



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1994-1995

Volume VIII

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of March 13, 1995

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH

3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, March 13, 1995

Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Statements and Proposals
 - A. Legislative Update and Questions -
Tom Hammond, Member, Kansas Board of Regents
- III. Approval of Minutes
- IV. President's Report
- V. Committee Reports
 - A. General Education Committee report - Ron Matson
 - B. Resolution - Faculty Senate Executive Committee
(tan attachment)
- VI. Old Business
 - A. Strategic Planning Task Force (2nd reading)
A.J. Mandt, Chair (2/13/95 agenda)
- VII. New Business
 - A. Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluation report
William Terrell, Chair (yellow attachment)
- VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Joyce Cavarozzi, President	3451	Box 53
James Clark, Past President	3220	Box 78
Donna Hawley, Vice President	3610	Box 41
Michael Kelly, Secretary	3590	Box 68
Jolynne Campbell, President-Elect	3146	Box 43
Ron Matson, Elected by Senate	3280	Box 25
Keith Williamson, Elected by Senate	3185	Box 31
Sue Bair, Appt'd by Senate Pres.	3340	Box 16

DRAFT

RESOLVED:

The Faculty Senate of Wichita State University supports President Hughes' decision to take down the steel superstructure of Cessna Stadium. Fiscal studies show that (1) the cost of bringing the existing stadium up to code are prohibitive, and that (2) the additional costs of reestablishing a Division I A or I AA football program are beyond the university's means under any foreseeable circumstances. Further, the university has academic needs that have priority, such as enhancement of library holdings, student financial aid, expansion of laboratories, computer equipment, etc. The President's decision was well-conceived, well-founded, and prudent. We urge the Kansas Legislature to support the university recommendation.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC FACULTY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY EVALUATION

February 1995

Committee Members:

Edward Flentje, Academic Services
Kenneth Pitetti, Health Professions
Ronald Christ, Fine Arts
Walter Horn, Engineering
Jeri Carroll, Education
William Terrell, Business, Chair
Melvin Zandler, Natural Science
Rob Zettle, Social Sciences
Ben Rogers, Humanities

CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Method	3
III.	Existing Faculty Evaluation Practices	4
IV.	Department Practices and Regent's Guidelines	21
V.	De Facto University Guidelines	22
VI.	Recommended University Evaluation Guidelines	23

APPENDIXES

I.	Charge to Ad Hoc Committee
II.	Faculty Performance Evaluation (Kansas Board of Regents)
III.	Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation Report (Kansas Board of Regents)
IV.	Ad Hoc Committee Survey of Chairs and Faculty (Instructions, Questionnaire and Responses by College)
V.	Ad Hoc Committee Draft Compliance Report to Regents
VI.	Fall 1984 Faculty Survey on Criteria for Quality Teaching (Instructions, Coding System, Response Rates, Results by Tenure Status and by College)

I. INTRODUCTION

In March 1992 the Kansas Board of Regents received a report from a system wide Faculty Evaluation Task Force. A portion of this report contains a policy recommendation, which was approved by the Regents during its April 1992 meeting. The policy is titled FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (Appendix II). Although the preamble statement of philosophy includes all kinds of faculty evaluations, the specific evaluative policy provisions focus on annual merit pay deliberations. By May 1992 Regent's staff proposed a policy implementation time schedule and presented this to the Council of Chief Academic Officers. This schedule requires that universities begin developing department-level evaluation criteria no later than January 1993 and that such criteria should be in place for annual merit pay considerations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1994. Pursuant to this schedule, in the spring of 1993 Provost Rex Cottle requested that the academic deans provide written reports on college and department evaluation policies and procedures (Dean Reports). Prior to completion of the Dean Reports Faculty Senate President Griffith provided the membership and charge for the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee (Appendix I) in March 1993. The Committee held its first meeting April 2, 1993 with professor Elmer Hoyer as guest. In addition to the detailed and extensive charge to the Committee, professor Hoyer indicated that the Regents had requested a compliance report from each campus with respect to the recent evaluation policy and that the Committee would be expected to write a draft report for use by the University central

administration in responding to the Regents.

By May 1993 the Committee received copies of the Dean Reports and discovered that the Cottle request to the academic deans only covered policies and procedures with respect to teaching and service. The Dean Reports contain no information regarding the evaluation of research, scholarly activity, and creative or performance achievements of faculty. As such, these reports were neither suitable for determining compliance with Regent's evaluation policy nor for meeting the Committee charge. They do contain some 1993 benchmark information concerning the evaluation of teaching and service, and some portions of the Dean Reports are referenced below. Several bound copies of the Reports are available in the Faculty Senate office for loan to interested persons.

