knowledge. For us it helps to achieve TAMIU's international goals and objectives. It also supports research and/or teaching for 3 to 12 months and has active projects in 125 countries across the world. More information on this program can be obtained here:

<https://us.fulbrightonline.org/>

IV. The minutes for the March 3rd Faculty Senate meeting were approved with no additional corrections.

V. Informational Items:

Faculty Senate President's Updates (Senator Ynalvez):

Senator Ynalvez provided the Senate with several informational items:

- Fixed-term academic professional track faculty: process for reclassification. Senator Ynalvez offered to send an email to all deans reminding them of the reclassification of fixed-term academic professional track faculty as it appears in the Faculty Handbook. The question was also brought up as to why TAMIU does not grant tenure to fixed-term faculty. This is explained in System Policy 12.07 (see attached).

- Senator Ynalvez shared with the Senate TAMIU Policy 12.99.99.10.04 "Faculty Participation in Shared Governance" (see attached).

- The Texas Council of Faculty Senates and Texas A&M Assembly of Faculty Senates responses to Senate Bill 16, 17 and 18 (banning Critical Race Theory, banning DEI and eliminating tenure). Both organizations urged that actions taken in response to these bills be 'behind the scenes' working through agencies outside the Universities.

Senator Hatcher reported that a call has been sent out for nominations for committee positions and that nominations will be closed on April 6th.

VI. Committee Reports:

A. Awards Committee:

Senator Lola Norris reported that the Awards Committee has set up a Blackboard Shell "Faculty Senate Awards Portfolios (2023)" under "Organizations" in all senators' Blackboard accounts that will be available starting April 1st. All portfolios for the candidates as well as the teacher's classroom observations can be found there. A few observations may be late, but they will be uploaded as they are submitted.

B. Academic Oversight Committee:

Senator Kazen reported that the Faculty Executive Committee will be meeting in April to finalize the results for last November's Faculty Assembly, to be presented to the Provost and the President.

C. Assessment Committee:

Senator Brooks provided the Senate with a handout on the TAMIU Administrator Evaluation 2023 response rates (see attached). The committee is still working on the summary for all of the responses. It was suggested that for academic units with few faculty that a paper-based evaluation may elicit a greater response rate.

D. Budget and Finance Committee:

Senator Ganta reported that the BAC sent a reminder to all deans and chairs to submit their budget 'wish list', so that the committee can meet in the summer to review the lists and make their decisions.

E. Committee on Fixed-Term Faculty Promotion: no report.

F. Distance Education and Instructional Technology Committee:

Senator Momen announced that by next September there will be software in *Turnitin* that can be used to help detect AI submissions from students.

G. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee: no report.

H. Technology Advisory Committee:

Senator Kazen announced that OIT will be sending out an email soon to all faculty outlining their email retention policy. Also, OIT will be looking into loosening up those barriers that are causing certain emails to be blocked by the system (see attachment). Finally, there may be a new TAMIU app forthcoming.

I. University Ethics Committee:

Senator Houston reported that the committee is working on two faculty issues:

The issue of QM payments to the faculty has been resolved. Some faculty thought that QM payments would happen as soon as they were approved for QM certification, but that is not the case. The payment comes if/when the University decides to purchase the course. Also, there have been problems with administrators being added to faculty Blackboard course shells. The committee is continuing to work to resolve this issue.

J. Committee on Committees: no report.

VII. New Business Items (proposals):

Senator Ynalvez presented the Senate with a document on strategies for increasing course evaluation response rates for discussion (see attached). One suggestion was to ask the faculty who have high response rates to share their strategies with the rest. Also, it was emphasized that faculty need to explain to the students how important the evaluations actually are to the overall improvement of the course. Other suggestions included:

- getting student government involved,
- using real examples about how courses have been changed due to evaluations,
- reword the evaluation questions so that you get more relevant feedback,
- provide the faculty with a video they can play to the students about the importance of evaluations,
- having a discipline-specific evaluation instrument,
- the need to revamp how we evaluate the results between different course sizes and different levels of course content.

It was suggested that the Senate create an ad-hoc committee to continue working on and refining these ideas.

There was a discussion on the timeline for Faculty responses to the Chair, the Dean and the Provost in the PPE document, where Senator Ynalvez noted that she will send us an email about a potential timeline that could be used.

