

***Minutes of the February Session
of the Faculty Senate
Missouri State University***

The Faculty Senate held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, February 9, 2006, in the Traywick Parliamentary Room, PSU 313. Chair Art Spisak called the session to order at 3:34 p.m. Dr. Eric Shade served as parliamentarian.

Substitutes: Rob Owens for Carol Miller, FGB; and Annette Gordon for Jim Zimmerman, CHM.

Absences: Holly Baggett, HST; Connie Claybough, LAB; Clay Franklin, CSD; Norm Griffith, Staff Senate representative; Charles Harvey, GSC representative; John Hoftyzer, Budget & Priorities Committee chair, ECO; Jim Hutter, PEC chair, AGR; Kandiah Manivannan, Faculty Concerns Committee chair, P&A; Rick Martin, CSC; Dale Moore, Staff Senate representative; Wenping Qiu, FRS; Mike Reed, P&A; Ralph Rice, PAS; Barbara Turpin, CGEIP chair, PSY; Scott Wallentine, PTE; Dale Walton, DSS; Gary Ward, SMAT; and Rod Williams, MIL.

Guests: Kim Bell, Records & Registration; Tyler Barnes, SGA; Lois Shufeldt, MKT; Tina Biava, ENG; Jim Moyer, REL; Erwin Mantei, GGP; Pauline Nugent, MCL; Skip Phelps, Provost's Office; Tammy Jahnke, Provost's Office; Sarah Eubanks, SGA; and Scott Pierson, student.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January Senate session were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. A campus memo from Greg Burris, chair of the *ad hoc* Process Improvement Committee, was distributed listing the following changes that were made in the updated recommendation to President Nietzel concerning benchmark peers after the Committee obtained feedback from both the Staff Senate and Faculty Senate: (1) comparison institutions will be referred to as "benchmark peers"; (2) student and workforce diversity measures will be included; (3) the University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse was re-evaluated and excluded from the benchmark list; and (4) the recommended consumer price index is the December CPI-All Urban Index, Seasonally Adjusted.
2. Senator Woodard, chair of the Disabilities Services Advisory Committee, announced a new faculty and staff SUCCESSability award to be given to a faculty or staff member who goes above and beyond to make sure the educational environment is accessible for students with disabilities.

VOTE ON BYLAWS CHANGES PRESENTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate voted by secret ballot to amend ART I, SEC 8, B, (4), (b) Membership of Committee on Budget and Priorities and ART I, SEC 8, B, (2), (a) Purpose of Committee on Faculty Concerns. Both amendments passed by the required two-thirds majority of the senators present and voting. They will go forward as **SA 10-05/06** and **SA 11-05/06**.

NEW GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN TESOL

Senator Smith moved for approval of the new graduate certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). His motion was seconded by Senator Wyrick. On behalf of the Budget and Priorities Committee, Senator Kent reported that the Committee had reviewed all four of the new programs being considered at today's Senate meeting and saw no major issues. Thus, the Committee was bringing them all forward for the Senate's consideration. If additional resources arise, these will be made available from the appropriate college. After discussion, the motion passed by voice vote. It will go forward as **SA 12-05/06**.

NEW OPTION FOR DUAL EMPHASIS IN GRAPHIC DESIGN & ILLUSTRATION

Senator Jolley moved for approval of the new option for Dual Emphasis in Graphic Design and Illustration (seconded by Senator DeLong). Since no one from the Art & Design Department was in attendance at the Senate meeting to discuss the new option, Senator Wyrick moved to postpone (seconded by Senator Woodall). By voice vote, the motion to postpone passed.

NEW DIGITAL FILM PRODUCTION OPTION/MASS MEDIA (COMPREHENSIVE)

Senator Windborne moved for approval of the new Digital Film Production Option (seconded by Jerri Lynn Kyle). After discussion, the motion passed by voice vote. It will go forward as **SA 13-05/06**.

NEW GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN RELIGIOUS STUDIES FOR THE PROFESSIONS

Senator Given moved for acceptance of the new graduate certificate in Religious Studies for the Professions (seconded by Senator Swearingen). After discussion, the motion passed by voice vote. It will go forward as **SA 14-05/06**.