By the end of May 1993 the Council of Chief Academic Officers had approved the Regent's request for compliance reports due in late October. However, Regent's staff did not issue report guidelines until August 20 (Appendix III). At this point the Committee established liaison with and support from Dr. Peter Zoller as representing the Academic Vice President's office. Numerous joint meetings and information exchanges led to a Committee Survey of department chairs and directors of academic units that contain classroom faculty. Survey instructions, content questions, and results by college are contained in Appendix IV. The Survey was conducted in the last week of September and the Committee Draft Compliance Report (Appendix V) was finished and provided to the Academic Vice President's office in time for the October University compliance report (Appendix VI). The Committee returned to the

Senate charge, assigned writing tasks , and held its last calendar 1993 meeting in late November.

Subsequently, Committee member Dr. Mel Zandler provided the results of a fall 1984 survey of faculty concerning the evaluation of teaching. It is remarkable both for its detail and for the 198 faculty that completed and returned the survey (Appendix VII). Moreover, it provides a coding system that proceeds from the general to the specific details of instructional effort and achievement.

II. METHOD

Consistent with the scope of the charge (Appendix I) and with the need to address Regent's compliance guidelines concerning annual merit pay determination, the Committee designed a survey questionnaire that reflects both objectives (Appendix IV). The first 11 questions deal with merit pay compliance guidelines and the remaining 14 questions relate to the characteristics of faculty evaluation and merit pay from the perspective of Committee policy interests. Since the target of evaluation concerns classroom teachers, persons holding faculty rank whose duties are primarily administrative are excluded. Further, the Committee decided to write the first 11 survey questions exactly as they appear in the Regent's guidelines. There were no survey instructions that attempted to define, explain, or otherwise interpret the intent and meaning of the guidelines. Respondents were instructed to circle Yes, No, or Don't Know, and to indicate inapplicable (NA) items and written comments on the survey form. The survey was sent to chairs-directors and to randomly selected department faculty under

the auspices of the Academic Vice President (Appendix IV). Chairs-directors who failed to respond to the initial request received a second request from that office. It was also decided by the Committee that the chair responses, although showing variation, would not be subjected to statistical techniques because the variation is attributed to assignable cause.

The Committee identified 43 units in the Academic Affairs division of the University. Of these, 35 chairs returned the completed survey form, with very few omitted responses. The eight chairs and departments that did not respond to the survey include four departments in the College of Health Professions, three in the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and one School in the College of Fine Arts. The survey also was sent to 46 faculty, who were randomly-selected within each academic unit. Only 17 faculty returned the completed forms. Survey frequencies for both groups are tabulated by college and summed for the University in Appendix IV.

III. EXISTING FACULTY EVALUATION PRACTICES

General (Regent's Guidelines)

All 35 chairs agree that "The annual evaluation reflects the distribution of teaching, scholarship and service in each faculty member's assignment" (Survey question #1). This Regent's guideline derives from the policy statement (Appendix II): "Annual evaluation should reflect individual faculty assignments" (emphasis added). Perhaps chairs do indeed take into account differences in individual faculty assignments (job description). But there are also dean and chair-departmental policies that point toward a homogeneous

system of weights that are used in job description. The College of Education uses weights initiated by the dean to define every professor's job in every department, as well as to serve as weights in determining annual merit, and therefrom to determine salary increases. Similarly, Health Professions developed proportions at the departmental level that apply to job description and to merit evaluation. In Engineering the department chairs met for the purpose of establishing weights and, thereafter, each chair developed job assignment weights. For example, the chair of Electrical Engineering selected .50 teaching, .25 research, and .25 service. It is unlikely that any of these systems were initiated and approved by departmental faculty. Departmental faculty did approve the dean's initiative in Education.

