Faculty Senate Minutes
25 January 2013

Senators Present: Alex, Ambrose, Anwar, Atchison, Dalton, Drumheller, Jafar, Johnson, Kuennen, Landram, Loftin, Pendleton, Rausch, Riney, Severn, Vizzini, Ward

Senators Absent: Bartlett, Crandall, Takacs, Vick

Guests: Anne Medlock (substitute for Crandall), Jeremy Lewis (substitute for Takacs), Gary Byrd, Amy Andersen, Pat Tyrer

Call to Order: Ambrose called the meeting to order at 12:18 p.m. in Room 14 (Eternal Flame) of the JBK.

Approval of Minutes: Ward made a motion seconded by Atchison to approve as written the minutes of the 30 November Faculty Senate meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Ombuds Officer: Ambrose said he had not yet heard from Dr. O'Brien about the selection of the Ombuds Officer.

Parking Issue: Something needs to be done soon if something is going to be done to try to correct the problem before the Fall semester.

Faculty Development Leave: Applications were received from Drs. Elizabeth Morrow Clark and Denise Parr-Scanlin. Two, half-year leaves or one, full-year leave will be available. Vizzini said he thought both were really good proposals. Anwar said both would have good outcome assessment. Drumheller made a motion that Faculty Senate recommend both for one half-year each. Vizzini seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by all Faculty Senators present.

Supplementing the CIEQ:

Guest Amy Andersen said WT is moving to using online evaluations of faculty teaching, but the response rate for students completing the CIEQ online is dismal. Rausch said students completing online evaluations do provide good comments. The goal of the Committee Andersen chaired this summer was to provide additional measures faculty might choose for administrators to evaluate. Now, half of the evaluation of faculty instruction is based on the CIEQ, so additional measures provide other items outside of the CIEQ.

Ambrose said not only should pedagogy be evaluated but also the content of the course, and the proposed changes for evaluating faculty teaching do not seem to include much evaluation of course content. Vizzini said the issue at the end of the day should be how we know faculty members are providing nuts and bolts instead of just a floor-show in a course. He asked Andersen and Pat Tyrer to what extent a document like the new form might be tailored to individual departments. Andersen said peer observation could be used to judge the content of a course, and evaluation of course

content also could be included in instructor-developed evaluations of students. Partial student / partial self evaluation might be used. The CIEQ includes a few questions on course content. Tyrer said a course dossier, portfolio, and sample of student work could include course content. The CIEQ evaluates whether a student is entertained or likes the teacher.

Jafar said most faculty members in quantitative disciplines do not understand what some education items such as "start-stop-continue" in Section B (Additional Evaluation Measures) mean. Kuennen asked how the items will be weighed. Additional measures will count as 20% of the weight for faculty instructional responsibilities. Tyrer and Andersen said not all faculty members can do every option. Tyrer said additional measures to support teaching should be determined by the faculty member. Atchison said from an assessment standpoint, the evaluation is considered competitive because merit increases are involved, but too much subjectivity is in the proposed form. Tyrer said that is why additional measures were limited to 20%, with 10% by students. Atchison said variability should be limited as much as possible and department heads might prefer to limit the additional measures chosen for evaluation. Tyrer said everything in Section B needs to be narrated for the department head. Vizzini said he used to write long narratives to accompany the APS; he wrote reflections and assessments so the department head would realize that not all faculty and courses are the same and that CIEQ scores are not just numbers. Andersen said the revisions by the Committee are trying to do that.

Kuennen asked about the department head including the syllabus in the evaluation and said all faculty in his department use the same metric. Tyrer said it is up to the department head whether he chooses to review items faculty include. Kuennen said if an item is up to an individual faculty member's discretion, should it be up to faculty or the department head whether it should be evaluated. Dalton asked if we shouldn't assess the department head to see if he is biased. The department head should be overseeing the department, not cattle prodding. Tyrer said the evaluation is driven by faculty, not department heads. Vizzini said senior faculty reviewing junior faculty provides for greater consistency in the department. Vizzini said department heads evaluating individual faculty members is inconsistent, but there also could be inconsistent evaluations among departments on campus because of the different department heads. Tyrer and Andersen said evaluation of CIEQ scores currently differs by department head.

