

**Missouri Western State University**  
**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**April 6, 2006**  
Blum 220

Senators Present: President Mullins (presiding), K. Andrews, Chevalier, Fulton, Gregory, Heider, Kriewitz, Noynaert, S. Nandan, Ottinger, Roberts, Tushaus

Senators Absent: deGregorio, Hunt, Fulton

Non-voting and Ex-Officio Members Present: President Past Senate President Larry Andrews, Acting Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs Jeanie Daffron

Guests: Mark Mabe, Gene Eulinger, Michael Ducey, Cosette Hardwick

---

Call to Order: President Phil Mullins called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Approval of March 2, 2006 Minutes as amended: Approved

Approval of Agenda: Approved with the addition of a report from the Ad **Hoc** Graduate Studies Committee

**Informational Report on the Banner System.**

Gene Eulinger, Registrar, reported on the implementation of the Banner system.

MWSU is three years into the project of adopting Banner. This project was undertaken because the old system was no longer supported by Hewlett Packard. In general, the change of systems is going according to schedule and is under budget. While Banner does have problems, it is the best alternative on the market. In general, people with Banner problems at MWSU have been patient.

Banner modules are brought online, one by one. Each module has certain problems that have to be worked out. Staff time is limited and some kinds of problems have priority over others. The problems shared by faculty members to the Senate have been added to the list of issues to address. Some of the issues that directly affect faculty are presently being addressed. New staff members are being added to IT. A consultant has been approved to build the degree audit function. This should be operational by the fall.

Faculty questions about the Banner system included: Are the academic rules that MWSU has used (e.g., the twice repeat rule, 60-40, etc.) good rules? If not, then they should be eliminated because it is often very difficult to get Banner to monitor some of these matters. Banner users often exchange information. For example, it appears that we can adopt a modification used by another institution to get Banner to monitor continuous enrollment. On October 13 MWSU is set to implement the newest version of Banner - Banner 7.

Mr. Eulinger made several recommendations.

- Banner is not flexible. We have gotten used to a custom software system which we could customize.
- Accuracy of data entry is critical. Making changes after the initial entry is extremely difficult.
- Reevaluate the prerequisites for classes. If a prerequisite is being routinely overridden, is it really a necessary prerequisite?
- Are many of our academic rules really needed? We have some rules on the books that we have no way to enforce with Banner as it is presently configured. Twice enrollment is one example. The 40/60 rule is another example. Figuring ways to implement such rules is difficult.

Gene Eulinger and Mark Mabe took several questions and comments from Senators including:

Can the problem of over booking of rooms be resolved? Don Willis is trying to work on this scheduling problem.

Can Learning Communities be organized with linked classes? Right now we don't think the system is working as well as it should. Right now there is a work-around, and we are looking for a better long-term solution.

Is there a way to control enrollment in Honors sections? This problem has been addressed, and it should be working correctly during the current registration.

Are there going to be any changes to the Goldlink system, particularly about attachments? Someone will need to look at this problem.

Is there something wrong with our junk-mail service? The spammers are constantly adjusting their tactics. We do have "spam filters" in place, but every time a new filter is developed the spammers find a way around it.

Are student timecards problems being addressed? We have been looking a couple of solutions. The Banner system does have a feature that allows students to enter their times, but Human Resources objects to this because the system allows them to type in any time they want. We are looking at alternatives that would use the system time.

Can faculty and advisors have better access to information they need to do their jobs? We have already tried to expand the roles that faculty and advisors have.

### **Report from the University President and the Acting Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs:**

Vice President Daffron presented a report on behalf of President Scanlon and herself.

Dr. Scanlon has been in Jefferson City for the past three days. He has testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Governor's Lewis and Clark initiative, which includes the capital budget for Western's Agenstein Building addition and renovation. Along with

representatives from the city, the county, the St. Joseph School District and the St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce, Dr. Scanlon also met with the legislative delegation from the region. They discussed various issues, including the Agenstein Building at Western. Dr. Scanlon is the chairperson of the Presidential Advisory Council to the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education. That group was meeting today.

The Western Governance Advisory Council will meet on April 7 at 3 pm in Spratt 208. The agenda includes several items from Faculty Senate.