Proposals for new business items:

- Senator Houston announced that she has received feedback from the faculty regarding Senate Bills 16, 17 and 18 (see attached). A motion was made to either create a new resolution or update our 2022 resolution so that it better responds to the current language in these senate bills, because the wording in the old resolution has been deemed by some to be inapplicable to the current bills. It was mentioned that no other Faculty Senate has, thus far, issued a new resolution and that our old resolution has already responded to these bills. The motion was seconded. The vote was a tie, so the motion failed.

VIII. Other Business

Senator Ynalvez announced to the Senate that they have one month to consider who next year's senate officers will be. It was also requested that all senators review the Award's candidates for May's discussion and voting.

A motion was made to modify the current statement, rather than the resolution, to reflect the wording on the current senate bills. This motion was seconded and the motion passed with a vote of 10 for and 5 against.

IX. Meeting was adjourned at 2:54 p.m.

12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty

Approved September 26, 2008 (MO 327-2008)

Revised August 8, 2013 (MO 192-2013)

Next Scheduled Review: August 8, 2018



Policy Statement

This policy establishes an option for the universities (academic institutions) of The Texas A&M University System (system) to provide long-term stable academic positions for non-tenure track faculty whose focus is heavily weighted toward either teaching or research.

Reason for Policy

Faculty who have a singular focus or area of expertise in teaching, research or service may experience impediments meeting the necessary requirements of the tenure track process and, as a result, are restricted to positions with little or no long-term stability. This policy is designed to provide a means to recruit and retain faculty whose excellence in teaching, research or service make them beneficial members of the system academic institution, while providing them with stable, long-term employment.

Procedures and Responsibilities

1. FACULTY DIFFERENTIATION

- 1.1 It is imperative that members of the faculty at system academic institutions are able to meet and sustain the highly competitive requirements necessary to excel in their positions. The granting of tenure is a recognition of excellence in the areas of teaching, research **and** service (See System Policy *12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure*). And, while system academic institutions are able to recognize the contributions that these individuals make, it is also essential that recognition be given to faculty whose interest, excellence or discipline does not include all three areas required for tenure.
- 1.2 The creation of the non-tenure track of Assistant Professional Track Faculty, Associate Professional Track Faculty, and Senior Professional Track Faculty provides a means of securing and retaining faculty who bring to the system academic institution excellence in teaching, research **or** service. This would include faculty whose position is in applied or clinical settings. These individuals provide a specific, professional skill to the system academic institution, faculty, staff and students. In creating these new

ranks, the system academic institution is acknowledging that its skills are an essential part to the overall success of the system academic institution and its mission.

2. PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY RANKS

- 2.1 Assistant Professional Track Faculty. This is an entry-level rank. Appointment to this rank generally requires the appropriate terminal degree. Promotion criteria include excellence in teaching for faculty with teaching responsibilities, or excellence in research or service, as appropriate for other appointments. Overall superior performance and potential for development are also expected as criteria for promotion.
- 2.2 Associate Professional Track Faculty. Appointment to this rank generally requires the appropriate terminal degree. It also requires significant experience related to the position responsibilities. Individuals holding the rank of Assistant Professional Track Faculty are eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professional Track Faculty after at least five years as an Assistant Professional Track Faculty.
- 2.3 Senior Professional Track Faculty. Appointment to this rank generally requires the appropriate terminal degree and a record of sustained excellent performance in all areas of appointment. Individuals holding the rank of Associate Professional Track Faculty are eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Professional Track Faculty after at least five years as an Associate Professional Track Faculty.
- 2.4 System academic institutions may adopt titles that vary from those listed above as long as they are differentiated from tenure track faculty titles.

3. APPOINTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY

- 3.1 All new Professional Track faculty members shall be provided with an appointment letter stating the initial terms and conditions of employment. Any subsequent modifications or special understandings in regard to the appointment, which may be made on an annual basis, should be stated in writing and a copy given to the faculty member. The appointment letter shall explicitly indicate the necessary teaching, research and/or service requirements expected of the Professional Track faculty member. Essential job functions for a position may vary depending upon the nature of the department in which the faculty member holds expertise, external funding requirements attached to the position, licensing or accreditation requirements, and other circumstances. It is, therefore, important that essential job functions for each faculty position be listed in the initial appointment letter. For example, all of the following that are applicable should be listed: teaching responsibilities, responsibilities for advising students, independent and/or collaborative research responsibilities, engaging in patient care, committee assignments, conditions imposed by external accrediting agencies, conditions for holding a named professorship or endowed chair, or a position that combines academic and administrative duties, and any other specific essential functions for the position in question. All appointment letters must indicate that the appointment is non-tenure track, and will expire upon the completion of the appointment, unless the appointment is extended pursuant to Section 3.2 of this policy, or unless the faculty member is dismissed pursuant to Section 5 of this policy.

