

Minutes Faculty Senate

20 January 2012

Call to order: President Gary Byrd called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m. in 11 JBK.

Senators present: Alex, Ambrose, Anwar, Bartlett, Bigham, Byrd, Castillo, Crandall, Drumheller, Jafar, Kuennen, Landram, Loftin, Parr-Scanlin, Pendleton, Rosa, Severn, Vizzini, Ward, and Wilson

Substitute: Mary Rausch for Johnson

Revision and approval of minutes: Byrd led a discussion on changing minutes and tape recording to assure minutes are most accurate. It was decided not to tape record Faculty Senate meetings. Rosa motioned and Vizzini seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the 2 December 2011 Faculty Senate meeting as revised by Drs. Hallmark and Rausch. The motion passed unanimously.

Faculty newsletter: Byrd will prepare a newsletter of Faculty Senate actions and resolutions to inform faculty before Faculty Senate minutes are posted.

Third-year Review and CIEQ discussion with Dr. Hallmark:

Wade Shaffer and the Associate Deans' Council were asked to provide details to flesh out the third-year review process. Dr. Hallmark hopes the revised process will be put into action for the upcoming review cycle.

Byrd asked if the third-year review was for development of a faculty member or for comparison between faculty in different departments. Dr. Hallmark said Section 5.2.10 on termination is the only place in the third-year review that does not mention development, but the rest of the third-year review process is to provide feedback to the faculty member. Only one person during Dr. Hallmark's four cycles as Provost was offered a terminal contract, but that decision was overturned.

A line needs to be added in the department and dean sections the same as in the provost section to say actions for improvement. Jafar was concerned with the third-year review letter stating what is needed for improvement because a faculty member might think making only the needed improvements as stated in the letter are assurance for tenure. Dr. Hallmark said letters need to provide "hedge" language; feedback does not assure faculty of tenure if they do what is recommended in the letters.

Rausch was concerned about the value of the third-year review because faculty still could be terminated in the 4th or 5th year. Severn asked if there was any thought of starting the review before the third year, such as at 2.5 years. Dr. Hallmark said The System requires a mid-tenure review not to begin until completion of the third year, so WT is forced to comply with the System requirement. He believes there is value in a candidate putting together a portfolio in totality, not just by year. Dr. Hallmark also believes there is value in more faculty at different levels, not just a single department committee in consultation with the department head, reviewing a faculty member's performance. Dr. Hallmark thinks department heads have too much power in the

annual review, while the third-year review involves evaluation by a larger group of tenured faculty. Landram said someone other than the department head should review faculty performance; he said students in courses such as algebra evaluate instructors worse than students in easier courses such as computer games, and the results of the evaluation by the department head go up to the university committee. Dr. Hallmark would like CIEQs to be interpreted in the context of courses and said if CIEQ scores are not considered in context, the department head or other administrator is not doing his job. Rosa said the CIEQ was never designed for online courses; he and Anwar can't get online students to complete the CIEQ. Vizzini said in the WT move to quantify the tenure and promotion process, committee members are forced to use departmental standards and not discuss exceptions as much as were discussed in previous years. Dr. Hallmark thinks standards are valuable because they communicate what is expected, but reviewers need to use good judgment when making judgment calls after knowing the performance of individual faculty members. Byrd said there is need to do something to try to maintain balance between true performance and having just a checklist.

Vizzini serves on the university tenure committee and reads portfolios first for an overview, and then reads the annual evaluations by department heads, but he asked to what extent the third-year review is disregarding all the advice already given by the department head. Vizzini asked if the third-year review should be a dry run for the tenure process. Rosa asked how evaluations should be interpreted if a faculty member has had multiple department heads or deans; Castillo commented that her department had had three department heads in four years. Dr. Hallmark said department heads at WT are now evaluated every three years. He said department chairs rotate at many universities and are not permanent. Rausch said some WT departments are not large enough to have any tenured faculty so only the department head reviewed the third-year portfolios. Departments of Communications and often Nursing, SES, and Communication Disorders have few, if any, faculty to form a departmental review committee. Anwar said section 5.2.6 on the third-year review structure is excellent regarding when departmental committees meet but he said the process is not applied sometimes when only a few faculty in a department meet informally; the whole committee needs to meet in a formal process. Dr. Hallmark already changed the wording to "will" to state the departmental committee will, not just "may", be involved.

Anwar said Associate Deans at WT have served on review committees, but most universities do not allow administrators to serve on tenure committees. During the tenure process in fall 2011, Dr. Hallmark did not know an associate dean was involved on both department and university committees, but he has since learned this. Dr. Hallmark thinks associate deans should not be part of tenure and promotion committees. But, he asked what kind of administrative appointment should be eliminated from serving versus which would be allowed (i.e., associate dean versus director of honors program, etc.). Dr. Hallmark said on the Program Review Committee, a college dean asked if he could appoint a department head as a member of the Committee and was told a department head could be a member only if the faculty wanted to appoint the department head to the Program Review Committee. The tenure and promotion policy does not now exclude an associate dean from serving on tenure and promotion committees, but this will be discussed at the meeting in March when the university tenure and promotion committee will review and make changes. Jafar asked

if a person applying for promotion should serve as an outside member in another College; Dr. Hallmark had not thought of this potential problem.