Moreover, there exists another set of weights, not necessarily related to job description, that may be used in determining an individual's salary increase. During fall 1991 Provost Rex Cottle asked the academic deans to "... indicate the portion of a typical individual's raise that is based upon ..." teaching, research, and service. Some deans provided college wide proportions:

<u>College</u>	<u>Teaching</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>Service</u>
Business	.45	.45	.10
Education	.40	.40	.20
Engineering	Delegated to Departments		
Fine Arts	.40	.30	.30
Health	Delegated to Departments		
Liberal Arts	Delegated to Departments		

Some of these "typical raise" proportions have gone into effect without departmental faculty approval. The mischief they invite is clear. Because they are not related to job description the teaching done by one professor with a 12-hour load, three preparations, and one graduate course is weighted the same for pay purposes as another professor teaching 6 hours at lower division with one preparation. Likewise, the professor on 6 hours teaching who publishes a paper is in line for the maximum merit increase, while the 12-hour faculty will not likely receive even an average increase. Note that this event has embedded in it an assumption that reduced teaching responsibility is not payment for research. That is, there is no equivalency established between the one published paper and the three to six hours of eliminated instruction (6 to 12 hours eliminated per academic year) so that both faculty would be considered to have equivalent access to merit raises, with the ultimate pay recommendation depending only on the quality of the work.

The use of weights in job description and in establishing relative merit is not widespread. Some chairs openly acknowledge that they only have job description weights because a dean or a vice-president requires them to have weights. In such cases merit pay is based on judgment (chair or committee consensus), or upon an ordering procedure (lexical) that cannot make use of job description weights. Education is the only college that carries the weights to a logical conclusion, namely, a linear equation that yields a weighted average of numerical indexes (real numbers between 1 and 5) that have been assigned by the chair and faculty

categories: teaching, scholarship, and service (Dean Reports, various College documents). For example, the department of Curriculum and Instruction uses a measure of teaching merit that is 90 to 100 percent determined by student ratings. Faculty who are rated 4.18 in teaching, 3.50 in scholarship and 4.9 in service are given the following weighted average as measuring merit:

$$4.052 = .4(4.18) + .4(3.50) + .2(4.9)$$

There are several problems with this approach even if it has faculty approval. First, since homogeneity in job description is implied, there are likely some pecuniary pressures to make everyone conform to the same weights. The College of Education provides for exceptions to their uniform weights: Chairs and faculty may negotiate different weights on a short-term basis. Second, in order to assure that the three categories of work are mutually exclusive (to avoid double counting), the issue must be forced by viewing each work area as merely the title of a long list of activities and sub-activities that appear in no other work area. In Education, the activities for each work area also are ranked into classes, some of which are more desirable than others. Third, it is not at all clear that in some sense one can reduce disparate qualities-activities to a summum bonus via mathematical operations. Fourth, even if a kind of artificial mutual exclusivity is achieved it does not follow that the separate elements of work are independent of each other. That is, persons who are highly rated as teachers might also tend to be highly rated as scholars, or, high teacher ratings may coincide with high levels of service. To the extent of dependence, it may not be possible to justify the weighting procedure. An intensive examination in one area, with cursory review of the other areas,

may suffice. Fifth, there are some who view numerical procedures as not providing any new information. In this sense, the marginal cost far outweighs the marginal benefit. Faculty who are known to be highly rated without a weighted average remain so after computing the average, and faculty who are known by other means to have little interest in their work show up with low weighted averages. The extremes are already known, and weighted averages just duplicate the results of a far less time and cost consuming review.

In order to deal with individual faculty interests, there is an alternative numerical system that avoids both ex ante job assignments and the attending weights. The point of departure lies in recognizing that the traditional summary elements of teaching, research, and service have to be broken down into component activities anyway. So, why not deal directly with the activities? A list of 20 activities is approved by unit faculty, and each professor receives a numerical merit value from zero to five (0 - 5) for each activity. The sum of the merit values, one for each teacher, provides the basis for a merit ordering of the faculty. Individuality is permitted according to the choice of activities with a nonzero score, and according to the work effort or emphasis on a few activities. The same sum is attained whether it involves one point in each of 20 activities or five points in each of only four activities (with all of the others rated at zero). There is a variant of this procedure that permits the inclusion of additional activities in case the initial list is not exhaustive with respect to worthwhile undertakings.

The most important proviso concerning numerical rating schemes stems from the fact that the component measures are often

combined (usually via addition) into a single number. This permits highly-rated performance in one area to compensate for substandard work in another area. In fact, no one really believes that poor teaching is balanced with (or offset by) outstanding research, or that outstanding service is a substitute for scholarly activity. The problem with adding a teaching rating to a research rating is that there is no reality to which the operation corresponds. Imagine how one would combine or "add" teaching and research in the absence of numerical indexes. But such an operation is the reality for separate weights or separate lengths. Hence, their separate numerical measures can rightly be added together. At least, the use of some additive formula ought to be restricted to faculty who have achieved a minimum satisfactory rating in one or more of the component areas.

