

## **Minutes of Faculty Senate**

3 February 2012

**Call to order:** President Gary Byrd called the meeting to order at 12:23 p.m. in 11 JBK.

**Senators present:** Alex, Ambrose, Anwar, Bartlett, Bigam, Byrd, Drumheller, Johnson, Kuennen, Landram, Parr-Scanlin, Pendleton, Severn, Ward, and Wilson

**Senators absent:** Castillo, Crandall, Jafar, Rausch, Rosa, and Vizzini

**Substitute:** Louise Wade for Loftin

**Approval of minutes:** Dr. Hallmark's comments were added as an Appendix to the minutes of 20 January 2012. Anwar motioned and Wilson seconded the motion to approve the amended minutes of 20 January. The motion was unanimously approved by the Faculty Senators present.

**Faculty Newsletter:** A newsletter of Faculty Senate actions and resolutions will be prepared and sent to faculty, with copies to the department heads, deans, Provost, and President. Anwar suggested and volunteered to help set up links on the Faculty Senate Internet site for topics of special interest, such as summer teaching.

**Program Review Committee update:** Byrd said the Program Review Committee had not met since December, so no news about the Program Review process or financial data was available to report.

### **Supplement to CIEQ for evaluation of faculty instruction:**

Departments or disciplines have started working on supplements to the CIEQ for evaluating faculty teaching. Dr. Hallmark said when he met with Faculty Senate on 20 January that he wants no more than 50% of evaluation for instructional responsibility to be from the CIEQ. From Byrd's conversations with Dr. Hallmark, Dr. Hallmark was surprised most people seemed to be planning on weighting the CIEQ as much as 50%. Dr. Hallmark said supplements to the CIEQ were largely for the faculty to develop and he expects changes not to be perfect in the beginning but that several years from now they will have been worth making. Faculty are to work through what is best to use for evaluating instruction in their departments or disciplines. Some department heads seem to be ignoring the faculty's role in generating its own supplements, including not allowing a division within a department to develop its own supplements to the CIEQ. Dr. Hallmark was reported to have informed the Deans' Council that changes were to be largely from the faculty. Amy Anderson created a workshop scheduled for 9 February to present ideas for faculty to consider using to supplement the CIEQ for evaluation of teaching.

Faculty Senators discussed plans their departments or colleges had for supplementing the CIEQ for evaluations of faculty teaching. Byrd thinks it would be beneficial for departments to share their good ideas with other departments. Anwar said during the College of Business meeting that supplements to the CIEQ were discussed for 15-20 minutes and that a committee of nine people will be formed, with

members of the committee to visit classes in the College. Byrd reported that his discipline plans to use the CIEQ for 50% of evaluations to start.

Landram said if the weight of the CIEQ is lessened, people are going to have to look at other items, including peer review. Landram said the peer review form in the Faculty Handbook does not consider the syllabus or assess learning by students but only “entertainment” of students by the faculty member.

For Instructional Responsibilities in the Faculty Handbook, a variety of items are listed, with the CIEQ being only one item in the list. The Faculty Handbook does not set a percentage for any of the items. Drumheller said from the list in the Faculty Handbook that the CIEQ does not look like it would be worth 50%. Byrd said the Faculty Handbook does not tie your hands. The CIEQ ends up being about 33% during the tenure and promotion process but often is given more weight in the minds of reviewers. Drumheller thinks the weight of the CIEQ should be equal and consistent in the annual report and during the tenure and promotion process and asked if the faculty annual evaluation form will be revised. Anwar said a checklist is important and needs to be standardized for the tenure and promotion process. Anwar said some Colleges are meticulous and some are not during tenure and promotion reviews.

Severn asked if the 50% from the CIEQ is to be only the numeric scores from the CIEQ Summary or scores based on student comments written on the CIEQ, which are different metrics. Alex asked how comments on the CIEQ should be weighted. Drumheller thought comments could be used to supplement CIEQ scores; comments are qualitative. Anwar said comments written on the CIEQ are important, but only about 40% of students write comments. Byrd experienced that people on tenure and promotion committees view the CIEQ scores differently and have developed their own ways of considering comments. Byrd starts with CIEQ scores but looks at comments to enhance qualitatively and add to the picture suggested by the numeric scores. He also looks at alumni and other comments. Byrd said the CIEQ usually is the primary evaluation measure looked at by most reviewers during the tenure and promotion process, but department heads might be using the CIEQ as their main evaluation for teaching performance. Byrd thinks those with greater administrative roles and more to review tend to use their favorite evaluation items and do not necessarily look at everything.

Severn said and Anwar agreed that putting together a teaching portfolio might be useful. Drumheller was concerned about burdening faculty with more reports but suggested perhaps Sedona might be used to help prepare a teaching portfolio. A teaching portfolio should be convenient and depends on what is put into it. Written reports are not necessarily a good measure of what is actually going on in a class. Byrd said faculty already prepare syllabi and regular teaching activities which could be extracted and considered in evaluation of faculty performance. Byrd said he visits university bookstores when he is on vacation and by looking at the textbook used in a course can establish which faculty are teaching “fluff” and which are teaching substantial courses.

Byrd will meet with Dr. Hallmark and discuss the weight given to the CIEQ on the faculty annual evaluation form versus during review for tenure and promotion and will discuss inconsistency between what is allowed and what currently is being done. Faculty Senators are to keep Faculty Senate apprised of what issues may be developing on supplementing the CIEQ for evaluations of faculty teaching.

**Update on the proposed WT Ombuds Officer:** Byrd will meet with Dr. O'Brien on the afternoon of 3 February to be updated on the WT Ombuds Officer proposal.

**WT Faculty Standing Committees:** Ambrose is preparing a list of replacement faculty needed for WT Standing Committees. Faculty Senators should begin finding colleagues to serve on the committees.

**Update on Faculty Senate subcommittees:**

Byrd reported the Faculty Senate subcommittee on Cost-analysis of WT administration, academics, and athletics is waiting on financial information from WT.

On the two subcommittees that deal with faculty issues (Faculty teaching/release loads and issues related to Teaching/Graduate Assistants; Faculty evaluation, mentoring, and retention), supplements to the CIEQ for evaluating instructional responsibility are being discussed. At a previous meeting of Faculty Senate, the Senators discussed and passed a resolution on faculty teaching of summer courses. Ambrose also is sending an e-mail to Dr. O'Brien asking what he wants to consider before the subcommittee moves forward on new activities.

Drumheller reported the Changing WT processes so as to save money, time, and environmental resources subcommittee met several times and is claiming credit for getting rid of faculty printed timesheets. The subcommittee would like the company that recycles paper on campus also to start collecting cardboard. Water-use issues were discussed. The subcommittee wants to involve student groups.

**Lean Six Sigma:**

Severn said President O'Brien is taking the initiative and pushing for WT to be a Lean Six Sigma university. Lean Six Sigma ideas were developed for rebuilding Japan in the 1950s after WWII; they are simple ideas on how to do business and do business better. WT administrators need to buy in to make changes that are suggested from the bottom up.

The program has no connection to curriculum and is not about individual classes being taught, but is about how the university runs its business, such as advising, the STARR Center, how students get financial aid, how the university goes about awarding scholarships, and travel. Severn said WT needs to first map out the process. Drumheller pointed out there also are demands on WT that come from external sources.

Dr. O'Brien plans to have a series of introductory lunches for faculty. Deans and department heads will be trained.

The Faculty Senate meeting adjourned at 1:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Bonnie Pendleton  
Secretary

These minutes were approved on 17 February 2012.