DELETION OF PROGRAM IN JOURNALISM, B.S. IN EDUCATION

Senator Windborne moved for approval of the deletion of the Journalism, B.S. in Education, program (seconded by Jerri Lynn Kyle) due to a decline in students interested in pursuing the degree. After discussion, the motion passed by voice vote. It will go forward as **SA 15-05/06**.

REPORT FROM FACULTY CONCERNS SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Senator Kane distributed a revised copy of the *2005 State of Missouri State Leadership: Faculty Report* and a *Faculty Concerns Committee Report - Administrative Assessment, Part I: Leadership Priorities Assessment*. He said the second part of the report will be distributed to full-time faculty in a week or two. Thirty-six percent of the faculty responded to the survey this year (in 2003, the percent was 44 percent). Senator Brinker asked if the results could be accessed electronically so he could sort them for his department, and Senator Kane said, with the Senate's approval, he would try to make it accessible electronically.

When asked how the results are to be used, Senator Kane said it is on the shoulders of leadership to follow up. Chair Spisak said Senator Kane will present the results to Administrative Council and that he would also ask that it be presented to Academic Council. Skip Phelps said the Compensation

Committee will be reporting by next week, and the Committee will recommend that administrators be systematically evaluated. Senator Wyrick urged Chair Spisak to bring this specific issue up with the candidates for Provost when they visit the campus within the next couple of weeks, and Chair Spisak agreed to do so.

REPORT FROM FACULTY CONCERNS SUBCOMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT-HIREBACK

Dr. Erwin Mantei, chair of the Faculty Concerns Subcommittee on Retirement-Hireback, presented the subcommittee's report. Other members of the Committee were Ron Bottin, Tom Wyrick, Ron Netsell, John Kubicek, and Brian Breyfogle. The following questions were charged to the Subcommittee by the Faculty Senate. The answers to the three questions are also shown below in bold.

1. Would the administration establish a contract with the retiree to teach for a set number of semesters? **Yes. The respective Dean and Department will formulate the contract with the retiree. At this time, the maximum duration of the "contract" is for only 2 semesters. The contract may suggest more semesters for the retiree, based on "the need of the department and/or resources available at the College Level". In other words, at this time, there will not be a contract honored for more than 1 year at a time. What will happen in the future (with a new Provost) is not known.**
2. How many hours could be taught? **A total of twelve hours for the 2 semesters, no more, no less. However, the breakdown is any combination for the two semesters to equal the 12 hours.**
3. What benefits would be given? **At this time, the contract would not waive any special personal benefits present such as health insurance, etc.**

Dr. Mantei said he would like to promote a multi-year contract, and added that he himself would not sign a one-year contract but that he would sign a four-year contract. Other faculty members have also expressed an interest in a multi-year contract. Senator Brinker was concerned that the contracts would shift the burden of research and service onto the other faculty members in the departments. Senator Bourhis questioned where the pool of money would come from for the contracts.

Because of the interest generated by the Retirement-Hireback issue, a new charge will be sent to the Faculty Concerns Committee to continue its research on the topic.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - SENATE ACTION ON UNIVERSITY SGA TEACHING EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Action was postponed from the January Senate meeting on the University SGA Teaching Evaluation Instrument so Senate members could have time to poll faculty in their departments. Mike Barnett, SGA president, said the University attorney had also been consulted about the legal aspects of the teaching evaluations, and there appeared to be no legal concerns. Chair Spisak added that other universities are already doing such evaluations without any problems. Mike Barnett reminded Senate members that the evaluation won't allow any comments, and it consists of only five questions. When asked if any faculty involvement would be required, Senator Kane said the responsibility falls on the students to make the evaluations work. Senator Wyrick said he supported the evaluations strongly but thought it would be a good idea to get a letter from the Provost and/or from John Black

stating formally that the Administration would not use the information in the future for faculty evaluations. He felt the more information posted the better, and he suggested also putting links to course syllabus and grades.