Vizzini asked how to distinguish among faculty doing different things (for example, not always going to development workshops, but doing other development activities). Vizzini believes the evaluation should measure whether everyone is doing his craft. Drumheller said there are some concerns about how department heads might evaluate the different items. Andersen said the Committee discussed having structured training for department heads. Tyrer said department heads need formal training to determine numbers. Anwar suggested training department heads but also giving additional reinforcement and re-evaluation training later.

Drumheller asked if a "yes/no" response could be used for an item or whether the department head would judge quality. Drumheller said her College does peer evaluation and with peer observation, she suggested faculty should receive a yes or no

for making the effort or not. Rausch said he cannot find anyone to peer evaluate his online course.

Drumheller said Faculty Senators thought teaching a course overload was covered in a different Section and they wanted to give extra credit in Section C (Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions) if faculty do more than is required. Andersen said she thought Section C was not a bonus for teaching a course overload. Vizzini asked about recognizing teaching overloads. He is concerned about junior faculty volunteering to teach overloads; some faculty teach overloads but do not receive credit. At what point does an innovative, risk-taking, volunteering faculty member receive credit? Rausch said it is not his job to set his teaching load, but faculty should know what to expect for a load, etc. Atchison asked how compensatory should WT be to faculty teaching overloads. Atchison asked what does course load in Section C mean when some courses have large numbers of students, other classes are small, etc. Jafar asked what faculty would need to do to earn 100% of the points available for Section C. Tyrer said teaching in the CORE. Atchison said points in Section G are a bonus, but the other 10% could be distributed among other sections. Jafar asked what is the minimum required for an online course and what criteria should be used for online courses. Jafar said there have been issues with online courses for the past 10 years. Drumheller said issues with online courses are now on James Andrews' agenda.

Jafar said the evaluation needs to quantify; 90% now is social and behavioral. Atchison asked how does one obtain information and measure "treating all students with respect and courtesy", and how is the department head going to evaluate it. Faculty members also worry about the term enthusiasm in presentation of course material; WT faculty might get caught in a scenario of "is he enthusiastic enough to satisfy the evaluation at the end of the course?" Rausch said when he is most enthusiastic in class, students hate for him to be enthusiastic of government. Tyrer said the teaching self assessment workshop has items to evaluate oneself – all items combined reflect how well faculty members treat students. It was asked how the department head will know faculty do items in Section D (Communication and Interaction with Students). Drumheller asked how to document evidence and was told by longer narratives, including copies of materials, measurement tools used, etc. Jafar suggested having someone visit the class.

Ambrose asked if faculty need to do all or just some of the items in sections E (Academic Innovation) and F (Collaboration, Communication, Participation, Professionalism). Jafar suggested changing the last bullet point of Section F (treats all faculty, staff and students with respect and courtesy) by removing "all" faculty. Anwar said the Committee met five or six times during the summer and discussed how to measure items in Section F. He said there is much room for abuse – if the department head likes you, fine, but how do you deal with distinct personalities -- faculty in some disciplines are loners, while other disciplines tend to be extroverts. Anwar said some departments have many underlying issues (retaliation, discrimination, harassment, etc.). Evaluating spending time interacting with colleagues might be tricky and could lead to subjectivity. Tyrer said bullet points in Section F do not rely on social components. She said bias and harassment are legal issues and outside the scope of the evaluation. Anwar said collegiality was removed from the old form, but is back on this form. Determining collegiality might be abused. Andersen said her Committee did not add

collegiality, but only the list of additional measures. Rausch suggested the department head should find out if there are other issues involved when a faculty member is quiet.

Jafar wants resolution as to how many bullets a faculty person should do of each option list because the department head might want more than faculty do. At his former employment in industry, Jafar sat with his department head and defined and negotiated his objectives for the year; at the end of the year, he was evaluated on whether the objectives were met. He suggested this might work at WT, but faculty might renegotiate in the middle of the year if goals are not working.