- 3.2 Professional Track faculty member appointments may be made for periods not to exceed five years in length. If, during the course of an existing appointment, the system academic institution chooses to extend the duration of an existing appointment, the extension may not exceed an additional five years. For beginning Assistant Professional Track Faculty, an appointment of no more than three years may be appropriate.
- 3.3 The system academic institution shall notify faculty members annually, in writing, of their salary. Any other changes or additions to the appointment also should be included.
- 3.4 Faculty members are expected to fulfill the terms and conditions of employment for the following year unless they resign prior to thirty (30) calendar days after receiving notice of the terms. This provision should be included in all letters of appointment and annual reviews.

4. EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY

All Professional Track academic faculty will be reviewed on an annual basis by their department head or supervisor. Such review will include all requirements established in the initial letter of appointment and any additional requirements added during annual reviews.

5. DISMISSAL OF A PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY MEMBER

- 5.1 Professional Track Faculty members whose appointment has not expired may be dismissed for cause on the same basis that tenured faculty may be dismissed for cause under System Policy *12.01*, Section 4.3.
- 5.2 System academic institutions shall follow System Policy *12.01*, Section 6, when dismissing a Professional Track faculty member for cause.
- 5.3 Professional Track faculty members may be placed on administrative leave pending investigation as described in System Policy *12.01*, Section 5.
- 5.4 Professional Track faculty are subject to the provisions of System Policy *12.01*, Section 9, relating to financial exigency or termination or reduction of existing programs, and may be dismissed subject to this policy.

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

[System Policy 12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure](#)

Member Rule Requirements

No rule is required to supplement this policy.

Contact Office

Office of Academic Affairs
(979) 458-6072



Standard Administrative Procedure (SAP)

12.99.99.L0.04 Faculty Participation in Shared Governance

First Approved: March 24, 2023

Next Scheduled Review: March 24, 2028

Procedure Statement and Reason for Procedure

Texas A&M International University recognizes the need for its faculty to be deeply invested in the creation, monitoring, and revision of academic policies, procedures, and programs. Faculty share with academic and institutional administrators the responsibility for creating and maintaining high quality educational programs in a healthy work environment. This Standard Administrative Procedure is meant to document the means by which faculty routinely participate in the shared governance of Texas A&M International University.

Procedures and Responsibilities

1. FACULTY SENATE

Tenure-track and tenured faculty, as well as the fixed-term professional faculty serve on the Faculty Senate as representatives of their academic units. These Faculty Senators are elected according to the criteria and process specified in the *TAMIU Faculty Handbook*. The Faculty Senate is the official institutional organization to represent faculty in all governance matters. The Faculty Senate must approve additions and revisions to the *TAMIU Faculty Handbook*. It consults regularly with the university administration over any issue affecting the academic enterprise. The President of the Faculty Senate is a member of the President's Executive Council, which meets bi-monthly.

2. FACULTY HIRING

Faculty are involved in the hiring processes of their colleagues. Though final decisions about hiring reside with the provost, faculty search committees are composed of faculty in the discipline and/or related discipline of the faculty position to be filled but with at least one committee member from another department. Appointment to these committees is made by the college dean. These committees draft job descriptions, review applications, check references, invite finalists for on-campus interviews with the committee and other relevant parties, and make recommendations to

the dean of their college, who in turn makes a recommendation to the provost, who is charged with making official job offers.

3. FACULTY PROMOTIONS AND TENURE DECISIONS

3.1 Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

3.1.1. Mid-Term Reviews: Tenured faculty members of a department participate in evaluating a tenure-track faculty member's progress toward tenure and make written recommendations to the department chair and college dean as to whether the faculty member is making adequate progress, needs to improve in one or more areas, or is not making adequate progress and should be given a terminal year.

3.1.2. Tenure & Promotion: Tenured faculty members participate in making recommendations regarding faculty applications for tenure and for promotion at all levels – department, college, and university. The *TAMIU Faculty Handbook* provides extensive detail on the process.

3.1.3. Post-Tenure Review: Tenured faculty members form the committees which work with tenured faculty members placed on post-tenure review to improve their performance. These same committees issue a final recommendation to the dean and provost as to whether or not the faculty member has successfully completed their improvement plan and thus should retain their tenured status.