There was discussion as to whether the evaluations were relevant to graduate classes. Senator Bourhis said graduate-level classes were to be included. After discussion, Senator Wyrick moved to amend Item 6 in the report by lowering the threshold of courses to be evaluated from 10 to 5 students (seconded by Senator Hughes). By voice vote, the motion to amend passed. Senator Bourhis moved the previous question, and by voice vote, his motion passed. By voice vote the main motion, as amended, also passed. It will go forward as **Senate Action 16-05/06**.

NEW OPTION FOR DUAL EMPHASIS IN GRAPHIC DESIGN & ILLUSTRATION

Since the Art and Design departmental representative was now present at the meeting, Senator DeLong moved to reconsider the new option for Dual Emphasis in Graphic Design and Illustration (seconded by Senator Swearingen), and the motion to reconsider passed. Senator Hughes then moved for approval of the above new option (seconded by Senator Herr), and by voice vote, the motion passed. It will go forward as **Senate Action 17-05/06**.

VOTE ON 2005 STATE OF MISSOURI STATE LEADERSHIP: FACULTY REPORT

Upon Senator Kane's request, Senator Swearingen moved to accept the *2005 State of Missouri State Leadership: Faculty Report* (seconded by Senator Wyrick). Senator Harsha asked that the Senate members be given more time to study the report before voting on it. After more discussion, the motion failed by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting will be on Thursday, March 9, in the Traywick Parliamentary Room, PSU 313.

Rhonda R. Ridinger
Secretary of the Faculty

Senate Action 10-05/06

Adopted by Senate on February 9, 2006

Right of Challenge Expires March 9, 2006

Amendment to Bylaws

ART I, SEC 8, B, (4), (b) Membership of Committee on Budget & Priorities

Add sentence below to the above section:

The chairperson-elect of the Faculty Senate shall call the organizational meeting of the committee within seven (7) school days after the first Fall Faculty Senate meeting and preside until the membership has elected a chairperson who shall serve a one-year term and may be reelected for succeeding terms.

Right of Challenge Expires March 9, 2006

Amendment to Bylaws

ART I, SEC 8, B, (2), (a) Purpose of Committee on Faculty Concerns

Amend above section to read:

gg Shall conduct a survey of the morale of all full-time faculty during the fall semester of ~~odd-~~
~~numbered~~ **even-numbered** years. A report to include an analysis of survey results and any
appropriate recommendations arising from the survey shall be distributed to the Faculty Senate
members in time to be included on the agenda for the ~~November~~ **February** meeting. . . .

and add a new section to read:

**hh Shall conduct an Academic Administrators Assessment survey of all full-time faculty during
the Fall semester of odd-numbered years. A report to include analysis of survey results and
any appropriate recommendations arising from the survey shall be distributed to the
Faculty Senate members in time to be included on the agenda for the February meeting. To
facilitate comparison with earlier surveys, data for department heads and deans shall be
tabulated, analyzed and reported separately.**

Senate Action 12-05/06

Adopted by Senate on February 9, 2006

Right of Challenge Expires March 9, 2006

***New Graduate Certificate in Teaching English
to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)***

A complete copy of the above curricular proposal can be viewed in the Faculty Senate office.

Senate Action 13-05/06

Adopted by Senate on February 9, 2006

Right of Challenge Expires March 9, 2006

New Digital Film Production Option/Mass Media (Comprehensive)

A complete copy of the above curricular proposal can be viewed in the Faculty Senate office.

Senate Action 14-05/06

Adopted by Senate on February 9, 2006

Right of Challenge Expires March 9, 2006

New Graduate Certificate in Religious Studies for the Professions

A complete copy of the above curricular proposal can be viewed in the Faculty Senate office.

Senate Action 15-05/06

Adopted by Senate on February 9, 2006

Right of Challenge Expires March 9, 2006

Deletion of Program in Journalism, B.S. in Education

A complete copy of the above curricular proposal can be viewed in the Faculty Senate office.

