Student Surveys and Teaching Assessment

The QSSET subcommittee continues to respond to challenges in implementing the new system.

By Mary C. (Cella) Olmstead
President, QUFA

By this point in the term, instructors have likely received notice that the Queen’s University Survey of Students’ Experience of Teaching (QSSET) will be administered in their course.

The design and implementation of QSSET is governed by Article 29.3 in the Collective Agreement (CA); its ongoing administration and effectiveness are reviewed by a standing subcommittee (described in Appendix A) that includes students, QUFA Members, and University representatives. QSSET arose from recommendations put forward by a Teaching Assessment Implementation Committee (TAIC, 2018) that was co-chaired by Elizabeth Hanson and John Pierce, QUFA and University representatives, respectively. Unlike the previous University Student Assessment of Teaching (USAT), QSSET includes a standard set of questions that distinguish four aspects of the learning environment: Student, Instructor, Course, and Infrastructure. Theoretically, this provides independent feedback on each course component with only the “Instructor” portion being used in the evaluation of a Member’s teaching. For the first time since student evaluations were introduced at Queen’s (1994), only instructors are able to view the written comments on QSSET forms. Members often choose to include these comments in their own teaching dossiers, but that is their prerogative.

A major change introduced with QSSET was the move to virtual administration, drastically reducing paper waste as well as the labour required to scan each form. Even with...
the online platform, the TAIC report specifically recommended that, in the case of on-campus courses, the survey be conducted during class time. This helped to ensure that students who have experience with the instructor and the course are completing the surveys and that they are doing so independently. As with the previous USAT, instructors would be absent from the class while students completed the survey, which takes approximately fifteen minutes. Pilot studies confirmed that response rates for QSSET using this procedure were comparable to the paper administration of USAT (approximately 60%). Moreover, about 95% of the 1,968 students across 69 courses who opened the virtual link went on to complete the entire survey.

QSSET was to be rolled out in Winter 2020 but was delayed until Summer 2020 because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Summer courses are all delivered online, generally with no synchronous component, so surveys were left open for a one-week period near the end of term. This practice continued into Fall 2020 when the majority of courses, including those listed as on-campus, were delivered remotely. By the time in-person classes were fully reinstated at Queen’s, QSSET administration had defaulted to a one-week window with no provision for in-class administration. An added complication is that Scantron, the platform used to administer QSSET, lacked the functionality to open individual survey links based on class times. As a consequence, QSSET response rates have remained consistently low (usually under 30%), and some instructors report receiving feedback that is clearly not for their course. This may be an outcome of students simultaneously receiving four or five links to QSSET surveys, which they complete in one sitting (i.e., outside of class time).

The QSSET subcommittee is aware of these challenges and is working to set up solutions that increase student response rates and maintain the original intention of the TAIC report. The University’s contract with Scantron is now terminated; QSSET is currently being administered using Class Climate and piloting of the Scantron replacement, Qualtrix, will take place starting this term. An advantage of this new system is that it will allow instructors and faculties to select additional questions for their own QSSET survey. This was an original recommendation of the TAIC report, as long as questions are vetted and approved by the QSSET subcommittee in advance.

For the time being, QSSET will remain open for a one-week period, although QUFA is committed to ensuring that the TAIC recommendations are implemented in the future. Members are strongly encouraged to set aside a fifteen-minute slot during class time so that students can complete the survey. Recruiting a student representative who will read the QSSET instructions at the beginning of this time slot helps to ensure that students understand how the survey information will be used, and reminds them that any surveys containing any disrespectful, demeaning, discriminatory, or harassing comments will be discarded.

Finally, and most importantly, Members should keep in mind that student surveys are only one element of teaching evaluation, one that is repeatedly shown to be biased against women and other equity-deserving groups.¹

Note

Mary C. (Cella) Olmstead can be reached at olmstead@queensu.ca.
Relations with Students in the Twenty-First Century

Expectations about faculty-student relationships have shifted dramatically in recent years.

By Leslie Jermyn
Executive Director, QUFA

This article is reprinted and amended from the November 2018 number of QUFA Voices: “Socializing with Students in the Twenty-First Century.”

Faculty who interact directly with students need to be mindful that rules, norms, and expectations conditioning these relationships are changing quickly. Not only are students’ expectations with respect to technologically mediated communications and modes of information delivery changing, but so is the way students understand interactions with faculty outside the classroom, laboratory, or library. The shifting social context leaves many faculty wondering if socializing with students is desirable, and if so, is it possible and under what conditions.

First, with respect to socializing with students at all, there are compelling arguments for continuing to do so. Graduate students, for example, are often in training to become professors, librarians, scientists, and business leaders. Part of that training is an unspoken apprenticeship in the professional comportment those roles entail. That is not classroom work, but happens when students have opportunities to be with their teachers across a variety of contexts, including professional social events.