3.2 Fixed-Term Professional Faculty

3.2.1. Appointment: Fixed-Term Professional Faculty begin as either Instructional Assistant Professors or as Clinical Assistant Professors. Their first appointment is for no more than 3 years and is renewable in subsequent appointments for up to five years at a time. See Texas A&M University System Policy 12.07.

3.2.2. Promotion: Fixed-Term Professional Faculty may apply for promotion after 5 full years in rank. The process for promotion will follow the process in place for tenure-track and tenured faculty (see 3.1.2 and the *TAMIU Faculty Handbook*).

4. ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATIONS

College faculty members in consultation with their deans develop and approve the specific criteria for annual evaluations of teaching, research, and service and submit their recommendations to the Faculty Senate for approval.

5. CURRICULM

Faculty members constitute curriculum review committees at the department, college, and university levels. Faculty assess the quality of their degrees and course offerings through systematic assessment of learning outcomes. Based on the results of those assessments, they recommend revisions to both degree and course offerings as well as propose new course and degree offerings. The addition of new programs or courses or the revision of current degrees

and courses requires the approval of the faculty serving on curriculum committees at the department, college, and university. Academic administrators at each of these levels must also approve of these changes.

6. GRADES AND GRADE APPEALS

Faculty control the assessment of student work and course grades. Should a student challenge a grade and not be able to persuade the instructor of the course, the student may request that the department chair form a Faculty Grade Appeals Committee of tenured faculty members in the discipline or related discipline to hear the student's appeal and the instructor's justifications for the grade. Should this committee find that the grade was incorrect or unjustified, the committee may rule, in writing, that the grade should be changed. Then, and only then, would a department chair or dean be allowed to change the grade.

7. GRIEVANCES

Tenured faculty members serve on a rotation basis as members of the faculty Grievance Pool, from which grievance committees are formed to hear formal grievances of faculty members against other faculty members, including academic administrators, and to make recommendations to the provost for resolutions of the grievance.

8. STANDING COMMITTEES

As detailed in the *TAMIU Faculty Handbook*, faculty serve on a variety of committees that directly impact faculty work. They have representation on the Budget Advisory Committee, Technology Committee, Distance Education and Instructional Technology Committee, University Risk Management Committee, University Library Committee, University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Grievance Pool. Faculty also have representation on ad-hoc search committees for deans, provosts, and presidents.

Related Statutes, Policies, Regulations, or Rules

[TAMIU Faculty Handbook](#)

Contact Office

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, 956-322-2240

p/2

TAMIU Administor Evaluation 2023 Response Rate

Admin Name	Responses	Expected Respondents	% Respondents
Pablo Arenaz	81	221	36.65%
Thomas Mitchell	84	228	36.84%
Faculty Senate	84	228	36.84%
Dean Hong	2	12	16.67%
Dean O'Meara	7	18	38.89%
Dean San Miguel	57	123	46.34%
Dean Sears	13	37	35.14%
Dean Torregosa	15	34	44.12%
Chair Faltis	7	18	38.89%
Chair Ghosh	9	21	42.86%
Chair Goonatilake	9	12	75.00%
Chair Khasawneh	7	13	53.85%
Chair Kidd	7	17	41.18%
Chair Kock	4	16	25.00%
Chair Lelekis	13	24	54.17%
Chair Lozano	9	17	52.94%
Chair Luo	12	27	44.44%
Chair Moyer	7	17	41.18%
Chair Zschirnt	13	23	56.52%
Library Director	2	4	50.00%
Average			43.38%

Technology Advisory Committee

Minutes

4.25.23

3:00-4:00

KL 420

Meeting Facilitator: Dr. Hayley Kazen

Invitees:

