

Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, April 24, 2017
Clinton Hall 126, 3:30PM-5:00PM

Senators Present:

Senators Absent:

Summary of Action:

1. Accepted the report from the Court of Academic Appeals.
2. Accepted the report from the Faculty Affairs Committee
3. Accepted the report from the Faculty Support Committee
4. Accepted the report from the Rules Committee
5. Accepted the report from the University Admissions and Exceptions Committee
6. Accepted the report from the Undergraduate Research Committee
7. Accepted the report from the University Tenure and Promotion Committee
8. Accepted the University Promotion Guidelines for Teaching Faculty

I. Call to Order – Meeting called to order at 3:30PM by President Yildirim

II. Informal Statements and Proposals – None

III. Approval of Minutes

1. Minutes of the April 10, 2017 meeting were approved as corrected.

IV. President's Report

1. **Provost's Evaluation Survey** – The survey is almost ready to be distributed. Senators still have time to provide feedback. The survey should be distributed before next Monday (May 1st)
2. **Weapons Policy Training** will take place April 26th and 28th. Everyone is encouraged to attend. Training sessions are being recorded and will be available on my WSU.
3. **Weapons Policy Update-Boiler Plate Syllabus** – Syllabus language is needed regarding the Weapons Policy. President Yildirim noted that it is important to have a statement in place before the beginning of the summer semester. Senator Castro will resend the statement she crafted. Senior Associate Vice President Muma will add the statement to the HLC syllabus template.
4. **Planning for Ombudsperson Training** – President Yildirim said he is hopeful that Ombudsperson Training will take place during the Fall 2017 semester.

Currently, in the process of identifying someone to carry out the training and determining the cost. The previous training was well attended by faculty and staff.

5. **The Shared Governance Statement** – The statement is sitting with the President's Executive Team (PET). President Yildirim noted that the statement contains language which allows for the president of the faculty senate to have a reduced teaching load, and the USS and UP senate presidents to have an appropriate release. As the document has not yet been approved, some USS and UP members were not able to run.
6. **New WSU Student Fee Structure** – The Budget Committee is discussing a new fee structure. At this point the fee structure is per credit hour. The plan is to move to a model where it is not a function of a credit hour. It may be that students would pay a fixed fee – over a certain number of credit hours. President Yildirim would like faculty feedback on this issue.
Several members of the senate had questions including:
Question (Q) – Is the campus smoke free July 1st? Is someone letting people know? President Yildirim asked Associate Senior Vice President Muma how this information is being communicated to faculty, staff and students. **Response (R)** Associate Senior VP Muma will follow up and see if there is a campaign to let people know.
Q: Is there a penalty for a faculty members smoking on campus? **R:** President Yildirim stated that there were some individuals who received a ticket, but they were not supposed to be penalized. Associate Senior VP Muma stated the point of smoke free campus is not to go around policing, but to apply smoking cessation and assistance to help individuals. **Q:** What is the rationale for changing the student fee structure? **R:** President Yildirim commented that would be a good question to ask Dr. Hall.
Q: Are faculty involved in these meetings? **R:** President Yildirim stated that there are not members of the faculty senate involved in the meetings. **Comment:** We have seen a lot of stuff that is in the final model that we have not had a lot of say in until we see the final model.
7. **KBOR updates**
 - i. **GED** – College algebra should not be granted approval (rigor vs content). Content is not to the extent identified in the Kansas Core outcomes. There is still ongoing discussion.
 - ii. **Governance committee** – the Weapons Policy was discussed.
 1. No permanent adequate security measures
 2. Temporary adequate security measures at athletic events. At KSU – if a visitor asks for such measures, they will ask for temporary security measures. These measures require the purchase of metal detectors which will be purchased using athletic funds.
 3. Training of faculty on not telling students to stack their bags at the front of the class. The weapons policy requires you to have your

weapon under your control all of the time. What are the implications of this? Not clear on the answer to this question.

Q: In order to have temporary adequate we have to purchase these metal detectors. **R:** President Yildirim stated otherwise you would have to hire security people to run the event.

Comment: It was suggested that faculty have a telephone number that we could call and immediately get responses to questions. Faculty and instructors need a point of contact. President Yildirim stated that a boiler plate syllabus statement would help. **Comment:** Still think we need a contact to call.

