Faculty Senate Minutes
22 February 2013


Senators Absent: Bartlett, Drumheller, Johnson, and Loftin

Guests: Shavron (substitute for Loftin) and Harry Hueston

Call to Order: President Ambrose called the meeting to order at 12:19 p.m. in Eternal Flame Room of the JBK.

Approval of Minutes: Vizzini made a motion seconded by Atchison to accept as amended by Anwar, Atchison, and Jafar the minutes of the 8 February Faculty Senate meeting. The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Hueston’s Study on Retention of WT Students: Hueston said President O’Brien at a College meeting spoke about low retention of WT students. Hueston thought incoming students did not know how to read, write, or think. He thought accepting incoming freshmen with dual credit caused problems. He worked with Pat Tyrer and Kendra Campbell. Kendra looked at 1,203 freshmen who entered in 2011, and followed them through 2012. Those who took the English 1301 course had a 2.53 GPA after their first semester at WT, while those who took an exam instead of the class had a 3.28 GPA. Only 53% of students who took the course were retained at WT, but 83% who took the exam were retained. WT students leave for one of three reasons: they see no value in college education, have a family legacy to go to another university but use WT to start, or lack financial support and cannot afford WT. Plans are to target IDS courses with findings for success and how to obtain scholarships and financial aid. Hueston wrote a letter with data to President O’Brien. WT is using a Noel Levitts survey to collect data to learn why WT students are not retained. Rausch said Noel Levitts gives each student a number based on chance of success.

Rausch said he once advised an incoming student with 32 credit hours who could hardly find any WT courses to take. Ward said perhaps incoming freshmen with dual credit are better students and would be retained better anyway. Severn said students with dual credit usually are driven to be good students. He asked how many students who earned F in an English course attended class 90% of the time and turned in any paper; the failure rate of a student who attended and turned in any paper was only 1%. Anwar said WT is not alone; “dumbing down” is being discussed at every university, Wall Street, etc. He said the problem is discipline specific. The book “Academically Adrift” addresses the issue, Christianson’s book “Innovative University” also is good, and “Four-year Party” book discusses students partying for 4 years. Vizzini has had freshmen with 4.0 GPA from high school earn 1.0 in his course. He said what surprises him is the many students who come to WT with no dual credit; many WT students are first-generation students, and perhaps low retention is a cultural issue. He
said at Chapel Hill, 90% of students have parents with college degrees. Vick said first-generation students do not know how to navigate college and are paralyzed with fear. Their families do not appreciate college. The students come to regional, low-cost universities. Vick said Texas teachers are facing the same or worse problems than WT is. Teachers teach to the test which is focused on reading, writing, and science. By the time students reach junior high, they have learned little social studies, and their brains are not developed to think in those ways. Dalton asked about the WT rejection rate – in Virginia, 75% of applicants are rejected. He thinks WT might be getting students who cannot get into a better university. Jafar asked if WT is doing a good job in IDS and whether only instructors, not professors, teach the IDS courses. Hueston thinks WT needs a thorough examination of why students are leaving – his data on freshmen coming with dual credit to WT do not hold up, but perhaps other disciplines would obtain different results. Crandall asked if WT administration is creating a committee to address retention. The First-Year Experience Committee is designed to look at many facets, and the Provost is involved.

Jafar asked about Hueston’s appointment as **Ombuds Officer**. Hueston said he contacted people in the same position at other universities and most are confused as to what the position entails. He is joining the international ombudsman association. Hueston is working with President O’Brien. Hueston is creating a web page approved by the Provost. Hueston needs to clarify what is legal. He then will meet with WT groups (faculty, deans, librarians) to make sure people know what his role is or isn’t.

Ambrose met with Provost Shaffer last week to learn what Faculty Senate should do about **revising the teaching evaluation**. Faculty Senate has been asked to submit a revised teaching document to Shaffer by 5 April. Ambrose set up a committee of himself, Anwar, Atchison, Pendleton, Riney, Severn, and Vizzini who will meet and present their findings to Faculty Senate on 8 March.

Gary Kelley put the **Evaluation of Administrators forms** into campus mail on 20 February. Comments should be typed and put into a sealed envelope with the administrator’s name on the front, and the Provost’s office will copy and deliver the comments to other administrators. The evaluations are due to Faculty Senate by 8 March; no late ones will be accepted. Faculty who do not want to give their evaluations to the Faculty Senator in their Department may take the evaluations to Gary Kelley or Ambrose.