Undergraduate students similarly benefit from these kinds of interactions, though their access is usually circumscribed until they are in the last years of study. More generally, extracurricular interactions with students help to build academic community.

How, then, can we manage extracurricular events so that they are positive and safe for all participants? Here are a few guidelines and tests to keep in mind when planning an event with students.

Place and Time
Keeping things close to or on campus during regular work hours is the best combination. Moving away from campus or away from Kingston means you need to think about how people will get home safely or how they will leave when they wish to. Socializing in the early evening is fine, but creating situations where people have to get home late at night or where they are reliant on someone else to leave is not recommended.

Public vs Private
Queen’s prohibits you from holding classes in your home, but if you decide to have a social event at your home (a unit end-of-term party, for example), be aware that this makes you responsible for the well-being of those who attend. If alcohol or other substances are consumed, you have to be mindful of people’s ability to walk, bike, or drive themselves home. An additional concern could arise if you find yourself alone with a student who has stayed late.

Since public venues take care of the responsibility of monitoring for inebriation and have the added advantage that you can leave at your own discretion, they are recommended over private venues when students will be included.

Number
There should always be more than one student plus one faculty present at an extracurricular event. Beyond being inclusive, having larger numbers reduces the chances that a student will experience pressure from a faculty member to behave in a particular way, and protects the faculty member should there be miscommunication or misunderstanding about what happened.

Gender and Age
We need to be mindful of gender differences and how they operate in the perception of power and safety. Further, while students attain formal adulthood while attending university, the age differential between them and faculty could figure into an assessment of whether a power imbalance existed should sexually intimate relations ensue.

Alcohol and Other Drugs
Many academic traditions include drinking alcohol. While these kinds of events will continue to play a role in our campus lives, we also should supplement these with ones that are meaningfully inclusive of traditions that do not include alcohol and which are comfortable for people who do not wish to be around it. As cannabis consumption becomes normalized, we’ll have to find the right balance with it, too. Generally, if intoxicating substances are available at an event that includes students, you are strongly advised to exercise moderation and to alert the appropriate people if you see a student consuming to excess.

Nature of the Event
Certain kinds of social activities are more appropriate for students and academic staff to attend together than others. Context is key here, so it is nearly impossible to prescribe anything. However, common sense suggests that attending student-hosted parties late into the night is riskier than going to a matinee performance of the play you’re studying in class. Risk is heightened
when the context encourages participants to put aside their formal roles as faculty and student. Reputational risk to the faculty member is heightened when it’s not clear what professional benefit is conveyed to the student by co-attendance at an event.

Technologically Mediated Communications

While not related to social events per se, the question of using newer and less formal channels of communication with students has been raised and has sometimes created problems for faculty.

Texting, Tweeting, and Facebook-friending with students can be aspects of a positive and responsive learning environment. Unfortunately, these media, with apologies to Marshall McLuhan, are sometimes themselves the message. Slang, informality, emojis, and afterhours communications are all features of these types of media, and make misinterpretation much more likely. A casual text from a professor to a student at 11.00 p.m. with a “winky-face” emoji can very easily be misunderstood. The general rule is to keep things as formal as possible, and confined to conversations about teaching and learning as much as possible. Imagine any communication (e-mail, text, etc.) posted on a billboard on Princess Street; if you would be uncomfortable seeing your words in public, reconsider your phrasing, timing, medium, or message.

Shared Living Space

Some graduate supervisors have helped graduate students, newly arrived in Kingston, by allowing them to stay temporarily at their homes while they find living quarters. This generosity is laudable but having a student you supervise live with you, even short-term, may be a breach of the Collective Agreement (CA) because it creates the perception of a conflict of interest. As an alternative, you could help the student find temporary space with other students rather than risk your reputation—or worse, reprimand or discipline.

Romantic Relationships

Members have sometimes raised the question of whether romantic relationships are “allowed.” While not clear, the CA prohibits such relations between faculty and students over whom they have authority or the ability to confer benefits of any kind. It is also important to note that consent can be seen to be vitiated when there is a power differential between the parties, especially when one party relies on the other for employment or professional advancement.

There may be situations where someone who holds a Queen’s staff or faculty position could have an intimate relationship with someone who is registered as a Queen’s student, but in the current legal and policy climate, I would advise extreme caution if you are contemplating initiating such a relationship on the assumption that there is no risk. Rather, I would advise you to consider such a relationship to be high risk and urge you to carefully review the University’s expectations respecting the requirement to report any potential conflict of interest.