### **Report from the Senate President**

The Executive Committee has met twice. The new officers are working on the new committee appointments.

### **New Business:**

Kathleen Andrews, Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Graduate Curriculum Committee, distributed an informational report (See Appendix A). The committee received nine proposals. The committee felt that four proposals were ready to be forwarded. The committee did forward the proposals with specific concerns. All of the Master's degrees submitted use a common core of fifteen credits. All are targeting people who are already working in the field and want to pursue a Masters degree as a goal, rather than people wanting to pursue a PhD. The Committee is still accepting proposals, and there are proposals in progress.

**Cosette Hardwick, Chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee, distributed a copy of the Fringe Benefits Committee report (See Appendix B).**

SB5-2006 Motion : Part-time faculty and staff should be allowed to purchase reserved parking permits (Heider/Andrews).

SB6-2006 Motion: Change the policy and procedure guide for Section 9c. Section 9c. should be amended from: "Meet together with the Salary Committee twice a semester to develop a five-year plan for improving salaries and fringe benefits." to "Meet with the Staff Fringe Benefits Committee once a year to discuss and act on common interests and concerns" (Heider/Andrews).

Michael Ducey, Chair of the Evaluation of Faculty Committee, reviewed highlight in his committee's annual report ( See Appendix C) that included two sections; (1) A report on the Feasibility of Electronic Gathering of Student Evaluation of Faculty (Appendix D), and (2) Evaluation of Faculty Survey (Appendix E).

SB7-2006 Motion: In relation to Senate Evaluation of Faculty Committee recommendation 5a, move to establish an electronic collection of student evaluation of faculty pilot program to be conducted in the Fall of 2006. The program will involve volunteer tenured faculty members from both colleges. Student evaluation of faculty should be collected for at least one course per faculty member. The faculty member should have taught this course within the past **two** years so that a comparison between evaluation methods may be accomplished. Senate should be updated on the results in March 2007 (Heider/Noynaert).

SB8-2006 Motion: In relation to Senate Evaluation of Faculty Committee recommendation 5b, move to establish an optional peer evaluation of teaching program. The program design should include structure, evaluated components, parameters detailing how such evaluations would be conducted, a training program for evaluators, and a discussion of its use as a formative and summative evaluation. Task Evaluation of Faculty Committee to present the program and implementation plan to the Faculty Senate by December 2006 for implementation beginning as early as Spring 2007. Implementation of such a plan should also include an addition to the Policy Guide describing the program and insuring that it is the option of the individual faculty to submit to such an evaluation (Heider/M. Nandan).

SB9-1006 Motion from Promotion and Tenure Committee (Ottinger/Heider):

**Motion to Change Faculty Senate Bylaws for the Promotion/Tenure Committee and Performance levels required for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor.**

**Revise Appendix L Section III.F.7.Membership.c (page 257)**

Change from: “c. All members of the committee must be tenured.”

to: “c. All members of the committee must be tenured **and have the rank of associate or professor.**”

**Revise Appendix L Section III.F.7.Procedures.d (page 257)**

Change from: “d. The report will be presented to and discussed by the entire Promotion/Tenure Committee before committee recommendation is made. ~~When final recommendations are voted on, there will be an equal number of parties voting from each school.~~”

to: “d. The report will be presented to and discussed by the entire Promotion/ Tenure Committee before committee recommendation is made. **At least six committee members must be present for a vote on a candidate to take place.**”

**Revise Appendix L Section III.F.7.Procedures.e (page 257)**

Change from: “e. Each person applying for promotion or tenure will have the option of appearing before the subcommittee reviewing his/her packet ~~and briefly (ten minutes) to discuss materials documented in the application packet. Applicants will not have the option of appearing before the entire Promotion/Tenure Committee.~~”

to: “e. Each person applying for promotion or tenure will have the option of appearing before the subcommittee reviewing his/her packet **to** briefly discuss materials documented in the application packet.”

