

## Faculty Senate Minutes

8 February 2013

**Senators Present:** Alex, Ambrose, Anwar, Atchison, Bartlett, Crandall, De'Armond, Drumheller, Jafar, Johnson, Kuennen, Landram, Loftin, Pendleton, Rausch, Riney, Takacs, Vick, Vizzini, and Ward

**Senators Absent:** Dalton and Severn

**Guests:** Nicole Walls (substitute for Severn) and Gary Byrd

**Call to Order:** President Ambrose called the meeting to order at 12:18 p.m. in Eternal Flame Room of the JBK. He introduced new Senator De'Armond who is replacing Pjesky from Finance.

**Approval of Minutes:** Vizzini made a motion seconded by Kuennen to accept as amended by Drumheller and Jafar the minutes of the 25 January 2013 Faculty Senate meeting. The motion passed unanimously by those present.

### **Supplementing the CIEQ for Evaluation of Faculty Instructional Responsibilities:**

Ambrose reported he met for more than an hour on Monday with Provost Shaffer. Anwar said he serves on the CIEQ Committee and briefed Faculty Senate in October and November. Anwar read a follow-up e-mail message the CIEQ Committee received after Andersen and Tyrer attended Faculty Senate on 25 January. There was misunderstanding by some members of the CIEQ Committee regarding the interaction of Andersen and Tyrer with the Faculty Senate and the time Faculty Senate had been given the form to review. Faculty Senate is perceived as delaying, and the Deans are ready to move forward with the new form without waiting. Atchison was concerned that Faculty Senate received the form only in November, not September, and faculty had only a meeting before and a meeting after the holiday break in which to review the document they were expected to rubber-stamp. Atchison said a huge issue like this should not be rushed. The form will be used by WT for a long time and everyone will be stuck with it, if faculty do not speak up now. Ambrose said if Faculty Senators want to eliminate subjective items from the form, they need to speak up.

Anwar said we should show respect to colleagues and both sides need to have a say in the discussion in order to adopt an appropriate new form. Jafar said the Committee representative should have informed Faculty Senate and problems discussed before they happened. Drumheller said Faculty Senate should have been involved from the time the Committee started, not after the fact. Vizzini asked if this is an institutional thing and whether Senate is an afterthought with committees. It was suggested that Deans Council, Faculty Senate, and committees sit down together to discuss issues in the future.

Landram asked with what other universities WT conferred to learn their successes or what they would do differently, but Andersen and Tyrer had said WT did not confer with anyone. Vizzini finds disappointing that no data were obtained but

decisions will be made that impact faculty member's lives and careers. The Deans Council should be worried about lawsuits if faculty do not receive tenure.

Shaffer said he met with Ambrose who shared numerous concerns about the CIEQ form, but Deans are eager to move forward, although faculty need a little more time to discuss. Shaffer said many mistakes were in the promotion and tenure document because of a rush to produce it. He said communication had not been straightforward about the amount of time after Faculty Senate received the proposed form.

Vizzini said he thought his department used to have a good model; they wrote narratives, had peer evaluations, etc., but not much now. He asked if something came up short. Shaffer said 2 years ago as Dr. Hallmark was reviewing promotion and tenure folders he thought every ranking was based on CIEQ scores. Atchison said faculty are happy to again be discussing evaluation, do not love the old document, and a better document can be created. Drumheller said the CIEQ Committee discussed only Sections A and B, but Faculty Senate thinks all sections of the form should be reviewed.

Shaffer said he had a general sense of the concerns of Faculty Senate, and asked what tactics to focus on. Drumheller said the key issue is Section B. Faculty do not know what some of the items are, how they will be measured, how many need to be done, and how to receive full credit. Jafar said faculty with a quantitative background would not understand many of the items and asked if there will be a template for creating a portfolio, etc. Jafar asked if a Department Head does not like the items chosen by a faculty member, then what? He suggested each faculty member sit with his Department Head to agree on items to do and meet again before the second semester to check progress toward goals. Shaffer said he does not think faculty will be required to do all items in Section B, but it currently is open to interpretation and might turn into something a Department Head could abuse. Riney suggested adding parameters such as how many items to do, perhaps 2 of 3 items, for example.

Shaffer said there are many traditional instruction faculty at universities across the country, but new enhanced technology also is being sought. He wants to encourage all faculty to be trained and use new technology to enhance the educational experience of students, but does not mandate not lecturing in the classroom. He said the goal is to raise the focus of all faculty to alternative assessment methods. He said it is a quantity, but also a quality issue and the process is inherently objective. The current system has hundredths of a point on some subjective items. Takacs said there is a disconnect with how Department Heads use items for merit raises. He said he thought WT already had standards, but standards were never declined or approved. Riney was concerned about variability among Department Heads across campus. Shaffer said faculty should not lose out because one Department Head evaluates harder than another. Atchison said training Department Heads could help with evaluations, but Shaffer said even with training, there might be 18 interpretations by 18 Department Heads. Anwar suggested faculty at the College level sit down after 1-2 years to investigate what went right or wrong.