Right of Challenge Expires March 9, 2006

Senate Action
University SGA Teaching Evaluation Instrument

Whereas, the Student Government supported continuation of the University faculty dental plans with a student fee increase, and, in exchange, was promised that Faculty Senate would consider a University-wide faculty evaluation instrument, the results of which would be accessible to students;

Whereas, Faculty Senate Resolution 10-04/05 approved in principle the concept of such evaluation instrument and delegated to the Academic Relations Committee the responsibility of developing such a University-wide Faculty Evaluation Instrument and its implementation process in consultation with representatives of the Student Government Association, and such instrument and process have been developed and are attached;

RESOLVED, that the five attached faculty evaluation questions (and the anticipated grade question) listed in the Academic Relations Committee Report shall be adopted as the University SGA Faculty Evaluation questionnaire; and

RESOLVED, that the electronic gathering, reporting and accessing of the results of the University SGA Faculty Evaluation questionnaire shall be administered electronically through “My Information” for students, and accessible by the faculty member being evaluated through the Faculty/Advisor Resource Center, in accordance with the Feedback and Implementation criteria of the Academic Relations Committee Report attached to this resolution.

Academic Relations Committee Report on

University SGA Teaching Evaluation Instrument:

Teaching Evaluation Questions

- The course as taught was intellectually challenging.
- Overall, the instructor's presentations were understandable.
- The instructor was generally accessible to respond to students' questions.
- The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.
- Overall, I learned a great deal from this course.

What grade do you anticipate receiving in this course?

Feedback

*Course Identification Information:

- Professor
- Course code and number, course title
- Meeting times for class sessions
- “Type” (lecture, lab or combination) & “delivery method” (traditional, TV or Internet)
- Number of students **responding** versus **enrollment** at time the survey was available
(beginning of next to last week of semester length classes).
(ie. X students responding out of Y enrolled in course)

*Each of the five substantive questions shall be listed.

Adjacent to each question, feedback on two measures shall be provided:

- The professor's overall **average** Likert scale rating for each question (one through five) is based on total responses and is reported to two places to the right of the decimal. Options should be labeled as follows:
5 = strongly agree 4 = agree 3 = neutral 2 = disagree 1 = strongly disagree
- The professor's combined average Likert scale rating for each question is also reported by the combined rating of students who anticipate receiving an A or B in the course.

Rationale: The grade anticipated variable was requested by the students for inclusion in the questionnaire and feedback. Students want to compare the ratings given by “better students” to overall ratings. This is also the rationale for the anticipated grade being included with the five substantive questions. The anticipated grade (rather than the final grade) is more relevant to the mindset of the student at the time the evaluation is being filled out. To minimize privacy concerns (and the ability to identify particular students), the data of anticipated A and B students will be aggregated.

*University SGA Faculty Evaluation results will be linked to the SGA end of semester grade distribution of professor (already available).

Implementation

1. "My Information" on the Missouri State University system will be used to administer collection and disbursement of feedback on University SGA Faculty Evaluation Instrument.

Rationale: The system is already operational with access and security built into the system. It insures that students can only submit an evaluation for classes in which they are enrolled. Class attributes (delivery, course code, title, etc.) can be captured automatically. The evaluation instrument could be added with minimal cost and greater administrative ease. Paper bubble sheets would be more expensive and time consuming -- in class, in inputting data and then linking it to a new system.

2. Fall and Spring semester courses only will be evaluated.
Block courses during those semesters will be evaluated.
Summer, Intersession, Short, and Extended courses will not be evaluated.

Rationale: Initially the mechanics of initiating the system in Fall and Spring are more manageable. During Intersession and summers, courses start and stop at too many different times, making turning the access on and off for each course cumbersome and it would be harder for students to know when they could provide the feedback for each course and for SGA to adequately publicize times for evaluations.

3. There will be a two week window of time at the end of the semester during which a link would appear through which students could access the questionnaire and provide feedback through "My Information." The access will begin on Monday at 12:01 a.m. at the beginning of the next to last week of semester length classes. The access period will end at midnight Friday of Study Day. SGA is responsible for publicizing the access dates and shall send out two e-mails (one on the day the access is first available and another the next to last day it is available).