Ambrose said the Faculty Senate **Post-tenure Review Committee** of six has finished. President O’Brien had asked Faculty Senate to update the post-tenure review section in the Faculty Handbook. Some things were slightly changed to mesh with other WT documents on promotion/tenure. The situation with “poor/unsatisfactory” was put into the lowest category. Discussion of summer school was removed because it no longer applies. Atchison said administrators will have to argue a person is considered “satisfactory” but is on post-tenure review if they do not like the suggested updates. Senators should review and be prepared to vote on 8 March.
Takacs said WT doesn’t have enough faculty members to cover teaching overloads. His handout at the end of last semester looked at teaching loads for fall 2011-spring 2012. In the Faculty Handbook, 12 hours is considered full-time which may be 15 hours for certain departments. Maximum teaching load should be 12 to 15 hours. In music, 22 of 24 faculty members teach more than 12 hours, six teach more than 18, and one teaches more than 21 hours; music is the most overloaded department. Each department head is responsible for speaking with Dr. O’Brien about overloads. Long ago, overloads used to be paid, but not in the last 11-12 years. Vizzini said a measure is in place to compensate for overloads, but the means are inconsistent by department. Vizzini wondered if Faculty Senate should pass a resolution to suggest considering teaching overloads when faculty are reviewed for tenure/promotion. Faculty Senate could pass a resolution that faculty should receive credit if they teach overloads. If faculty must teach overloads and are denied tenure/promotion, there might be lawsuits. Severn asked if a line should be added to the CIEQ supplement about teaching overloads, but how does teaching overloads compare with other tasks? Landram served on a WT committee where faculty had to teach lots of overload but did not receive tenure so were given 2 more years, but 2 years is not enough time to crank up other required activities. Severn suggested talking to faculty on committees and asking President O’Brien to push deans to give consideration to faculty who teach overloads. Riney asked if part of course load should deal with the number of students enrolled in the class. Takacs said according to the Faculty Handbook, faculty are supposed to receive extra credit for teaching more than 60 students in a class. Vizzini suggested WT follow up on faculty not being 3-3. He said that Hallmark said it would not help the situation because there would be for example, three sections of 80 students instead of four sections of fewer students. Rausch said student-credit hours, not sections of courses, count at the state level. Takacs suggested tracking the student:faculty ratio during the past few years. Rausch said some accredited departments can have only a limited number of students, but those not accredited can have any number of students.

Anwar said the Parking Committee will meet next Tuesday. Ambrose said faculty members in his department are not complaining about parking. Jafar said he parks across from McDonald’s, but the 60 green spaces were rezoned to only 15 and the others reserved for the forest service. Faculty parking spaces are being lost now. Crandall said nothing has changed about curb parking and suggested reconsidering going back to what we had before. Anwar hopes to seek a middle ground. Jafar counted 30 cars parked at Fine Arts after 12:30 midnight. Crandall said there are problems with patrons parking near the Fine Arts Building. Crandall said if parking is a WT revenue issue, at Texas Tech if a person wants to park near a building, he pays to park, otherwise he parks way away and takes a shuttle. Rausch said some cars park a long time and every car should move once every 24 hours or park in a long-term parking area. Takacs said resident students should park at FUBC or somewhere else and have a shuttle provided for them during extended hours. Parking at other universities needs to be studied.

Regents Professor nomination guidelines for the year were received. The nominee should be in mid-career and have potential for continuation, not about to retire. Rausch
asked who is full-time faculty and was told someone teaching full-time and not an administrator. The nominees need to be voted on at the end of the semester, and Dr. O’Brien will be provided with ranked choices to select who to forward to the state.

Shaffer asked to have a Faculty Senate representative on the learning assessment coordinator search committee. Drumheller and Vick were nominated and Ambrose will ask one of them to serve.

Student evaluation/CIEQ scores are available online, but may not be accurate based on differing sample sizes of students in courses. Anwar suggested adding another column for how many students completed the evaluation. Atchison said sample size of students completing the CIEQ is available at WT. Rausch suggested just using the CIEQ outputs. Rausch asked how many people look at scores online because he visits his site frequently to increase the traffic.

Anwar announced that he will attend the Texas Council of Faculty Senates meeting on 28 February and 1 March.

The Faculty Senate meeting adjourned at 1:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie B. Pendleton, Secretary

These minutes as written were approved by Faculty Senate on 8 March 2013.