San Juanita Hernandez– Faculty Senate Appointee-absent

Devang Khambhati-COAS -present

Hugo Garcia-SSB-absent

Cynthia Pina-COED -present

Sumalai Maroonroge-CNHS-absent

Omar Ramirez-UC -present

Eva Hernandez-KL -present

Marvin Bennett-President’s Appointee -present

Fred Juarez-Finance and Administration-absent

Tony Ramirez-IT -present

Enid Nuez-IT -present

Elizabeth Smith-Institutional Advancement-absent

Rene Prado-Student Success-absent

Mike Munoa-IT; ex-officio-present

- I. Review and approval of minutes
 - a. Marvin Bennet moved to approve minutes
 - b. Cynthia Pina seconded
- II. Old Business
 - a. AI information
 - i. Turnitin: now has AI detection
 - ii. OIT training: Trainings have been conducted and more will be offered, likely this summer. Trainings will include BB and other detection tools.
 - iii. Student Code of Conduct-Dr. Houston working on new policy. Dr. Pina suggested that we ask Faculty Senate and Honor Council to form a committee or committees to work on this to be ready for fall. TAC believes the policy should be on all syllabi in the fall.
 - b. TAMIU app
 - i. No new information as per Carlos Bella: Mr. Munoa expects a new app by spring. The old app is being retired, and a new one has not been selected. We may not replace the old app. This will likely be decided this summer.
 - c. AEFIS information not being updated to TAMIU Faculty Profiles
 - i. Resolution: Mr. Munoa said IT is working on it.

III. New Business

- a. Email retention policy (Enid): Ms. Nunez sent out an email to TAC for feedback. Working on final changes and then it will be sent out to all faculty.
- b. Emails being blocked: Mr. Munoa said he has made some changes to help offset this issue. Domains can be unblocked by IT if necessary. Mr. Munoa will work on this issue more this summer to make it easier for faculty to conduct their work without emails being flagged.
- c. Committee Purpose
 - i. Refocus? Please review information below: Line between DEITC and TAC. Most student learning issues fall under DEITC. Anything that is not directly related to teaching and learning is TAC.
 - ii. Dr. Pina suggested having 2-3 issues for TAC to tackle next academic year. Mr. Munoa believes this is a good idea, but TAC is really a connection to OIT in order to disseminate information to faculty and explain why things are done the way they are.
 - iii. Dr. Pina also suggested that IT pilot new things with TAC
 - iv. Ms. Hernandez suggested that we have more input into how technology in students' spaces should be designed.
 - v. Dr. Kazen mentioned the perhaps creating steps for faculty to obtain free software. Quick reference sheets for email retention, downloading software, etc.

IV. Open agenda

- a. Ms. Hernandez asked about imbedding library information into BB. This is under DEITC.
- b. Discussion of how TAC can support course evaluations. Tony mentioned integration with BB (course eval).
- c. Dr. Pina suggested we change the wording of the TAC description in the Faculty Handbook.

For next year's TAC:

- A. Serve as a pilot group for IT initiatives
- B. Have more input into how to incorporate technology in student spaces
- C. Creating tip sheets for email retention; installing free software, etc
- D. TAC supporting course evaluations
- E. Rewriting TAC description in faculty handbook

The Technology Advisory Committee. The purpose of this committee is to monitor matters related to the development and implementation of the University-based strategic technology plan. The member appointed from the Faculty Senate will serve as a co-chair of the related University Technology Advisory Committee. Other senators with expertise in Information Technology may also serve as appointed by the Faculty Senate President.

From the Strategic Plan

Utilize current and emerging technologies to enhance classroom learning and expand distance-learning opportunities.

1.3.1 Monitor and evaluate the use of technology to support student learning, expose students to off-campus instructional experts, and connect faculty to remotely located students.

1.3.2 Support faculty development for use of technology in the classroom.

1.3.3 Increase the number of online academic programs.

1.2.5 Plan new buildings and renovate existing ones to effectively and efficiently utilize learning spaces, support “best practice” pedagogy, and incorporate new technologies.

STRATEGIES TO INCREASE COURSE EVALUATION RESPONSE RATES

The best way to increase the response rate, and usefulness of course evaluations is to demonstrate to students that the evaluations are important to a faculty. Here are some strategies to do so:

