



# Health Science Center

## FACULTY SENATE

**A204 GEB January 29th, 2019 4:00 PM**

Recording available: <https://mediaserver.uthsc.edu/uthscms/Catalog/catalogs/tflorence-2018>

*Present:* Kristen Bettin, Bill Callahan III, Beth Choby, MaryAnn Clark, Ricketta Clark, Shawna Clark, Wanda Claro-Woodruff, Dawson Colvert, George Cook, Terry Cooper, Cathy Crill, William Dabbs, Martin Donaldson, Mary (Molly) Erickson, Jami Flick, Lori Gonzalez, Bruce Hamilton, Peg Hartig, Penny Head, Michael Herr II, Vinay Jain, Robert Jean, Vickie Jones, Santosh Kumar, Mack Land, Chris Ledbetter, Sam Li, Carol Likens, Sharon Little, Tao Lowe, Nawajes Mandal, Jillian McCarthy Maeder, Tracy McClinton, Myra Meekins, Dayna Myers, Edwards Park, Frank Park, Tayebah (Fruz) Pourmotabbed, Laura Reed, Phyllis Richey, Shaun Rowe, Cindy Russell, Nadeem Shafi, Jackie Sharp, Richard Smith, Helmut Steinburg, Fridtjof Thomas, Kwame Torgbe, Jacqueline Venturin, Wes Williamson, Thad Wilson, and Yanhui Zhang.

*Absent:* Shiva Bohn, Jami Brown, Alicia Diaz-Thomas, Ioannis Dragatsis, Tammam ElAbiad, Meiyun Fan, Peter Fischer, Amado Freier, Oscar Grandas, David Hamilton, Carrie Harvey, Kenneth Hohmeier, Colin Howden, Uzoma Ibeguogu, Jerry Jones Jr., Vijay Joshi, Rajesh Kabra, Rafal Kedzierski, James W. Kennedy, PJ Koltnow, Csaba Kovesdy, Ramesh Krishnan, Aneel Kumar, Sajeesh Kumar, Roberto Lachica, Jennifer Langford, Roberto Levi-D'Ancona, Morgan Lisner, Elisha McCoy, Mike McDonald, Linda Moses-Simmons, Megan Mulligan, Debendra Pattanaik, Jeff Phebus, Ranjit Philip, James (Will) Pledger III, R.K. Rao, Duane Schafer, Reese Scroggs, Anthony Sheyn, Christina Spivey, Wen Lin Sun, Michelle Surbrook, Jeffery Towbin, Kirtikumar Upadhyay, Jason Vanatta, Gregory Vidal, and Regan Williams.

- Meeting called to order at 1602 hours CST.

### **New Business**

#### **1. Review of Peer Review of Teaching Policy**

Board of Trustees (BOT) required a post-tenure review, which was approved by the Faculty Senate. The BOT also implemented a policy for peer review of teaching for tenured faculty. The policy will go into the Bylaws and that is why a review and vote is needed by the Faculty Senate today.

#### Discussion:

- All colleges will need to develop their own policies and submit them to the Vice Chancellor for review and approval.
- Resources available on campus, such as the Teaching & Learning Center to assist with development of college-level policy.

- Concerns voiced in regard to online teaching and it was deemed that online teaching is covered under the main policy and could be further addressed on a college level.
- College level would be best for broad guidance in the Bylaws. Departments could make policy at their level for peer review teaching, but not all departments are required to have bylaws.
- Sub-committee meeting for peer review teaching – discussed primary teaching/traditional lecture versus active teaching (i.e. labs). Faculty members should have input into what courses are being reviewed.
- The policy is for tenure track faculty members at this point. Highly suggested for anyone undergoing a post-tenure review or review for promotion.
- Who has authority to choose the peer reviewer? - Decided at the college-level. Example – have an approved list of reviewers and faculty member gets to select or weigh-in on conflicts of interest.
- Colleges will define who the peer reviewers are for the faculty.
- How will faculty receive credit for peer reviews? Methods for determining whether its service, administration, etc. can be determined at the college level.
- Discussed peer coaching model in the College of Medicine
- Issue voiced with the following sentence: “a faculty member may request that the department chair initiate a peer review of teaching at any time”. Does that solely pertain to the faculty member seeking review or can any faculty member request a review of another faculty member? Can be handled on the college-level. Addendum recommended: “faculty member may request that the department chair initiate a peer review of his or her own teaching”
- Concern raised that not all faculty are teaching in courses and there are clinicians engaged in bedside teaching, as well as training program lectures. It was deemed that this is covered in the policy.
- The policy will be applied regardless of whether a college implements bylaws or not. UTHSC has to adopt a policy for peer review of teaching since the Board of Trustees (BOT) will not review faculty members dossiers for tenure unless there are peer reviews of teaching present.

