

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate February 17, 2017

Present: Alex, Ambrose, Blanton Blodgett, Commissiong, Craig, DeButte, DeOtte, Dursun-Kilic, Hindman, King, Klaehn, Lee, Lust, Revett, Tao, Seward, Stuntz

Guest: Jean Stuntz for Brian Ingrassia, Pippa MacDonald for Carolyn Ottoson, Dave Rausch

Absent: Vicki Hartin, Choon-Ha Nam, Neil Meredith, Enyonam Osei-Hwere, Bin Shao, Michelle Bartlett,

D. Craig acting as secretary due to an illness.

Vice President Maxine DeButte called the meeting to order about 12:15 pm. Senate President is attending a professional meeting. We deferred approval of minutes for a report from guests:

Online Proctoring Pilot Report

J. Andrews from external programming came along with D. Rausch to report on the pilot of online proctoring and evaluations systems. Currently testing Examity and will continue with ProctorU and Respondus. The idea originally arose from realization in SACS review for a robust online solution to proctoring, etc. They related various student concerns so far, mainly about privacy, but also pointed out that online proctoring is very new and may require a cultural change in attitudes. Rausch related experiences with piloting so far: e. g. don't use for too many tests (major tests vs. quizzes, etc.) He also commented that it made the grade distributions in his course more reasonable. He likes using proctoring online, also notes that it may help to discourage local students from taking online courses when face-to-face likely is more effective for them. A. Commissiong asked how much professorial control is expected over the process? J. Andrews replied that it should not be forced, and there is likely to be an authentication-only option, with level of proctoring up to faculty member. He also noted it would probably take at least two years to implement after selection of the provider.

There was a general discussion about connectivity, testing center proctoring, online courses as a partial solution to classroom space problems, etc. R. Alex agreed about the need to discourage local students from online classes; Rausch mentioned he had suggested local "convenience fees" in the past. DeOtte mentioned that having non-interactive classes tends to lead to poor retention for incoming students. Rausch noted that he has surveyed dropped students and found most dropped due to course complexity issues rather than proctoring. J. Andrews noted that there are "suitability tests" for online students, and he would look more at those. There was a question about how/if the fees for the services would be passed on to the students. J. Andrews replied that there was no idea on that yet that he knew of, and it will have to be considered.

Previous minutes:

A. Commissiong moved minutes be accepted, and this was seconded and approved.

Old business

Instructor promotion proposal

Dean's council indicated they might be willing to approve this with revisions. Examples were given in agenda (short versions below):

- Promotion after only 7 years and restriction to top 10% of instructors, etc.
- Senior instructors receive 6 months' notice before termination and seniority preference...
- Deans may promote outstanding instructors to fixed-term/clinical, etc.

J. Stuntz reported as proxy for B. Ingrassia that he opposes the exclusivity and six vs. nine month warning ideas. K. Seward noted that which categories will be considered for "outstanding" in the evaluation needs to be clarified, and that it should emphasize instruction for instructors.

M. DeButte noted that the committee should meet again to discuss this. N. Meredith's impression to her was that the Dean's Council wants more exclusivity in this process, and that the Council and Provost would accept it with revisions.

Committee on Post-Tenure Review

Provost requested two more volunteers from senior faculty from Senate before their first meeting. J. Stuntz and T. Kilic volunteered and will serve.

Committee on Committees report

DeButte reported on meeting of the committee and noted that there were only a few changes likely so far: renaming the Parking committee to Parking and Transportation, and possible merging of the Information Technology and Instructional Technology committees. The Committee on Committees will meet again in the next few weeks.

Promotion and Tenure Assessment Committee Update

Provost has notified the chair of the committee, Emily Hunt, to convene this committee as soon as possible.

Sedona update

Provosts and Director of Institutional Research are coming to Senate on March 3 to discuss this. There is a possibility of changing to Digital Measures but the cost difference (\$48,000 vs. \$12,000 per year) is an issue in a year with budget cuts. There was some general discussion of Sedona and the cost issue, how it was used by administration vs. convenience for faculty, etc. R. DeOtte noted that \$48,000 is a very tiny part of the university budget and would pay for itself if it were more convenient and less time-consuming for faculty.

H1B Visa training update

The Provost is planning to bring in the TAMU system point person/expert on immigration to do training for WTAMU personnel. T. Kilic asked if this would be one-time or repeated, and that is not known yet. M. DeButte noted that she has had very good experiences with this person.

Big picture finance update

VP for Business and Finance, Randy Rikel, will attend Senate meeting on March 24 Current questions for him are:

1. Are capital campaign funds being directed toward the retention and hiring of faculty?
2. Where is the money going from significant increases in enrollment and tuition?

Please submit any other questions you may have ahead of time to Neil and he will pass them along to Randy.

Confusion on evaluation scores to report for Annual Professional Summary

The Provost is working on a document for the faculty on this issue. There is also a possibility of adding a training page on the intranet. D. Lust and T. Kilic asked where the proper set of scores were to be found, and DeButte replied that one place is the WTAMU HB2504 web page, and that it needs to be the set of scores that give professor and course information separately.

There was no more old business.

New Business

Extra credit for taking student evaluations and the FAQ page.

President Meredith reports that profs in his department who give extra credit get different evaluation scores, whereas VP DeButte notes no apparent difference in her department and some others. There is a general concern for bias and the apparent "punishment" of students who don't evaluate if extra credit is given.

M. Meredith would like a standard operating procedure managed by the university rather than the faculty. Several issues were raised by senators, here is a list from discussion:

- Commissioning: Did extra credit raise the response rate? DeButte: Not known.
- D. Craig: It would take several years of statistics just to work out importance of response rate, for example.
- D. Lust: Any guidance from administration on a target response rate? DeButte: not any given, but they mention 60% just as an example.
- R. DeOtte: CIEQs are only supposed to be part of our evaluation and we need to use other methods as well, D. Craig concurred and noted all faculty and departments need to be encouraged to develop and use other assessments.

As noted in agenda, Dean's Council is also reviewing these issues in next meeting.

FAQ page on post-tenure review and “termination” language

The provost is not a fan of the “terminated” language, does Senate recommend removing this language?

There was some general discussion, then J. Stuntz pointed out that this was put in to satisfy legislature’s need to show that professors could be fired. She also noted the language could be changed to “released” or something similar. R. DeOtte noted that this is a long process, about four years or so for removal. There was some general discussion about whether any change in this language would be important. DeOtte and Craig noted that checking the legal status of the language might be needed.

D. Craig moved that we communicate our comments to the provost and ask him what he wants us to do about this. A. Commissiong seconded and the motion passed.

Announcements

- Provost Shaffer will attend March 3 meeting.
- President Wendler will attend April 7 meeting. It will begin early (12:00) to accommodate his schedule and give more time for discussion.
- Dean Spaulding of the Graduate School will attend the April 21 meeting.
- Regent’s Professor process will be started later this month. Full professors with five years at that rank are eligible.

J. Stuntz reminded everyone that it will soon be time to elect new officers. Senators should check on the rotation schedule for their terms, especially those interested in serving as officers, and be prepared to notify Deans and supervisors for course release if elected.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned about 1:30 pm.