

Faculty Senate Minutes

30 November 2012

Senators Present: Alex, Ambrose, Anwar, Atchison, Bartlett, Crandall, Drumheller, Jafar, Johnson, Kuennen, Landram, Loftin, Pendleton, Riney, Takacs, Ward

Senators Absent: Dalton, Pjesky, Rausch, Severn, Vick, Vizzini

Guests: Gary Byrd, Howard Wilson for Dalton, Monica Hart for Severn

Call to Order: President Ambrose called the meeting to order at 12:19 p.m. in Room 14 (Eternal Flame) of the JBK.

Approval of Minutes: Drumheller made a motion seconded by Ward to approve as written the minutes of the 16 November 2012 Faculty Senate meeting.

Ombuds Officer: President O'Brien asked Ambrose to reopen and accept new applications for the WT Ombuds Officer position. Ambrose had Barbara Petty send another announcement to all faculty. An application was received from Harry Hueston. Ambrose also contacted everyone nominated by Faculty Senators or the Deans Council, but no one else applied. Gary Byrd was voted first choice by 13 of the 15 Faculty Senators present and voting. Harry Hueston was the first choice of two and second choice of six Senators. Jean Stuntz was the first choice of no Senators and second choice of seven Senators.

Faculty Development Leave: Denise Parr-Scanlin submitted her application for faculty development leave. Vizzini also received an application from Elizabeth Clark. Faculty Senators will vote on the applications at the first Senate meeting of the spring semester. Ambrose or Pendleton will send Senators the applications to review before the meeting.

Reports from Faculty Senate Sub-Committees: The Faculty Senate post-tenure review committee is working and will be ready to report in the spring. Loftin said the teaching loads committee members had not met but are waiting for information. Kuennen reported for the summer pay committee and said summer pay is now fairly equitable across campus. Only Fine Arts and Humanities responded to a survey. Severn has more information but was absent from Senate.

Teaching Evaluation Part of Annual Evaluation of Faculty: Faculty Senate is concerned how to increase response rates if the CIEQ goes online next semester. Gary Kelley said the CIEQ is not going online in the spring, but Shaffer said it probably will later. Student response rates online always are less than in face-to-face courses, but there is an increase in typed qualitative responses on how to improve the courses. The length of the survey does not seem to affect the response rate. The more students understand the purpose, the more students will complete the evaluation. The more input from administrators to encourage completing the CIEQ, the better. Anwar compared notes with colleagues at other universities and said high response rates on

evaluations are discipline specific; professors in some disciplines tend to be introverts and some are extroverts. Faculty should think of ways to encourage WT students to access and complete the CIEQ online. Crandall said research showed students prefer doing evaluations online. He suggested using WTCClass in courses so students are used to logging into courses online. Faculty should direct students to published results of the CIEQ. Gary Kelley was asked if students could access the CIEQ through mobile devices (ipads, mobile phones, laptops). The CIEQ is not available by mobile device yet. Anwar suggested purchasing 100 ipads per college to use. He said at many universities, freshmen in the future will be given free ipads. Jafar suggested a pilot study to see what works and what does not with an online CIEQ.

Annual Activity Evaluation Form. The CIEQ committee met five times in summer to revise the evaluation form that was then sent to the Deans and later to Faculty Senate. Anwar said any revisions must be approved by the committee. Jafar asked if the new evaluation form would be effective 1 January 2013. Ambrose reported that Shaffer said the new form could be implemented at the beginning of 2013. Jafar suggested piloting the new proposal to see if it works for one department or faculty member. Kuennen made a motion saying Faculty Senate strongly advises that the new evaluation form should not go into effect on 1 January 2013, or it should be piloted. Crandall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by the Senators.