**Revise Section Two.VII.D.1.Performance levels required for promotion to Associate Professor (page 11 of the Revision adopted by the Faculty Senate 2/16/2006)**

Change from:

“The assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor must be able to document consistently strong teaching effectiveness. Teaching quality will be compared with other MWSU faculty. Active, constructive service ~~in departmental, institutional, and/or community~~ is expected. The candidate must demonstrate that he or she has ~~kept current with advances in areas of expertise and teaching duties and~~ has shown a continuous significant growth in scholarship/creative activity.”

to:

“The assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor must be able to document consistently strong teaching effectiveness. Teaching quality will be compared with other MWSU faculty. Active, constructive service **to benefit students, the institution, the discipline/profession and/or community** is expected. The candidate must **also** demonstrate that he or she has shown a continuous significant growth in scholarship/creative activity.”

**Revise Section Two.VII.D.2.Performance levels required for promotion to Professor (page 12 of the Revision adopted by the Faculty Senate 2/16/2006)**

Change from:

“The associate professor seeking promotion to professor must ~~be able to document~~ quality performance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. The faculty member’s performance in one area might be outstanding and compensate for a solid but not outstanding performance in another area. Teaching will be compared with other MWSU faculty. ~~High quality participation in departmental service is required on a regular basis. Evidence of active leadership in departmental and institutional service is expected. In the area of scholarship/creative activity, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor must document a pattern of consistent significant growth since the last promotion. Significant professional service to students, institution, discipline/ profession or community must be documented.~~”

to:

“The associate professor seeking promotion to professor must **demonstrate** quality performance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. The faculty member’s performance in one area might be outstanding and compensate for a solid but not outstanding performance in another area. Teaching will be compared with other MWSU faculty. **The candidate must document high quality teaching, significant professional service to benefit students, the institution, the discipline/profession, and/or the community, and a pattern of consistent significant professional growth.**”

**Adjourned at 5:40 PM.**

**Graduate Curriculum Committee  
Report to Faculty Senate  
April 6, 2006**

**Spring 2006 Members**

Kathleen Andrews, Chairperson  
Len Archer  
Cindy Heider  
Susan Hennessy  
Rezae Hamzaee  
Kevin Anderson  
Konrad Gunderson  
Brian Cronk  
Martin Johnson (ex-officio)  
Brenda Blessing (ex-officio)

The Committee has met seven times during Spring 2006. The committee's work has included developing procedures for graduate curriculum approval, providing input on policies related to course numbering, graduate credit issues, etc., to the Graduate Studies Committee, and reviewing proposals for graduate programs submitted by various departments or individuals.

This report is intended to provide information to the Faculty Senate regarding the proposals that have been approved by the Graduate Curriculum Committee and forwarded to the GAC. If approved by GAC and signed by President Scanlon the proposals will be submitted to the Department of Higher Education (DHE) this Spring.

To date, nine proposals have been received. The Graduate Curriculum Committee based their consideration of proposals on the following criteria: development of the proposal, potential duplication with other graduate programs in the region, institutional fit, strong cadre of undergraduate majors to feed into the program, sufficient faculty within an existing department or departments to support the program, and the likelihood of Missouri Department of Higher Education approval. Also factoring in our decisions was the impact of the current lack of a Graduate School infrastructure and lack of a Graduate Dean for program support. These criteria were guided by input from Dr. Scanlon and Dr. Daffron.

The Committee approved four proposals to be forwarded to the GAC for first-round submission to DHE in April, with the following concerns: the use of graduate teaching assistants represents a departure from current practice and philosophy of MWSU and should be considered very cautiously, and any costs associated with development and implementation of these programs MUST NOT come from the current academic budget. The approved proposals include the following:

- Masters of Applied Science in Chemistry (submitted by Chemistry Department)
- Masters of Applied Science in Human Factors and Usability Testing (submitted by the Psychology Department)
- Masters of Applied Science in Information Technology Management (submitted by the Math and Computer Science Department)
- Graduate Certificate in the Teaching of Writing for Prairie Lands Writing Project (submitted by Dr. Jane Frick and the Prairie Lands Writing Project).

The first three proposals for Masters in Applied Science represent an interdisciplinary approach for masters programs, sharing a common core of 15 credits. These programs combine a scientific curriculum with cross-disciplinary courses in communication, business, economics, statistics, and project management. The target audience for these programs will be students with undergraduate degrees in the disciplines, currently working in or desiring to work and advance in related business and industries.