Anwar said the purpose of WT is quality, but sometimes there is too much recycling of exams and assignments, and perhaps the university should force faculty to revise and update to produce better quality for students. Dalton said nebulous things are impossible to evaluate; hard data are needed for proof. He said WT is trying to do something impossible and needs to get down to a basic rubric of does the student do a quality research project, do faculty members publish, etc.? He said the easiest things to evaluate are does the faculty member show up to class, does he lecture, do students hate him? Landram said the more we add, the more complicated it will get. He asked if high CIEQ scores and publishing a lot are not enough. Dalton said too much credit is offered to the student, and the department head tends only to hear complaints by students who are made to work. Landram tries to put the burden of learning on the student, but faculty should not take all the blame for students failing or not failing. Anwar said any time people do research and write they are communicating with their discipline – if faculty stop reading, they stop teaching effectively. Any time a faculty member is a good researcher, all the world will know. Any time a faculty member is a good teacher, the campus will know.

Severn asked why WT students cannot be forced to complete the evaluation – some universities are forcing students to fill out the evaluation online or not receive grades. He said he does not know of any policy against forcing students to complete online evaluations except at WT. Andersen said it will not do WT good to limit student enrollment, grades, etc. for not completing the CIEQ. Tyrer said until students become accustomed to the online evaluation, there is lots of negative feedback. Drumheller said that while she was at McMurry University, faculty were told they could not force students to complete evaluations because lawsuits had been threatened at other universities; similar fears might be driving WT. Vizzini supports teaching evaluation and said the Provost said the CIEQ online would save time and money, but with all the extra time involved, it is not saving time or money. Andersen said paper CIEQ forms cost an immense amount more money than does online evaluation. Vizzini asked if WT is taking something already broken and making it worse. Dalton suggested not trying to put too much information online (like teaching surgery online). Andersen and Tyrer were dismissed.

Ambrose said Dr. Shaffer wanted Faculty Senate to review and approve the new procedures. Ambrose asked if he should go to Shaffer and request him to wait for what will come. Vizzini asked if pushing adoption of the new procedures now is not going to be worse. Ambrose said Faculty Senate passed a motion at the last meeting to pilot the new procedures first and take a little more time to be sure the new process will work. Kuennen suggested having several departments volunteer to pilot the process.

Atchison said it is difficult for departments to pilot when the new form is not finalized yet; Andersen and Tyrer left with no finalized form, and revisions still are needed by the Committee. Anwar suggested having the formal CIEQ revision committee rework the form for Faculty Senate to review. Anwar said discussion on revision is needed with all WT faculty. Landram said the new form is not modeled after similar procedures at any other university. He said WT needs to contact other universities to learn what they do and what works. Drumheller suggested learning how to quantify items from the WT CIEQ revision committee before implementing a new form. Severn said specifics as to implementation by faculty are needed. Jafar suggested having training sessions to teach faculty. Jafar said he thinks the department head should have time to sit with each faculty member to agree together what the faculty member plans to do for the year. Riney said whatever form is used, faculty should have at least a year in advance because during the year he applied for tenure, some faculty did not receive tenure because they did not know what Provost Chapman expected of them. Dalton asked if we are trying to make WT faculty into generalists. Ambrose said Shaffer plans to attend Faculty Senate next time.

Inviting Police to Discuss Faculty Action during Campus Violence: Jafar asked if the head of police might be invited to Faculty Senate to discuss guns on campus, violence, etc. so we can understand the law. It was suggested that Ambrose should invite the head of police to come to Faculty Senate. Jafar wanted to know the boundaries of faculty to monitor guns on campus. Drumheller said faculty need to be told exactly what to do. Severn said deans, but very few faculty, attend CERT meetings. Severn suggested that faculty should take the on-line active shooter training. Faculty Senators should ask faculty to complete the online training on the police site. It is not against state law to carry a gun on campus, but is against university policy, so faculty should call the police unless the student is in law enforcement and allowed to carry a concealed weapon. Chief Burns will be happy to add faculty to his list for the university evacuation plan, but usually uses staff because they are on campus full-time. Severn said during live shooter trainer, it is best for campus to be as empty as possible because it is unsafe during normal school hours. Jafar suggested having the Provost's office send a notice about online active shooter training.

The Faculty Senate meeting adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie B Pendleton

Bonnie B. Pendleton, Secretary

These minutes as amended were approved at the 8 February Faculty Senate meeting.