Anwar said Section F was not discussed by the Committee, but received by e-mail. He said Section F is the main problem in his opinion; if faculty do not get along with the Department Head, there could be problems. Shaffer said he thinks Section F is a valid category and stands alone but guesses Department Heads might overlook

Section F and give it the same overall score as for the CIEQ. Anwar said there currently are policies in place for leave and showing up for office hours and class, which probably are not necessary items to include on the form. Shaffer said at least several times a year, faculty leave without telling students they will be gone from class. Anwar questioned how to evaluate discussing with colleagues and treating all colleagues with respect and courtesy. Shaffer said Department Heads need to be able to say there is a problem, but if not written down, faculty cannot be evaluated on it. Anwar said faculty can write explanatory comments after their yearly evaluation by the Department Head.

Shaffer recommended pruning the bullet points on the proposed form, clarifying how items in Section B should be processed, determining what faculty need to do to earn full 20% credit in Section B and 10% in Section C, etc. Drumheller suggested stating in Section B that “yes, faculty are doing additional items in addition to the CIEQ.” Shaffer said faculty should document Section B items, but not submit excessive amounts of documentation like he received from some faculty when he was Department Head. Drumheller asked if items might be entered in Sedona to involve less writing. Rausch said faculty were not taught how to fill out Sedona, such as into what category to fit an item, especially by the music department. For example, community service and recruiting and teaching are linked, but are separate in Sedona. Jafar asked about privacy and who granted permission to post his CV somewhere besides Sedona. Shaffer said James Webb would be interested in learning that information from Sedona was posted outside WT. Anwar said faculty data are available through Google.

Atchison asked about evaluating content not just technique of a course. Byrd said WT should evaluate course content to meet at least minimum standards for a college-level course to be at least as good as at other universities. Shaffer said he is open to suggestions on how that can be done in a way that is not intrusive. It might be difficult to review the many unique courses WT faculty teach, but Core courses could be reviewed by several faculty. Byrd asked if a group of peers in history might evaluate in a general sense the level of Shaffer’s early American history course although they do not know the exact subject matter. Rausch said WT has challenges in some departments such as history where political science has different professional requirements and in a department such as math, chemistry, and physics where different subjects are taught. Atchison said in Psychology, faculty as a group evaluate psychology courses and discussed giving the information to the department head who is a sociologist. Shaffer said if all disciplines could come to agreement, it would be good to evaluate every course or some courses each year, but it is difficult to reach consensus. Faculty need to stay current, but Atchison said trying new things might negatively affect evaluation scores by students. Byrd said on the proposed form, there is nowhere to evaluate faculty not doing what is needed for course content. Drumheller said evaluating course content is program assessment and not teaching effectiveness. Byrd disagreed and asked how and where to document a faculty member not teaching up to par in one of several sections of a course in a program area. De’Armond said faculty should meet and discuss what is needed for students to be employable. Shaffer said the Business College maps curriculum and what is required when, but sees it as program evaluation.

Anwar asked if faculty have input into evaluating the department head every 3 years. Shaffer said the evaluation process for Department Heads is in place but he

needs to enforce it to obtain faculty input. Faculty are supposed to be allowed to submit information to Deans for Department Heads being evaluated, and faculty also have the annual evaluation of administrators. Shaffer said Department Heads are appointed by Deans and he would like to think but is unsure whether Deans take into account faculty input regarding evaluations of Department Heads. Shaffer said if Faculty Senate will develop a form, he will take it to the Deans Council for feedback.


**University Committees:** Shaffer reported WT is starting to search for a learning assessment coordinator/director and wants Faculty Senate to select a representative to the committee. He said WT is starting the SACS reaffirmation process again and needs a QEP (quality enhancement) committee for compliance to produce a document to be submitted in mid-2015, which sounds like a long time away, but will require a long time to produce. Rausch and Shaffer were on the previous QEP committee and started from scratch, but WT now has a procedure in place. Students, faculty, and staff will be surveyed and there will be town hall meetings to learn information, and then start the document. The QEP Committee will be finished in August, but SACS service will require more time. Faculty should contact Shaffer if they would like to serve or not, and he will put together committees this semester. The fifth year interim report was just accepted by SACS, but WT is starting on the next report.

Dr. Hallmark sent Shaffer information on the **Regents Professor**. Shaffer will forward the information to Ambrose to copy and give to Faculty Senators to nominate deserving faculty from their departments.

**Faculty evaluation of administrators** for this academic year is due by the 8 March Faculty Senate meeting because President O'Brien wants to review for feedback and potential merit increases. The evaluation packets to complete will be sent to faculty on 20 February. A similar process as last year will be used, with Senators collecting completed packets from faculty in their departments. Scantron forms will be taken to Gary Kelley, but typed comments in sealed envelopes will be taken directly to the Provost's Office; then, the Provost will send the comments up or down the chain to other administrators.

The Faculty Senate meeting adjourned at 2:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Bonnie B. Pendleton, Secretary

*These minutes as amended were approved at the 22 February Faculty Senate meeting.*