The Prairie Lands Graduate Certificate proposal will enable offering MWSU graduate credit for courses that have been approved and taught as NWMSU graduate courses in the last three years. The courses are grounded in ongoing changes in theory and instructional practices in writing. Need and demand for the program have already been established.

Proposals that were not approved at this time were submitted by the following departments: Engineering Technology, **Government**, English and Foreign Languages, the Western Institute, and Student Affairs. It is anticipated that some of these proposals may be further developed and resubmitted at a later date.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Andrews  
Chairperson, Graduate Curriculum Committee

**Fringe Benefits Committee  
Report to Faculty Senate  
April 6, 2006**

2005-2006 Members

Cosette Hardwick (Biology) – Chair  
Jim Bargar (Psychology)  
Earl Haynes (Education)  
Matrese Benkofske (Business)  
Geo Sipp (Art)  
Kathleen Andrews (Nursing) – Senate Liason

2005-2006 Staff Faculty Benefit Committee Participants

Barbara Davis  
Kathy Joe  
Terry Weaver

This year's Fringe Benefits Committee began the year by discussing benefits lost. The list generated included: internet connection, wellness program costs, loss of ability to purchase insurance for one child, changes in tuition waivers. As a result of these changes Jan Aspelund was invited to attend a meeting to discuss benefits and benefit changes. The staff fringe benefits committee was also invited as all the fringe benefits being discussed are staff benefits as well. Jan noted that the benefits have been lost because of financial constraints. Jan also discussed last year's charge to investigate tuition reciprocity with other institutions. She reported that she would like to investigate further as there may be a need for state law changes to allow a reciprocity system. She also noted that it might be possible to develop reciprocity agreements with private institutions.

The current by-laws were discussed. It was noted that 9.c. specifies "Meet together with the Salary Committee twice a semester to develop a five-year plan for improving salaries and fringe benefits." This committee discussed that in the past two years they have not met with the Salary Committee and do not feel that this is an important task. It seems more relevant to meet with the Staff Fringe Benefits Committee each semester to determine if there are common interests.

The majority of the committee's time was spent developing a survey to generate a survey wish list and to check on utilization of current benefits. Members from the staff and faculty committees were involved in survey development. The data from that survey is attached. As last year's committee noted, parking continues to be the biggest issue noted followed by tuition agreements with other colleges. Parking concerns are in two general areas. The first is the need to pay for parking if you are faculty or staff. The second is the lack of reserved parking for adjunct, part-time and MOA faculty and staff. In the list generated by responses (Questions 12 and 13), some items are not within the charge of the committee such as: insurance, salary, employee training, and retirement. Items that the committee discussed to be pursued include:

parking, domestic partner rights, tuition reciprocity. We also noted in the survey that several employees asked for benefits that they currently have or noted that they were unaware of the current benefits. This information is provided to employees as a part of their benefit information every year. The committee discussed that Human Resources might want to consider an education campaign. One idea suggested was a “Benefit of the Month” highlighted on gold link. Based on the results of the survey and discussion, the following are fringe benefit committee recommendations.

### Recommendations:

1. We recommend that the Faculty Senate consider a change to the policy and procedure guide for section 9. Section 9.c. should be amended from: “Meet together with the Salary Committee twice a semester to develop a five-year plan for improving salaries and fringe benefits.” To “Meet with the Staff Fringe Benefits Committee once a year to discuss and act on common interests and concerns.”
2. We recommend that the Human Resources department continue to investigate the possibility of a tuition reciprocity agreement with other colleges and universities. This allows the tuition benefit to be utilized by dependents of employees pursuing an education at another university. It also may encourage dependents of faculty at other institutions to consider Western. Jan Aspelund began this investigation last fall and would like to continue to investigate the possibility within the state system and private systems.
3. We recommend that faculty and staff who are not full time employees be allowed to purchase reserved parking permits. The ability to purchase reserved parking permits makes a statement that these individuals are no less valuable than full time employees.
4. We recommend that consideration be given to no longer requiring the purchase of parking permits by employees.
5. We recommend that the Faculty Senate consider the issue of domestic partner rights.
6. We recommend Human Resources consider other options for providing information about fringe benefits to employees. Based on survey results, some employees do not review the benefit package and are not aware of what is available to them. Monthly information provided on the Goldlink system might improve communication about benefits.