- Give students time in class: Devoting class time shows students that the evaluations are important to you. Announce ahead of time to students to bring a device to class, so that they are able to complete the survey (e.g., smartphone, laptop); Walk the students through the procedure of completing the evaluation in class
- Inform students about the purpose of evaluations:
 - Let students know that you will use their feedback to make changes in the course. This is where utilizing an option to add personalized questions to one's online evaluation form for any given course will be useful (responses to these personalized questions do not get reported, and are available to the instructor only).
 - Give students some examples of useful feedback you have received in the past, and how the course/pedagogy has benefited in response.
 - Use a recent example so students can see how the feedback from prior students benefited them and how their feedback will thus benefit future students.
- Check/monitor the response rate throughout the survey window, and immediately after the in-class allotted time for survey completion. Use the real-time response rate to further prompt students to complete their surveys, and provide additional encouragement.
- Give students periodic updates about the response rate. During the evaluation period, let students know what percentage of the class has responded and that your goal is to receive feedback from everyone.
- Send personal reminder email to students
- Treat course evaluation as one of the course requirements in the syllabus. Include the dates the evaluation is available and explain its importance. Including the evaluation in the syllabus as a course requirement conveys the message that it is an important part of the course - similar to a homework assignment, but a non-graded one.
- Make it an assignment on your syllabus: Listing the Course Evaluation in the same category as the other course assignments, even if no points are at stake, may help raise response rates.
- Offering an incentive of extra points to all students if a set response rate is achieved. (?)
- Provide a non-point-based incentive. Be creative with what is appropriate for your discipline and is motivating for your students, like an additional review session, extending a deadline, or allowing a note card on the final exam; institutional incentive in which those who completed course evaluations got early access to their grades.
- Faculty incentives: Depending on department/college/university resources, offer an incentive to faculty members who reach a certain percentage of response rates. The incentive could be a gift card to Amazon or a local bookstore to use for research and professional development purposes, a gift card to a coffee shop on campus.

"Goodman, Anson, and Belcheir surveyed 678 faculty across a range of disciplines asking them to report how they were trying to boost online response rates. Among those surveyed, 13% reported that they did nothing to improve the rates and that, on average, 50% of their students completed the forms. Those who

did something to encourage students to complete the evaluations generated response rates of 63%. The most common approaches faculty reported were the ones we'd expect. They reminded students to complete the forms, which upped the response rate to 61%, and they explained how the results helped them improve instruction, which bumped the rate up to 57%. But what improved response rates the most (roughly 22%) was to provide students with incentives." (Goodman et al., 2015)

Reminder: Don'ts

- Do not tell students that they should complete the course evaluations because they are important for merit pay, tenure and promotion decisions. Research suggests that students will be less motivated to tie their evaluations to how well they personally are doing in class if this is given as the main purpose of the evaluations.
- Do not use extra credit incentives for course evaluations.
- Do not hold grades for a test or exam until a high percentage of class complete the evaluations. This approach is considered punitive and not recommended.

References:

Web links

<https://support.canvas.fsu.edu/kb/article/1713-increase-student-response-rates-for-end-of-course-evaluations-using-the-response-rate-tracker/>

<https://teaching.berkeley.edu/how-can-instructors-encourage-students-complete-course-evaluations-and-provide-informative-responses>

<https://www.uhd.edu/academics/university-college/centers-offices/teaching-learning-excellence/instructional-excellence/Documents/How%20to%20increase%20course%20evaluation%20response%20rates.pdf>

<https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/faculty-development/course-evaluations-can-improve-response-rates/>

Articles:

Chapman, D. and Joines, J. (2017) Strategies for increasing response rates for online end-of-course evaluations. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 29, 47-60.

Goodman, J., Anson, R. and Belcheir, M., (2015) The effect of incentives and other instructor-driven strategies to increase online student evaluation response rates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40 (7), 958-970.

Responses from TAMIU Faculty Regarding Texas Senate Bills 16, 17 and 18

Collector: Web Link 1(Link)(Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 9:14:51 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 9:22:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:08

I am on a hiring committee for the library director position; the third party hiring firm who we are working through has expressed several times that we are not getting many candidates to apply for this position because of senate bills limiting academic freedom as well as concern about the possibility of senate passing bills limiting tenure. We have severely limited our applicant pool. On a personal note, I am also concerned about these issues, particularly about the demise of tenure and academic freedom

Collector: Web Link 1(Lin(Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 7:48:11 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 7:48:34 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:22

These senate bills have me looking for employment outside of this state.

Collector: Web Link 1(Link)(Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 9:22:50 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 9:25:19 AM
Time Spent: 00:2800:02:28

I am very worried about the bill; if it actually passes not only does it threaten academic freedom but also the quality of the university because faculty will probably leave in droves. Who would want to stay if they can find a job in another state?? I hope that the university and others in TX will draft a statement of some sort. I don't understand why administration is not more worried.