4. AAUP Kansas State Conference will be held April 29, 2017 from 10:00AM-4:00PM at the Marcus Welcome Center. RSVP by April 24th, although individuals can RSVP later than today. **Q:** What is AAUP working on? **R:** Updates from committees, election of members, budget concerns, weapons on campus. This conference is open to all teaching faculty and graduate assistants.

V. Committee Reports

1. Standing Committee Annual Reports – The reports for all of the committees listed were accepted as presented.

- i. Court of Academic Appeals
- ii. Faculty Affairs
- iii. Faculty Support
- iv. Rules Committee
- v. University Admissions and Exceptions
- vi. Undergraduate Research
- vii. University Tenure and Promotion

VI. Old Business - None

VII. New Business

1. University Promotion Guidelines for Teaching Faculty – 2nd Reading –

During last meeting there was significant discuss on the scholarship of teaching and creative activities. Several members of the senate commented that scholarship of teaching and creative activities is research, and research was not required of teaching faculty. The committee revised the description and removed the research component from the proposal. President Yildirim shared the revised proposal and noted the changes that were made including; putting the expected achievement level in bold, removing rank language from the document, using the term levels, using parallel wording. The committee felt that professorship is perceived as having a terminal degree and wanted to make sure that those individuals who did not have a terminal degree has a clear path for promotion. The titles at three different levels were equivalent and if you earn a terminal degree you move to the corresponding level.

- i. **Q:** Are the higher level of achievement determined by departments? **R:** Yes, it is important that all the departments define the role of the teaching faculty.
- ii. **Comment:** We are trying to get rid of the class system, and would just like to that we have two tracks within a track so we need to be mindful that we don't create a class system.
- iii. **Q:** Is how this advancement works being considered and will it be modeled similar to the tenure and promotion structure for faculty? **R:** Yes.
- iv. **Comment:** I noticed in the criteria for promotion, there is the teaching excellence part, but there is also a service component. There is a problem if service is not in someone's appointment letter. **R:** The responsibility is defined within their department role statement.
- v. Several members of the senate commented that service was not part of the role statement for all teaching faculty, it varied by college and department. Some senators were concerned that teaching faculty might feel pressured to take on service, in which case their teaching might suffer. President-elect Shaw asked whether it was better to be specific to protect people or vague to protect people? After a lengthy discussion, Senator Castro made a motion to amend the document: every time the word service is used we put in the caveat "as defined in the role statement." **Motion was accepted**
- vi. There was general consensus that being vague was a better alternative and that it was incumbent upon departments to make the determination. The members of the senate then voted on the *University Promotion Guidelines for Teaching Faculty*. **Motion was accepted.**
- vii. President Yildirim stated that the committee will discuss how we start the process and guidelines for colleges and departments. According to President Yildirim, the Provost thinks that longer term contracts, for teaching faculty, are feasible. This could happen after a certain length of experience at the university or after a promotion. **Q:** Will this tie into a mandatory time period? **R:** President Yildirim stated that there would not be a mandatory time period, but every 6 years teaching faculty could ask for promotion.
- viii. The committee also proposed using an index for promotion and incentive salary increments. One other recommendation to President Bardo was that a committee be formed to study faculty compensation, and benchmarks with respect to peer institutions and set 10-year faculty compensation goals, similar to the compensation model used by KSU. Kansas State University Faculty Compensation Model.

2. Teaching Evaluation Policy – 1st reading - President Yildirim Bayram shared the following background: questions have been raised regarding the SPTs, they have not been revisited for some time, and in some instances the SPTs were perceived as taking the largest share of teaching evaluations. President Yildirim shared the *Teaching Evaluation Policy*.

- i. **Q:** Language to this effect is in the T&P guidelines. **R:** This policy is for the university level. If there is something that is not in line with this, then

there should be discussion. President Yildirim provided an example where the SPTEs and feedback were given to the Dean's office, prior to being given to the faculty member. The Teaching Evaluation Policy states that faculty has access to SPTE and feedback before anyone else.