## **Results from 2006 fringe benefits survey**

### **Questions 1 & 2**

All benefits asked about on the survey are being utilized. The lowest utilization was notary service and the highest was bookstore.

### **Questions 3-11**

The following is the results of questions 3-11. We asked respondents to rate importance of the possible benefits. The percentage noted is the combined percentage of the ratings “somewhat important” and “very important”.

No charge for your yearly parking permit	66.83
Tuition waiver reciprocity with other 4-year colleges in MO	65.85
Ability for faculty and staff to use health services for routine health matters	62.44
Free access to the wireless computer network	53.69
Tuition waiver reciprocity with private colleges in US	52.19
Tuition waiver reciprocity with post-high technical schools	35.61
Food delivery to offices through Aramark	31.71
Infant day care on campus	22.20
Dry cleaning pick-up and delivery	12.68

### Question 12

**What other benefits would you like to see considered should funding become available?**

#### **Parking**

- Parking for staff should be free.
- Staff Parking for MOA's
- Bringing back parking for half-time employees
- Free parking for currently underpaid adjunct teachers
- If you are acting in a capacity as an official employee then you should be allowed to have the reserved parking spaces.

#### **Domestic partner rights**

- domestic partners rights
- the benefits apply to domestic partner/significant other just like it applies to married staff

#### **Wellness Incentive**

- wellness incentive program with either monetary benefits in wage structure or days off
- Also a significant benefit for employees that do not smoke
- Health/wellness/exercise classes for employees

#### **Tuition (waiver)**

- Reimplementation of tuition waiver for part-time and half-time employees
- reduced tuition costs for ALL courses at Western, not just those leading toward a degree
- re-instate the tuition waiver for HALF-TIME employees' dependents because they are loyal to the campus & community as well as full-time employees
- Letting the tuition waiver and scholarships both be used together when a student has been awarded them
- 80% tuition wavers for Western Institute classes
- more of a discount to classes through Western Institute.

#### **Tuition (reimbursement)**

- Graduate School reimbursement
- funding toward graduate studies

### **Discounts (MWSU)**

- Discounts for employees at food court, cafeteria, deli, C-store, and other Aramark food services (2)
- free admission to all sporting/cultural events (3)
- Even greater reduction to campus events

### **Discounts (community)**

- Check into discounts from merchants in our community - what are we gaining by 'the good job we do... with the community..' when we don't see any tangible benefits from it (4)
- St. Joseph Country Club membership
- wireless phone discount

### **Retirement**

- Better early retirement program
- benefits for retirement, (internet, sports admission, etc)
- Health/Life Insurance coverage after retirement
- Employer matched retirement contributions (2)
- Matching the state in retirement saving
- a tax sheltered annuity option for the amount the institution pays for employee insurance would be nice.

### **Insurance**

- Lower cost for BENEFITS
- More affordable medical health insurance -- my family is currently uninsured!
- insurance cover for mental health needs
- family health insurance
- Life Insurance for my whole family provided by Missouri Western
- Pay part of dependents health insurance
- Health Savings Account

### **Employee training**

- I would like to see some short courses for faculty and staff only. For example, maybe an investing club
- on campus training for supervisors, time management, dealing with conflict, etc.
- financial seminars offered
- On-campus professional development and computer training opportunities (Word, Excel, etc)

### **Other**

- Univ. should have a fleet of cars so that we do not have to use personal cars for business travel
- use of campus resources such as shops-mechanical
- Or some trips both US and abroad for faculty and staff only.
- I would rather see this money be put towards pay increases or a holiday bonus.
- free computer software for personal use (staff and students), reserved parking spaces, some free meals,
- Paid twice a month.
- Across the board bonus - non meritorious
- laptop notebooks/tablets made available for semester
- Free internet access at home.
- Consist use of employee sick leave benefit,
- if you are currently taking classes that you can have a day with pay before mid-term and finals
- dues payments for professional organizations