Dr. Hallmark said decoupling the third-year review from the tenure process is okay in most cases [see amendment Appendix by Dr. Hallmark]. The number of third-year portfolios, such as the 17 in Fine Arts and Humanities this cycle, can be large. Some third-year review portfolios surpassed portfolios by several tenure-seeking faculty, which might be an issue when third year and tenure times are linked. Rosa suggested third-year faculty with exemplary portfolios might be encouraged to apply early for tenure.

Jafar said it is not clear from the third-year review process when letters should be added to a portfolio or not. Dr. Hallmark said this is embedded in the tenure and promotion process. It was suggested to state when letters of recommendation by the committees should be added to the portfolio. Rosa asked who is supposed to send letters to a candidate. Letters from the departmental committee go to the department head but not directly to the candidate. The department head, not the departmental committee, is supposed to send a letter to the candidate. Rosa asked if annual evaluations by the department head and departmental review committee of a non-tenured faculty member shouldn't be added to the third-year folder. There was discussion on whether there is a policy for letters from the third-year review to be put into the tenure package. Dr. Hallmark said all information needs to be in the portfolio. Anwar asked if an officer for structure and procedure might be needed to make sure rules are in compliance, because everyone at WT seems to be running his own show. Byrd said a checklist is needed to be sure all letters, standards, etc. are in the portfolio without adding information or letters to the folder after the review committees have begun evaluating. A checklist needs to become part of the faculty handbook. Anwar suggested adding a flow chart in the faculty handbook to clarify the review process.

Ambrose said to include "tenure-track associate professors" with the "tenure-track assistant professors" in section 5.2.1. Dr. Hallmark said faculty beginning employment later than the start of the fall semester have an extra part of a year before starting their timeline before review for tenure. Jafar asked if the wording in section 5.2.7 of "independent" recommendation by the department head should be changed to "separate" assessment by the department head.

Byrd suggested that Faculty Senate take the role of tweaking the third-year review process to be a little more developmental, with proposed revisions to be submitted to Dr. Hallmark for consideration.

Rosa asked if there is enough time to implement changes in the CIEQ and other evaluations. Dr. Hallmark said changes do not apply to annual evaluations due this 1 February but begin with classes being taught this spring semester. He does not expect the process to be easy but said WT must start and push now but can revise and tweak later so WT is not relying on the CIEQ five years from now. Dr. Hallmark thinks WT relies too much on the CIEQ while some universities in Texas have limitations on student evaluations. Byrd complimented Dr. Hallmark on taking the initiative to supplement the CIEQ. Drumheller asked about other qualitative measures, and Rosa was concerned about peer evaluations. Dr. Hallmark said department faculty in collaborative effort should come up with other 50% of evaluations to supplement the CIEQ [see Amendment Appendix by Dr. Hallmark]. Byrd and Hallmark agree faculty

should be very involved in deriving what needs to be done and not allow changes to be made without faculty leading and deliberating to facilitate good ideas for change. Faculty Senate could serve as a clearinghouse for suggestions that departments could use to supplement the CIEQ.

Faculty Development Leave request: Bonnie Roos submitted her application for Faculty Development Leave before the 1 December deadline. Drumheller moved and Rausch seconded the motion for Faculty Senate to approve Bonnie Roos' application. The motion passed unanimously. The application will be sent from Faculty Senate to the Provost's Office to be submitted for approval to the Board of Regents if they approve faculty development leave this year. In the future, the Provost's Office will notify all WT faculty early in the fall semester of the criteria, procedures, and deadlines for Faculty Development Leave.

The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Bonnie B. Pendleton, Secretary

These minutes as amended were approved on 3 February 2012.

Appendix: Amendment by Dr. Hallmark on 1 February 2012

“Dr. Hallmark said decoupling the third-year review from the tenure process is okay in most cases. The number of third-year portfolios, such as the 17 in Fine Arts and Humanities this cycle, can be large. Some third-year review portfolios surpassed portfolios by several tenure-seeking faculty, which could be an issue when third year and tenure times are linked.” This is not inaccurate, but I KNOW I said in this discussion that it was coupled for logistics purposes so we would not have two committees working simultaneously, particularly when we have so many departments that do not have enough tenured faculty to fill one or more committees. What you have written is accurate, and is what I said, but I also said something about logistics and that is an important component that didn't make the minutes.

“Dr. Hallmark said department faculty in collaborative effort should come up with the other 50% of evaluations to supplement the CIEQ.” Don't know what I said, but the rule is that the CIEQ must count for “no more than 50%”. The statement in the minutes would lead one to believe the rule is 50% CIEQ, and 50% something else. Instead it should be “CIEQ no more than 50%.” Frankly, and for the record if that matters, I hope it is less—considerably less—than 50%, but that is the faculty's call. My only call is no more than....