Conclusion

When this article first appeared in November 2018, I wrote that “this is changing terrain, so once taken-for-granted understandings about what is okay between faculty and students no longer hold true.” In 2023, I have to amend that to “the world has shifted dramatically with respect to expectations about faculty-student relationships, and this shift has made many formerly acceptable kinds of interactions not only risky for faculty but actually job-threatening.” Please review our piece on Bill 26 in the September 2023 number of QUFA Voices for proof of this claim.2

At the end of the day, if you’re in doubt about a planned interaction or communication with a student, talk about it with your head or at a unit meeting. Your colleagues will be a useful sounding board, and if you would be reluctant to tell your colleagues about your intentions, it’s a clear sign you shouldn’t continue with your plans at all.

Notes

1https://www.qufa.ca/publications/qufa-voices/november-2018/

2https://www.qufa.ca/publications/qufa-voices/september-2023/

Leslie Jermyn can be reached at qufaed@queensu.ca.
MEMBER SERVICES

New Changes to Adjunct Compensation

A review of the changes to Continuing- and Term-Adjunct compensation arising from the most recent round of bargaining

By Micheline Waring
Member Services Officer, QUFA

We hope that you have had a restful Fall-Term Break. As the term continues to wind its way along, we wanted to highlight the most recent changes from bargaining with respect to Adjunct compensation.

Continuing Adjuncts

Continuing Adjuncts will note two major changes in Article 42. The first relates to the calculation of the standard FTE (Article 42.3.3). Historically, for Members with a teaching load equivalent to the Unit teaching workload, the FTE would be calculated at 50%, which includes an allowance for course-related administration. Since the last round of bargaining, there is a second option that permits a 60% FTE for a teaching load equivalent to the Unit teaching workload and a full Unit service load. Both options are prorated for teaching loads that differ from the Unit’s normal teaching load. For Continuing Adjuncts who are interested in being fully integrated into the service needs of the Unit, this can be an interesting option. A higher FTE to include service is based on agreement from both the Member and the Unit Head.

Secondarily, Continuing Adjuncts are now covered by the newly expanded Appendix Q for the first time (Article 42.3.8). Please see below.

Term Adjuncts

Term Adjuncts will likewise note two changes in Article 42. There was a 1.5% bump to the base stipends before the standard ATBs were added, as well as an increase from 6% to 8% for salary in lieu of benefits. Retroactive payments for the period from 1 July 2022 to 31 August 2022 should have been paid out.

The other major change involves Article 42.4.4.4. This refers to a situation where instructional, supervisory, or administrative service duties are required to be performed beyond the end date of the contract. Such additional duties may be offered by the Unit Head to the Term Adjunct, which would be compensated for under Appendix Q (see Article 42.4.4.1). This includes student accommodations.

Appendix Q

Appendix Q (Compensation for Additional Duties Pursuant to Articles 42.3 and 42.4) was updated and expanded for the first time in many years. There are a few highlights to note.

- **Appendix Q** now applies to Term and Continuing Adjuncts, as previously stated.
- **Categories 1-3** in Table A, which includes non-supervisory graduate responsibilities, graduate and undergraduate supervision, have seen both an expansion of duties and increases to the compensation amounts to be in half and full days, as well as in percentages of stipends.
- **NEW! Categories 4-5** in Table A, which includes assigned committee work and assigned administrative work. Committee work is broken down by light, moderate, and heavy committees. Administrative work includes Undergraduate Chair, Graduate Chair, and Year or Team Advisor.

If you have any questions or concerns about these new changes, please feel free to reach out to me.

Micheline Waring can be reached at micheline.waring@queensu.ca.

---

ANNOUNCEMENT

Health and Safety

Information about COVID-19 and other respiratory illnesses, in particular guidelines to be enforced on campus, can be found at:

https://www.queensu.ca/risk/respiratory-illness-information

Please also consult the QUFA Health and Safety Web site:

https://www.qufa.ca/hs/

Questions? Please contact Health and Safety Officer Nicolas Hudon:

nicolas.hudon@queensu.ca

- **NEW! Compensation Rates for Other Duties** now includes conference planning, community outreach, and academic accommodations (for Term Adjuncts) that extend beyond the term of the Member’s contract.

- **NEW! Section 5** highlights how assigned administrative service shall be applied. For Term Adjuncts, this shall be paid upon completion of the additional duties, or at the end of each Academic Term for the proportionate amount of the service completed. Continuing Adjuncts shall receive the better of the consideration provided in the Member’s Unit workload standard, the compensation as per Term Adjuncts above, or the accrual of additional service duties towards a teaching release.

If you have any questions or concerns about these new changes, please feel free to reach out to me.