- Creation of a faculty dining hall
- Expanding Pay Scale Ranges for those at the end of their range (due to years of service)
- Participation in the Readership program
- More readily available postal services or a post office on campus
- Having more things we could use a campus "debit" type card for so having to carry around cash isn't necessary
- More drink & snack machines (healthy)
- Alternative on-campus food service for employees
- More flexible work schedules--coming early, leaving early
- Funding equivalent to "maternity leave/sick leave" for adopting a child, Leave for Adopting a Child
- comp days for professional staff when they have to come in for emergencies
- Required Diversity Training
- increased days for death of family member
- the ability to pass University depend benefits to someone else. Such as reduced university tuition.
- cost of living raise
- office technology upgrades for athletics

### Question 13

**overall level is good, but looking at the idea of step pay for longevity or higher increments of vacation benefits based on years of service similar to other institutions might aid in employee retention**

I think that charging west campus staff to park on dusty gravel is wrong. It would be bad enough to have to pay to park on the hard surface like most do, but to be charged to park in a dust lot where you come to work in a clean truck and leave with a dirty one. That is wrong and needs to be changed.

**One company already offers the dry cleaning service**

I am very appreciative of the fringe benefits that are currently offered. I really enjoy the fitness center, pool, racquetball courts etc. The Wellness clinic, chaired by Marsha, Debbie and Darcy etc. is terrific. That is at the top of my list!

**It is a very good package and I do appreciate it very much!**

Compare to other UNIVERSITIES and determine where we rate.

**I sincerely appreciate all the fringe benefits we currently receive. I worked as an MOA for over a year at MWSU before applying for a full-time position.**

Most people don't know what is available to them.

**Insurance is too high!!**

Have option to put money that the university spends for employee's health insurance into an IRA if the employee has health insurance from elsewhere.

**MWSU offers employees good fringe benefits.**

We have fantastic appointments

**I appreciate what we currently have.**

The benefits we receive now are very good.

**MWSU has always had a great benefit package for their employees and I am very grateful for what we have.**

I think that MW offers a wonderful package for fringe benefits.

**Pursuing a reciprocity agreement for tuition discounts with other colleges, both public and private, should be a priority**

I don't have children, but I would really like to MWSU expand the tuition benefit and the day-care on campus.

**I was unaware that spouse and dependants can use the current privileges without my attendance.**

students need a full-time faculty in commercial music degree program

**Everyone should get the cost of living raise whether they are at their maximum pay scale or not.**

An employee working 30 hours per week is not eligible for health care or life insurance.

**I really feel we have very good benefits as they are.**

Would be nice to have this type of survey done more frequently to assess needs.

**FREE admission for faculty/staff to ALL athletic events**

change funding for some of the non important benefits to use for health coverage benefits.

**Insurance is too expensive for dependent coverage, spouse has better coverage at a lower cost to us.**

More holidays

**Health Insurance sucks**

They are all very good. Even if I don't use them, I want my colleagues to have the opportunity to use them

**I am well pleased with the benefits**

good benefits -- need to communicate about them more clearly and more often

**Are we really getting the best rates?? It seems that family coverage is very high.**

When you own more than one vehicle which has a parking permit...it would be nice to be able to have both vehicles on campus, at once, without having to worry about tickets.

I would highly recommend the non-stripping of further benefits, but rather do what you can to keep employees. The institution is not Wal-Mart or a grocery store, where an employee does the same routine day after day. Some jobs, reports and assignments are done on a yearly basis - some reports are on the state or national level of reporting. It usually takes 1-2 years to fully settle into your position. The stripping of benefits will only cause further turnover and eventually the institution will find itself attracting a lower quality of workers, which will hinder proceeding forward with Western's mission.

**notary services and check cashing are not well publicized as fringe benefits. I have used the notary service within the last two years, but didn't know the Business Office would cash personal checks.**

Equality in benefits. Presently support staff does not receive equal vacation compared to professional and administrative staff. We are all employees of Missouri Western the benefits should be exactly the same for all of us.

**health insurance cost is outrageous**

tuition waivers should be applicable to doctorate degrees as well

**MWSU Evaluation of Faculty Committee  
Final Report to the Faculty Senate  
April 6, 2006**

The following report is submitted on behalf of the Faculty Senate Evaluation of Faculty Committee. This report address Committee activity related to assigned charges and duties during the 2005/06 academic year.