For block courses, the access window shall be one week -- beginning one week prior to the last day of class and ending at midnight of the next to last class day.

Rationale: The evaluations should be done late in the semester, but prior to the Final Exam. The response rate will be higher if the evaluation is made while the class is still meeting. No additional in class time is needed to administer the instrument. Students need adequate time to respond, but not such a long period that response rate is hindered.

4. The University SGA Teaching Evaluation Instrument shall contain five evaluation questions. [See attached questions.] Each evaluation question is answered on a 1 to 5 Likert scale, with 5 being "strongly agree" and 1 being "strongly disagree." The average score for each item shall be calculated and report to two places to the right of the decimal. (For example, an instructor might receive a 4.12 average for responses to the first question.) The student is also asked to provide his/her anticipated grade in the course in whole letter grades (A, B, C, D, F). [See Feedback.] For each evaluation item, both the total average score for all students, and the average score by the combination of A and B students shall be reported adjacent to the evaluation question being assessed.
5. Access to results of data is limited to Missouri State enrolled students and the faculty member being evaluated.

Students access feedback through "My Information" on any course in which they seek to enroll.

Faculty access feedback his/her courses through Faculty/Advisor Resource Center pages.

6. All Fall and Spring semester courses shall be evaluated, but only courses with five or more students shall be reported. (Independent study courses will not be reported.) Both graduate and undergraduate courses will be evaluated (unless Graduate Student Organization opts out of the plan for courses with a 600 or higher course number).

Rationale: The reliability of the data decreases with a small sample size, so courses with fewer than five students will not be reported.

Rationale: 500 level courses may have both graduate and undergraduate students and the impression that each has of the course is influenced by that dynamic. Therefore, all students taking a 500 level course should have the opportunity to participate in the evaluation of that course and the ratings should reflect the entire enrollment in the course.

7. Results of the prior semester evaluation shall not be accessible until after the University deadline for faculty members to turn in final grades (typically the Monday after Finals Week), but shall be accessible prior to the beginning of the next Fall/Spring semester. The system shall be first implemented in the 2006 Fall semester.

(Note: Dummy data is being created to test the system in the Spring of 2006, prior to the first time the process is used for real classes.)

8. Feedback summaries for each class shall be retained and accessible for a period of five years. Results from each semester shall remain separate and shall not be aggregated into a cumulative average.

Rationale: Viewing results from multiple semesters provides students with a more accurate picture of students' perceptions of the professor's class. Some courses are only offered every two years; this would provide data from more than one semester. It is consistent with the five year cycles for faculty tenure and promotion. Data older than five years may not reflect current teaching methods or students' current impressions.

9. **Change in the language of the evaluation questions** or the overall basic delivery mechanism for collecting and distributing data require **approval of both SGA and Faculty Senate**. (Minor changes to the delivery mechanism and computerization can occur without formal approval, but shall be reported to the SGA, Faculty Senate and the Academic Relations Committee.)

Questions are to satisfy the following parameters:

- Questions should focus on variables important to student learning.
The answer to the question should be important and informative.
- Questions should have broad applicability rather than being relevant to only a small portion of classes.
- Things outside the control of the professor should not be evaluated
(such as room dynamics, equipment failures, group selected texts . . .).
- Wording ambiguities should be avoided or minimized in the structure of the questions.
Conjunctions should be avoided; the reader does not know which half of the question to answer.
Conditional statements that tend to bias responses should be avoided.

10. This Report was developed by a joint student-faculty-staff subcommittee of the Academic Relations Committee and was presented to and approved by the Academic Relations Committee (12/9/05) and SGA (11/29/05). Other groups to which the Report will be presented include: Faculty Senate, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, and the Missouri State University Administration.

Senate Action 17-05/06

Adopted by Senate on February 9, 2006

Right of Challenge Expires March 9, 2006

New Option for Dual Emphasis in Graphic Design & Illustration

A complete copy of the above curricular proposal can be viewed in the Faculty Senate office.