Gary Byrd is preparing a white paper and a presentation for faculty to view on evaluation of faculty teaching. Byrd said only once before in the 36 years he has been at WT has faculty had input. Byrd said faculty members have their areas of specialty and discuss standards, etc., but what faculty do informally is not evaluated. WT faculty are entrusted to ensure curricula are appropriate and allow students to be competitive with anyone. Byrd wants to ensure course content is equivalent or better than at other universities. When Byrd visited Portland State, Oregon State, and University of Washington, he went to bookstores and saw books in his subject area, and he knows whether books in his area are fluff or high quality. He looks at textbooks or syllabi to sense whether the contents of his similar courses are equivalent or better than taught at other universities. Course content is difficult to evaluate and is a piece missing from the WT evaluation. For example, history faculty, not the department head of another discipline, are the best judges of history courses taught by faculty.

Ambrose was given comments on the new form that “nothing in the evaluation assesses the quality of a course, but only pedagogy.” Many bullet points in the evaluation are very subjective; some seem to overlap with service and scholarship. Senators suggested deleting or combining bullet points on the proposed form.

Concerning the percentage the CIEQ should count in evaluating faculty teaching (part A), Ambrose said he would rather trust students’ opinions than someone else’s. Drumheller proposed delaying discussion on the proposed percentage.

Part B. Additional Evaluation Measures. Ambrose said some faculty are being forced by department heads to do specific items and he reported that Shaffer said faculty should choose the items on which they want to be evaluated. Kuennen suggested faculty choose which additional items to do at the beginning of the year during the annual evaluation with the department head. Jafar asked who would evaluate the items – Senators decided this should be done by faculty. Jafar said the new form is written by an education person for education faculty. He asked about

“informal student responses (start-stop-continue)” and “clinical instruction evaluation.” Drumheller said Amy Andersen has documentation that describes/defines the additional measures. Jafar suggested having workshops on how to create portfolios, etc. Anwar asked how many Senators make portfolios each year – no Senator did. Atchison suggested adding a bullet saying “faculty in your discipline have reviewed your course.” Landram said each course should be judged differently because each subject is different. Drumheller said Faculty Senate should suggest doing a certain number of additional measures. Atchison asked what would be the scoring rubric for additional evaluation measures. Atchison said the evaluation form should have items with yes/no responses for information in addition to scores from the CIEQ; this would be different than if a department head is using it to judge the quality of a faculty member’s work. Atchison made a motion seconded by Kuennen to adjust part B into a dichotomous yes/no statement that additional measurements of evaluation chosen by the faculty member are occurring outside of the CIEQ and that a list of suggestions in addition to the ones listed be provided. The motion passed unanimously by the Faculty Senators.

Senators said Part C Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions is not necessary because faculty should be doing their jobs. Drumheller made a motion seconded by Crandall to delete part C and add the points into part G for accepting extra responsibilities based on departmental need. The motion passed unanimously.

Part D Communication and Interaction with Students. Riney suggested simplifying parts D, E, and F into one topic. The sections are full of subjectivity. It was suggested to delete the bullets for course syllabi, communicating, and giving well-organized up-to-date lectures. Drumheller suggested saying “does the faculty member do the job expected? – post syllabi, maintain office hours, etc.?” Drumheller moved and Atchison seconded the motion to remove part D and replace it with measurable items from part D of the current Faculty Handbook.

Senators decided that points in parts E (Academic Innovation) and F (Collaboration, Communication, Participation, Professionalism) need to be measurable and revised back to those in the Faculty Handbook. Crandall made a motion that points in parts E and F of the new evaluation form be revised back to those in the Faculty Handbook and be measurable. The motion passed unanimously by the Senators.

Drumheller suggested and Anwar supported inviting Amy Andersen and committee members to come to the first Faculty Senate meeting in the spring semester.

Atchison discussed the web sites with financial information obtained through Dr. O’Brien. Texas A&M System universities are compared.

The Faculty Senate meeting adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Bonnie B. Pendleton, Secretary

These minutes as written were approved unanimously at Senate on 25 January 2013.