Committee Members:

Michael Ducey, Chemistry (Chair)

Michael Smith, Education

Cynthia Jeney, EFLJ

Carolyn Brose, Nursing

Mei Zhang, Communication Studies & Theater

1. Narrative Statement

This committee began work with the recognition that Evaluation of Faculty and its associated issues were more important than ever before within the new “up or out” tenure system. Evaluation of Faculty, in many forms, plays a key role in not only tenure and promotion decisions, but within award applications and yearly performance evaluation as well. With regard to teaching, Student Evaluation of Faculty results serve as a primary tool for making such decisions. This committee, through the execution of its assigned charges and duties, recommend changes herein that will allow for clearer interpretation and valid use of Student Evaluation of Faculty, that would allow for examination of long-term trends in Student Evaluation of Faculty, and the establishment of an optional peer evaluation of teaching program that could be used to supplement a faculty member’s other evaluation components.

2. Charges to the Committee

- a. Provide a report that analyzes variables in student evaluation of faculty such as class size, students’ motivation/preparation, general studies vs. majors courses, elective vs. required courses in students major, department and division means for each evaluation question, relationship of evaluations to grade point averages, etc.
- b. From this report, develop and distribute guidelines to administrator, faculty, and the FS Promotion and Tenure Committee for accurately and meaningfully interpreting current statistical data on student evaluation of faculty.
- c. Explore the feasibility of electronically gathering student evaluation of faculty in order to expedite results of evaluations for faculty review, to reduce or eliminate the consumption of class time, to reduce or eliminate the physical handling of data, and to eliminate the need to type handwritten student comments for use in self-evaluation, promotion/tenure packets, etc. This will involve seeking the cooperation and input of the Information and Technology Center and the IMC. The final report should outline steps to be taken if the institution opts to implement electronically gathered student evaluation of faculty.
- d. Investigate how the institution can provide a standard error value and N value for every mean value provided on the faculty evaluation form.

- e. Meet with the Information Technology (IT) and the Instructional Media Center (IMC) to insure that there is an ongoing system in place to provide for collecting meaningful student evaluation of faculty.
  - f. Review and update (if necessary) the committee purpose, membership, and duties as outlined in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate.
3. Committee Purpose, Membership, Duties as outlined in the Faculty Senate Bylaws (MWSU Policy Guide 2005-06, Appendix L).
- a. Purpose: This committee studies current procedures for the evaluation of faculty and makes recommendations regarding the interpretation and administration of those evaluations.
  - b. Membership: This committee is composed of two faculty members from each school plus one faculty member chosen from the faculty at large.
  - c. Duties:
    - i. Annually provide information and recommendations regarding interpretation and comparison of current and past student evaluation data to the Faculty Senate and the Promotion and Tenure Committee
    - ii. Periodically review and recommend procedures for the evaluation of faculty members by peers, department chairs and the University administration.
    - iii. Conduct a continuing study of faculty evaluation at Missouri Western State University.
    - iv. Provide information regarding interpretation of evaluation data.
4. Summary of Committee Activity Related to Charges:

The committee met a total of four times during the 2005-06 academic year on the following dates:

10/13/05

11/17/05

1/19/06 (Meeting with Mark Mabe and Ruby Mayes - IT Services)

3/7/06

The primary focus of the committee was addressing charges c, d, e, and f as well as duties i – iv.

- a. Activity related to Charge a.
  - IT services indicated that retrieving the Evaluation of Faculty data from previous semesters is a nearly impossible task. To obtain data from previous semesters, the Admin system must be taken down and reloaded with the previous semester's data, the job would then be run, then the Admin system would again be taken down, and the current semester reloaded.
  - Using current system, there is no viable mechanism to obtain the data necessary to meet Charge a.
- b. Activity related to Charge b.