## 2. Vote on Peer Review of Teaching Policy

- Vote 1 - Amendment

Proposal: Amendment proposed to replace “a faculty member may request that the department chair initiate a peer review of teaching at any time” with “faculty member may request that the department chair initiate a peer review of his or her own teaching at any time”.

Action taken: Voting on amendment with a total of 49 responses (31 in-person and 16 online) 47 in favor of amendment (96%) and 2 against (4%). Motion passed.

- Vote 2 – Peer Review of Teaching Policy

Action taken: Voting on the Peer Review of Teaching Policy with a total of 46 responses (33 in-person and 13 online) 46 in favor (100%) and 0 against (0%). Motion passed. See Appendix A for the final policy approved by the Faculty Senate.

- Old Business – Annual reviews will not occur June 2019. Annual review will likely be conducted January or February of next year at the beginning of the next calendar year. Dr. Cindy Russell will release an announcement soon.
- Next full Faculty Senate meeting: February 12, 2019 from 4-5 p.m. in GEB A204.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1650 hours CST.

Respectfully submitted,

Jami E. Flick, MS, OTR/L

Faculty Senate Secretary

**NOTE: The material in this section would go into the UTHSC Faculty Handbook, Section 4.11.2.2: Peer Review of Teaching once it is approved on the campus and by the Board of Trustees**

Effective teaching supports the core mission of education at UTHSC. Appropriate evaluations of teaching effectiveness include, but are not limited to, those identified in Section 6.7.1 and Appendix J in the UTHSC Faculty Handbook. Programs to develop, expand and update faculty teaching skills and peer review of teaching performance are important mechanisms for enhancing the quality of faculty members' teaching, as well as for assessing and evaluating faculty members' performance in preparation for considerations of awarding tenure, promotion, or for other enhanced reviews.

A minimum of two peer reviews of teaching in the faculty member's primary teaching setting are required for every tenure track faculty member, typically during the second and fourth years of the probationary period (with the setting, representative of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities, to be determined by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member). The peer review required for tenure track faculty members must include observation of teaching, irrespective of the subject being taught, the mode of course delivery (i.e., face-to-face, online, hybrid), and the instructional method (i.e., lecture, lab, seminar, research, clinical, independent study), as well as the other activities related to the assessment of teaching (e.g., teaching materials, syllabi, assessment methods, and learning outcomes). The peer review assessment should be submitted as part of the faculty member's next annual review. Should the initial peer review of teaching indicate the need for improvement, a formal improvement plan must be developed as part of the next annual review.

College plans for achieving the above faculty development and accountability goals must be submitted to the chief academic officer for review and approval. The approved plan shall be included in the college bylaws. The plan should be developed through a collaborative process between faculty members and administrators and should address the materials to be reviewed, the selection, training and role of the peer reviewers, the communication and use of the peer review assessment, minimum requirements for peer review reports, the selection of faculty members for peer review of teaching, and other relevant items. Colleges may elect to require peer review of teaching for faculty members to be considered for promotion, post-tenure review, or other enhanced reviews. The college plan should include information on when peer review of teaching will be an option or required beyond the requirement for tenure track faculty.

In addition to peer review of teaching prescribed in college plans, a faculty member may request that the department chair initiate a peer review of his or her own teaching at any time. The department chair may also request that peer review of teaching be conducted based on a determination that there is an issue with the faculty member's teaching performance; in such a case, the department chair shall provide a written rationale for additional peer review to the faculty member and the dean. The dean will make the final determination.

Any faculty member who feels aggrieved by the peer review of teaching as applied to him or her may appeal through the provisions of Section 7.