Micheline Waring can be reached at micheline.waring@queensu.ca.
LETTER TO THE EDITOR

A Call to Arms …
… in Long, Floppy Sleeves

By Anya Hageman
Department of Economics

The Editor:

Colleagues, won’t you join me in wearing robes to class? Not your dress robes, necessarily, but a simple black set with a few velvet stripes. We need to bring a sense of excitement and grandeur back to the campus, don’t you think?

With so many of us still slouching towards our comfy home offices, and with so many students absent from class, we need to be reminded of the glory of the Academy.

With a robe, we connect to hundreds of years of history. With a robe, we add drama and pageantry. With a robe, we don’t have to worry about what to wear. With a robe, we have something a little fuzzy to wrap ourselves in. With a robe, billowy and tempest-tossed, we are just a gust away from being airborne.

Consider that we have the Douglas Library “Harry Potter” Room. We have a castle that starts with an “H.” We have a Headmaster as gracious and wise as Dumbledore. Let’s go all the way and get ranked number one in imagination!

All we need is a dress code and four houses—or, with a nod to Indigenous tradition, clans. Clans might be a nice way to connect students across years and disciplines. I see a lot of opportunities for events, mentorship, and merchandise.

Every day can be Convocation! Every day can be Hallowe’en! Every day we can look good!

All we have to fear is … chalk dust.

Anya Hageman can be reached at hagemana@queensu.ca.
ON CAMPUS

Fair Employment Week
CAUT’s annual event helps raise awareness about precarious employment on Canadian campuses

By Robert G. May
Editor, QUFA Voices

Last week (16-20 October 2023) was Fair Employment Week (FEW), an annual event sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) to raise awareness about precarious employment on Canadian campuses among contract academic staff.

QUFA participated in FEW by hosting an information table at Mackintosh-Corry Hall (see photo on p. 1), a pair of “Quaff with QUFA” Adjunct Socials at the Grad Club, and an Adjunct Rights Workshop via Zoom.

QUFA also participated in the “#Fairness4CF” social-media campaign organized by the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) by sharing these informational graphics across our Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram channels.

Robert G. May can be reached at mayr@queensu.ca.
GRIEVANCE CORNER

More Consultation Needed in Ontario’s Postsecondary Sector
Observations from the October 2023 OCUFA Grievance Committee Meeting

By Karen Sisson
Grievance Officer, QUFA

I had the opportunity to attend my first Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) Grievance Committee meeting in Toronto last week. It was my first chance to meet other Ontario university Grievance Officers in person for a collective consultation about some of the most pressing issues faced by faculty across Ontario. Perhaps unsurprisingly, many of the broader themes discussed at this meeting are also reflected in QUFA’s recent interactions with the University, including the need for transparency and meaningful consultation between administrators and faculty to best protect the public’s interest in a thriving postsecondary education sector.

In July 2023, OCUFA came under the new leadership of incoming president Nigmendra Narain. The Grievance Committee meeting was opened with the President’s Report, which provided updates about some of OCUFA’s activities between June and September 2023, and some of its strategic priorities moving forward. The report’s focus outlines planned responses to the provincial government’s “Blue Ribbon Panel” initiative; OCUFA’s efforts to reform bankruptcy and insolvency laws; tracking University policy changes in response to Bill 26; an update on negotiation trends arising after Bill 124 was declared unconstitutional; and information about OCUFA’s commitment to advancing equity, diversity, inclusion, and Indigenization. The report also highlighted the planning for OCUFA’s upcoming policy conference “Funding Our Future: Keeping Universities Public,” which will be attended by QUFA representatives. Professor Narain concluded his report with his expression of interest in receiving invitations to speak with association members across Ontario regarding these priorities and associated planning.

The dominant themes of these discussions highlight the perceived resistance to transparent and meaningful consultations with faculty and experts in the postsecondary education sector as the provincial government engages in critical decision-making that will influence the future of postsecondary institutions. I can’t help but draw a parallel to QUFA’s ongoing enquiries respecting the University’s budgetary planning, refusal to facilitate avenues for faculty to appeal the use of recording and transcribing software for some classes, and resistance to sharing information that is necessary to facilitate QUFA’s representation of member interests.

Although these observations paint a somewhat bleak picture respecting the future of labour relations in the university context, I was encouraged by the energies around the table on Friday. It is refreshing to be surrounded with colleagues at QUFA and in the broader sector who understand the importance of keeping voices of faculty and industry experts at the forefront of planning initiatives to best protect the integrity of university education in Ontario. I received some helpful feedback and advice respecting strategic grievance planning, and I look forward to continued opportunities to draw from OCUFA expertise as QUFA continues to advocate for the advancement and protection of the rights and interests of the membership.

If you have any questions about the information shared at the October meeting, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Notes
2That decision has been appealed by the Ford government. Arguments were heard in June, and the decision of the COA is pending.

Karen Sisson can be reached at ks233@queensu.ca.