- See charge a comments. Without the ability to examine trends in evaluation, and without relevant population sample sizes, the committee is unable to develop guidelines for the analysis of Student Evaluation of Faculty.
- c. Activity related to Charge c. See Appendix A: “Feasibility of Electronic Gathering of Student Evaluation of Faculty”.
- d. Activity related to Charge d.
  - Met with Mark Mabe and Ruby Mayes (IT Services) on 1/19/06. Reporting sample size with mean and standard deviation can be accomplished using the current system.
- e. Activity related to Charge e.
  - Met with Mark Mabe and Ruby Mayes (IT Services) on 1/19/06. The current system for evaluation of faculty can remain in place and continue to function for the foreseeable future. Primary issues are related to the cost, personnel, and time associated with this process. See charge c above.
- f. Activity related to Charge f.
  - All committee requirements as outlined in the Senate Bylaws were discussed and debated by the committee. A summary of recommended changes may be found in section 4d below.
- g. Activity related to Committee duties.
  - To address Bylaws Duty iii, the Committee prepared and distributed a survey intended to obtain faculty comments and positions on current and possible future evaluation tools. The survey was conducted early in the Spring semester. A summary of the comments and responses may be found in the Appendix to this report. A total of 199 surveys were distributed and 106 were returned (53% response rate). The complete survey with results and summary of written comments may be found in Appendix B. Observations and inferences drawn from the survey include:
    - 53.8% of faculty do not feel that the current evaluation tool meets the evaluation needs for the courses that they teach.
    - 62.3% of faculty responded that the current tool does not accurately measure their classroom teaching.
    - 58.5% of faculty responded that the current tool takes too much class time to administer.
    - Faculty do not feel that they currently receive their evaluation results in time to make changes to their courses for the upcoming semester (71.7%)
    - A majority of faculty (52.9%) are not opposed to peer evaluation of teaching.
    - A majority of faculty (61.3%) feel that peer evaluation of teaching should be an option for all faculty.
    - There is in general no consensus on the electronic submission of faculty evaluation (33.1% for and 38.6% opposed, the remainder with no opinion).
    - 67% of faculty would find it helpful in the preparation of their promotion and tenure packets to have access to campus wide trends in student evaluation.

5. Recommendations to the Senate:

- a. **Student Evaluation of Faculty should be not be conducted electronically at this time.** While many advantages may be identified using such an approach, the committee had a number of overriding concerns related to the process.

- A clearly viable alternative has not been satisfactorily tested using the on-campus student population.
- The currently available mechanism (WebCT) would require that students conduct evaluation of faculty outside of class time or that students be taken to a computer lab to conduct evaluation. While having students conduct evaluation outside of the classroom would save valuable teaching time, the Committee was not convinced that the population of students voluntarily completing the survey on their own time would be representative of students enrolled in the course.
- Significant questions regarding how such a survey might be conducted using WebCT and how instructor access to the evaluation submissions could be prevented during the collection period remain.

**The Committee recommends that a pilot program be conducted next year** (preferably during the Fall semester) with a volunteer group of faculty from both Colleges. The purpose of the program should be to compare Student Evaluation of Faculty collected electronically with that collected using the current method.

- b. **Faculty, especially nontenured, should have the option of requesting peer evaluation of their classroom teaching.** This could be used for formative or summative purposes. A general, standardized (i.e., examining an established set of teaching components) evaluation should be developed, to allow for inclusion of summative evaluations into yearly self-evaluation, award, tenure and promotion applications if a faculty member so chooses. Standardization allows for clarity in committee and administrative review of such evaluations. The structure of such an optional evaluation tool and the components examined would need to be developed by this or an appointed committee.
  - The Committee arrived at this recommendation based upon how Student Evaluation of Faculty is currently used in each of the aforementioned review processes and on responses obtained from Evaluation of Faculty Survey. Faculty who may receive high Student Evaluation of Faculty averages are not by default poorly performing in the classroom. Many factors other than how well students perceive a faculty member to teach impact survey results including difficulty of content, class size, grading scale, and general studies vs. major courses. Supplementing review of faculty with voluntary Peer Evaluation of Teaching may help to offset such factors.
- c. **Request that Information Technology Services include the population size with all associated averages and standard deviations identified on Student Evaluation of Faculty summaries.**
- d. **Develop and make available to faculty a process through which they may examine and comment on statistically relevant trends and differences in their evaluation data.**
- e. **If a mechanism for providing numerical data in a reasonable format (i.e., spread sheet) to the Evaluation of Faculty committee is not or cannot be adopted, then Charges a and b and Duties i and iv should not be required of this committee.**