Responses from TAMIU Faculty Regarding Texas Senate Bills 16, 17 and 18

Collector: Web Link 1(Link)(Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 1:40:43 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 1:48:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:1700:07:17

The Senate bills attacking academic freedom and tenure are disturbing. I quite literally will be unable to teach in the state of Texas if the bills are past. The composition of the House and Senate in Texas are not reassuring, and these bills may very well pass. TAMIU will keep losing faculty if these bills are past. As soon as I read about them, I started looking for jobs outside of Texas. Other reasons we're losing faculty are (1) smaller programs don't have enough full-time faculty which restricts the programs' growth, and (2) we tend to get excited about new faculty, we then encourage them to get involved, and sometimes pile the work on them, especially service, too early. There have been job search committees headed by faculty in their first 3 years here at TAMIU, and entire committees of untenured professors. We count on new faculty to get more grants, publish interesting research, etc, and they burn out. At the same time, newer faculty (especially those of underrepresented racial, gender, and sexuality backgrounds) aren't supported when they experience workplace harassment.

Collector: Web Link 1(Link)(Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 9:51:27 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 10:11:02 PM
Time Spent: 00:3500:19:35

I am writing to express what I believe should be the stance of the TAMIU Faculty Senate regarding the following proposed bills in the Texas State Legislature: SB.16, SB.17 and SB.18. The position of the faculty senate should be to unanimously oppose them. While some of the language in these bills is vague and could be interpreted in different ways, their vagueness opens up the doors to potential attacks on academic freedom and critical inquiry with regards to discussing things like systemic racism and other historical injustices. Of particular concern are the proposals to end tenure, ban DEI offices, and expand the powers of the Board of Regents to be able to hire executive staff and approve curriculum. The latter would make these appointments and our curricula vulnerable to politicized conflicts of interest and limit our ability to offer cutting-edge higher education to our students. Banning DEI offices is (A) An attack on freedom of thought, which these bills say they are trying to preserve and (B) threatens the safety and empowerment of minority students, faculty, and staff by only allowing student organizations to conduct DEI activities. The negative consequences to ending tenure are so obvious I hope every senator sees them. This senate needs to draft a resolution opposing these bills and if they do not, they are not doing their job, which is to advocate for the faculty.

Responses from TAMIU Faculty Regarding Texas Senate Bills 16, 17 and 18

From: Pamela Neumann
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2023 10:34 AM
To: Houston, Kate A.
Subject: Fwd: Sociologists for Women in Society Statement Against Florida HB 999

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the University. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

FYI- the professional feminist sociology organization SWS has issued a statement against proposed legislation in Florida that is quite similar to some of the bills being proposed in Texas. It is extremely worrisome to me that such bills could gather momentum and pass here in Texas as well. I would greatly appreciate it if you would share this statement with the rest of the faculty senate as a model for the kind of statement I believe we should make as well based on the disturbing content of several proposed bills here in Texas. Thank you so much for your tireless advocacy on behalf of the faculty, Kate.

With gratitude,

Pamela

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: SWS <sws@memberclicks-mail.net>
Date: March 27, 2023 at 9:45:35 AM CDT
To: Pamela Neumann
Subject: Sociologists for Women in Society Statement Against Florida HB 999
Reply-To: swseo.barrekatuna@outlook.com



Dear SWS Members:

Responses from TAMIU Faculty Regarding Texas Senate Bills 16, 17 and 18

Please review the Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) Statement Against Florida HB 999, proposed by Ron DeSantis, the Governor of the State of Florida. It is included here as an attachment and is also below in the body of this email. If this bill passes both chambers on May 5th, 2023, the following could be removed from Florida's College Campuses:

- NPHC Organizations (which are African American Fraternities and Sororities)
- NMGC & Latinax Organizations
- Race Studies courses
- Gender Studies courses
- Centers & Programs for Black Students
- Centers & Programs for Latinax Students
- Centers & Programs for Asian & AAPI Students
- Center & Programs for LGBTQ+ Students

SWS encourages its members to support one another who are presently in Florida and living through this challenging time.

We are planning to have a workshop in Philadelphia this Summer 2023 where we will work to support one another. We welcome your ideas for how we can collaborate with Committees. Please contact [SWS Committee Chairs](#) if you have ideas for how we can provide workshops that will better prepare us for the upsurge in attacks on our academic freedom.

While the threats to academic freedom affecting faculty research and teaching in such fields as gender, race, sexuality, intersectionality will be incredibly acute if HB becomes law in Florida, those of us in other states, because of broader national support for the items in HB 999, will also benefit from a broader conversation on how best to respond to such challenges.

