

**Welfare Council Agenda**  
**April 27, 2016**  
**8:30 - 10:30 a.m.**  
**Tigert 202**

---

1. Call to order and welcome
2. Approval of the March minutes
3. Old Business
  - a. Update on draft whitepaper on teaching assessment
  - b. Welfare of women faculty
4. New Business
  - a. Election of chair

**Welfare Council Minutes DRAFT**  
**March 23, 2016**  
**8:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. 202 Tigert**

<b>Attendees:</b>	Sue Alvers	Margaret Temple-Smith
Jodi Gentry	Karen Whalen	Daniella Saetta
Ray Issa	Jasmeet Judge	
Ray Thomas	Angel Kwolek-Folland	

Karen Whalen called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. and the February minutes were approved.

**Update on Whitepaper**

Karen reported that the whitepaper draft was forwarded to the Academic Policy Council for recommendations and feedback.

**Update on Faculty Club**

The new plan for the Faculty Club will be in the planned McCarty Parking structure. A linear building will be built attached to the five to six story garage. The top floor (about 7000 feet) will be the Faculty Club. Paul Davenport has asked the Welfare Council to decide how the Faculty Club will be governed.

**Welfare of Women Faculty**

The university is devising a plan for lactating stations across campus. There will also be more gender neutral bathrooms installed.

**Update on Climate Survey**

Climate survey results should be available in June. Plans are to have two large scale town hall meetings the second week of June to discuss the results. There will also be one in September for those who were unable to attend in June. These meetings will be available online.

**Plum Creek Resolution**

The Senate received a resolution about Plum Creek Development. Paul Davenport, Chair of the Senate, asked Welfare Council to review and recommend if there is a role for shared governance with this issue. The Council agreed with previous action with Dr. Davenport's previous discussion with the administration. If an issue has not been vetted through Faculty Senate or Student Government, then when the administration is speaking publicly they will self-identify. Margaret Temple-Smith mentioned that she is not sure this issue falls under shared governance. What is the role of shared governance? Karen Whalen will send a link to a Chronicle article on "What is Shared Governance" and the council will discuss more at the next meeting.

**Teaching Evaluations and Students accused of plagiarism**

Academic Policy Council asked Welfare to discuss the issue of students accused of plagiarism or any infraction that causes students to go through Honor Court and evaluating their instructor. Concern was raised that the student would give a low evaluation. Angel Kwolek-Folland pointed out that if the evaluation ultimately ends in the T & P process that the when the course instructor's chair can address the low evaluation in the chair's letter.

The Welfare Council meeting was adjourned at 9:47 a.m.

**From:** [Beverly Sanders](#)  
**To:** [Whalen, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [Sanders, Beverly A](#); [Alvers, Susan M](#)  
**Subject:** RE: White paper on teaching assessment  
**Date:** Thursday, April 07, 2016 1:29:26 PM

---

Hi Karen,

The APC discussed the draft of your white paper at our meeting on 3/16. We appreciate the effort your committee has made to do this. Some feedback:

1. The APC felt that this should be a recommendation, with final decisions about how or whether to implement peer assessment of teaching to individual colleges, rather than being guidelines expected to be followed everywhere. Reason: UF is very diverse, and it will be impossible to come up with guidelines that fit every situation. Evaluating clinical faculty teaching in a clinical setting was mentioned as an example.

2. Given the previous point, the current document is probably too detailed and specific. It could encourage colleges to adopt practices appropriate to their setting and offer best practices and list resources that colleges could draw from. Some sources of resources would be information from colleges that currently do a good job of peer assessment of teaching (e.g. CALS), and the way that online courses are evaluated.

3. Some other remarks:

a. We appreciated explicit recognition that assessments can be done with two purposes.

b. Assessments should only be for those with poor student evaluations: everyone can do better, and excellence should be documented, too.

c. Information solicited for teaching awards should expect peer assessment of teaching.

I also wanted to mention that the College of Engineering is currently exploring peer teaching assessment, so your committee might want to trade notes with them.

Best,  
Beverly

On Tue, March 22, 2016 10:45 pm, Whalen, Karen wrote:

> Whenever you get a chance. I can forward to the committee. :)

>

> Thanks,

> Karen

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Beverly Sanders [<mailto:sanders@cise.ufl.edu>]

> Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2016 10:18 PM