- ii. **Comment:** The faculty member has the right to keep and include any information in tenure and promotion.
- iii. President Yildirim asked if this is applicable for adjuncts.
- iv. **Comment:** In a department where classes are small the students need to be able to give anonymous feedback, whoever administers the SPTEs should also be typing up the feedback. **Clarification Q:** Does exit interview mean the student's exit interview? **R:** Yes.
- v. **Comment:** The minimum requirement is one evaluation a year.
- vi. **Comment:** What is missing is the quantifiable outcome, it would be nice if that was included. President Yildirim asked the senator to send him an example.
- vii. **Comment:** We should also include some qualitative outcomes.
- viii. **Comment:** Suggest that IDEA be added to line 17. We could say only the quantitative summary from normed evaluations is required.
- ix. **Comment:** It is misleading to suggest to a colleague that they can go with one evaluation a year. We are communicating a path that is not likely to help them. There is a potential negative to not putting forward all of your evaluations. **Comment:** The onus is on the candidate and is a mentoring issue.

3. **Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness – Redoing the SPTE?** – President Yildirim brought up the question of whether we should revise or redesign a new shorter/simpler SPTE tool based on the following comments/concerns from the Teaching Evaluation Policy Committee.

- i. One that could be administered on-line and possibly use some of the current SPTE. As an evaluation tool, the SPTE is a proven tool, well-defined, validated, supported by significant research and backed up with a significant amount of data. However, we have not changed it significantly over time, it is not transparent over norming, it is very long, difficult to interpret, aligns with course construction/design but does not measure course objectives, and there is no opportunity to respond in a timely manner to student perceptions.
- ii. Students on the committees felt there was a lack of transparency. They want a way to monitor/gauge if SPTEs are used to improve teaching. In addition, students felt that faculty do not care about SPTEs, it is too long, and having grade distribution of the classes would be helpful for students.
- iii. President Yildirim commented that other faculty issues related to the SPTE include: some type of faculty early alert response system (FEAR), better presentation of SPTE results, an annual report on SPTE analytics, whether it is legally responsible to have an on-line SPTE, is there a way to have unscaled combined score for evaluation, the need for organized teaching effectiveness workshops, resources, best practices, etc. (Note: all

of the aforementioned comments/ideas/concerns were from the Teaching Evaluation Policy Committee).

- iv. **Comment:** If we revise anything it would be nice to have it tailored closer to the course goals.
- v. **Comment:** I worry about the conflict of interest of incentivizing students to complete the form and worry about it on-line because of low response rate. **R:** In the business college, it is on the honor system and the reward given is additional points.
- vi. **Q:** What is the scientific proof? **R:** It is reliable and valid - it provides similar results. A lively, but brief discussion regarding whether the tool or any survey is scientific ensued.
- vii. **Comment:** Do the evaluation and then the grades could be submitted to the system, taking it out of the professors' hands.
- viii. **Comment:** Suggest giving it as a part of a participation grade.
- ix. **Comment:** SPTEs fluctuate more wildly than the IDEA. What do some of the comments on the SPTEs mean – for example: “comes across as teacher and person.”
- x. **Q:** Has the committee looked at other instruments? **R:** A couple of reports are available, and you can check how IDEA has changed.
- xi. **Q:** Do we want to short or long?
- xii. **Q:** Do we want to compare just to ourselves or do we want to compare to other institutions.
- xiii. **Q:** If we can make it so that students do it online, would we like to think about doing something at mid-term so changes to the rest of the course can be made?
- xiv. **Comment:** Would like to see more movement into the evaluation of the teaching process rather than the individual who is teaching. It would be highly beneficial to all of us if we were focusing on the teaching process.
- xv. **Comment:** Sometimes it is not just the process, but the human factor and process combined together.
- xvi. **Comment:** I think something we need to think about is are we training people to interpret the results correctly.
- xvii. **Comment:** We should have an ad hoc committee to look into it and investigate the design of the SPTE

4. **YMCA Q&A Session** – Dr. Teri Hall, Vice President for Student Affairs - Cancelled

VIII. As May Arise – Senator Moore-Jansen noted that Qualtrics can be used by faculty to create a mid-semester student evaluation.

IX. Adjournment – at 5:09 PM