Signed,

SWS Council on March 24, 2023

Official Statement

As an international organization of feminist sociologists, Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) has been closely monitoring the recent spate of proposed bills and new laws across the country that threaten civil rights and free expression around race and gender. The political intent to reduce free expression and personal autonomy by criminalizing drag shows, gender-affirming medical care, full control of reproductive care, as well as stunting efforts toward diversity, equity, and inclusion across public and private entities is a matter of great concern for researchers who focus on gender and race among other inequalities. Yet, as feminist sociologists, Florida's HB 999 is particularly chilling, not only to academic freedom, but to free expression and democracy more broadly. Proposed Bill [HB 999](#), filed in the Florida House of Representatives on February 21, 2023, provides for significant opportunity for political intervention abridging free expression and academic freedom by students and faculty, especially around the issues of race and gender.

HB 999 places ultimate control for hiring and firing of faculty within political control of the Florida Governor's office; it calls for the defunding of any activities on campus that attempt to increase diversity, equity or inclusion among the student body or the faculty and administration; and it explicitly intervenes in how curriculum can be organized.

We take issue with attempts to decrease racial and gender representation by defunding hard won initiatives to encourage full inclusion of all members of society. Yet this bill goes beyond simply defunding some offices. While hiring and discipline of faculty are typically a power explicitly held by the provost and faculty under a system of shared governance, this bill centralizes almost unchecked power in the Governor's office and by the Governor's appointees to university Boards of Trustees to control scholarship by controlling hiring of new faculty and the ability to call for impromptu "post-tenure review" of any faculty member "for cause"--an implicit threat of dismissal.

Responses from TAMIU Faculty Regarding Texas Senate Bills 16, 17 and 18

Further, (as of 3/24/23) this bill states that for each Board of Trustees “The board shall periodically review the mission of each constituent university and provide updates or revisions to such mission, as appropriate; upon completion of such review, examine existing academic programs at each constituent university for alignment with the university's mission; and provide direction to each constituent university to remove from its programs any major or minor that is based on or otherwise utilizes pedagogical methodology associated with Critical Theory, including, but not limited to, Critical Race Theory, Critical Race Studies, Critical Ethnic Studies, Radical Feminist Theory, Radical Gender Theory, Queer Theory, Critical Social Justice, or Intersectionality, as defined in Board of Governors regulation, or any major or minor that includes a curriculum that promotes the concepts listed in s. 1000.05(4)(a).” It should be worrisome to any democratic endeavor that any set of ideas is explicitly targeted for “removal” and that only race and gender are targeted by this bill. Importantly, none of the other federally-protected statuses such as veteran status or disability are similarly targeted for removal of programs.

The most basic purpose of tenure is to shield faculty—who are vetted by a five- to six-year process of peer-review—from political intervention in the pursuit of knowledge. This bill undermines that ethic entirely while chilling free expression around race and gender specifically and constitutes an unprecedented political overreach of a university system. We condemn these efforts to stifle crucial scholarship and teaching on racial and gender experience, expression, and equality and reject in the most vociferous terms the implied and explicit attempt to chill free expression. This bill allows governing boards and political appointees unprecedented oversight in the everyday decisions of governance. Conservative forces and right-wing extremism continue to flourish across the United States, and Florida is leading the way in attacking academic freedom.

HB 999 is a direct attack on the principles that are at the heart of [SWS's mission](#): it perpetuates the structural inequalities grounded in the intersecting identities of which it seeks to ban instruction, and it attacks academic freedom that exposes these structural inequalities. SWS recognizes the extremely negative effects this bill would have on our members in Florida, as well as the horrible consequences of such blatant frontal attacks on education and academic freedom in general.

Responses from TAMIU Faculty Regarding Texas Senate Bills 16, 17 and 18

SWS acknowledges the importance of academic freedom:

- Public and private universities provide students and faculty the freedom to conduct research, study, and teach without fear of government censorship.
- The state, including but not limited to elected politicians, administrators, and political appointees, has no role in hiring, evaluation, or curriculum content. Tenure must be sheltered from politics.
- Faculty make curriculum choices, hire faculty, and evaluate the performance of students and faculty.

SWS is working on ways to address this serious threat to academic freedom, and we welcome your ideas for ways that we can partner with you and hope that you will share this information with your networks in solidarity.

[Download the Official Statement](#)

[Blog Post](#)

Connect with Us:

[Facebook](#)

[Twitter](#)

[YouTube Channel](#)

[Socwomen.org](#)

This email was sent by swseo.barretkatuna@outlook.com

Sociologists for Women in Society

[Remove My Email or Manage Preferences](#) • [Privacy Policy](#)

powered by  MemberClicks