Some chairs and departments are well aware of the foregoing problem, and they will not use any kind of aggregated merit index (a scalar). One formal alternative involves an ordering of the various work components, say, teaching first, research second, service third (a vector). As an example, teaching would be examined first to determine only satisfactory or unsatisfactory work (a satisficing criterion as opposed to a linear ordering). Among the satisfactory set of faculty, publications are judged in the interest of determining relative merit and salary increase. Among the unsatisfactory teachers, low merit and low pay raises are established without examining research. Other departments might first establish a ranking or ordering of faculty on the basis of teaching, say, an unacceptable set, an average set, an above average set, and an outstanding set. Distinctions among

response is very low on the other aspects of teaching evaluation. Only 14 chairs report that they employ the "Assessment of tests or other measures of student learning" (#3b). Only 21 indicate that they engage in "Evaluation of syllabi" (#3c). Only 19 chairs consider the "Assessment of instructional materials" (#3d). A few more chairs (24) take into account "Student advising" (#3e). Several chairs added some evaluation methods that are not mentioned in the guidelines. The most frequent (but fewer than 10 chairs) include a) exit interviews with graduating students, b) direction of theses and dissertations, and c) chair classroom visitations.

In contrast to these chair responses, the fall 1984 survey of faculty (Appendix VII, p. 12) is revealing. Response to the detailed components of evaluation criteria broken down by college shows that only the Engineering faculty placed student ratings of instruction among the top five most credible indicators of instructional quality. For all six college faculties, including Engineering, the class of activities associated with course planning (code 210 in Appendix VII) took precedence over student evaluations. For three colleges (Fine Arts, Liberal Arts, Business) the five most important criteria include the production of course materials (code 220). The use of on- and off-campus resources to supplement teaching (code 340) were among the five most important criteria for three colleges (Education, Fine Arts, Business). Another three colleges (Engineering, Liberal Arts, Business) gave priority to the national recognition of teaching (code A20) via professional associations, guest lectures, visiting and distinguished professorial designations. For the 198 classroom faculty without regard to

college, course planning and the production of course materials
clearly outrank student ratings.

As to Engineering, the extensive collection of student ratings for nearly every course, every professor, every semester has come to a close. All but one department stated in the Dean Reports that after April 1, 1993 student evaluations are to be collected in only one or two courses per year per professor, and that individually faculty-designed surveys of students in their classes will also be used in merit pay decisions. Perhaps the report by chair Dr. Richard Johnson (Mechanical Engineering) is illustrative of the underlying rationale for change:

Use of a standard evaluation instrument for teaching effectiveness such as SPTE or IDEA. Because of student complaints about the number of evaluations they are asked to fill out and evidence that some are intentionally invalidating their responses, only two courses for each faculty member would be evaluated each calendar year.

Related comments and ideas. Suggest to SPTE that by discarding the top 5-10% and the bottom 5-10% responses for each question might remove some of the problems associated with intentional biasing of the results by students.

Along the lines of Dr. Johnson's experience, Dr. Charles Burdsal (person responsible for SPTE design, administration, and processing) reports that the total number of students in the classroom when the survey is taken is not recorded. Hence, his office has no empirical evidence bearing on the extent of student non response. However, non response is a significant problem in the use of student opinions due to response bias, and one recent standard recommends that they not be used if the response rate is less

than 75 per cent.

Regent's guidelines also request that chairs respond to the following open-ended point (#4): "The department has available for faculty the following norm referenced student rating scale(s) corrected for bias:" It is difficult to know what the chairs understand by the technical terms in this instruction. However, 21 of 26 chairs indicate the availability of SPTE, 5 chairs state that SPTE is not available or that they do not know, and 9 of the 35 chairs responding to the survey do not mention SPTE at all (#4a). With respect to IDEA 21 of 24 chairs affirmed availability, 3 say either no or don't know, and 11 chairs fail to mention IDEA (#4b). It should be noted in these frequencies that a substantial number of chairs reported availability for both IDEA and SPTE.

The chairs in Business and Education plus one department in Liberal Arts (7 of 11) report the availability and use of college-developed questionnaires, but not to the exclusion of IDEA and SPTE (#4c). According to Dr. Burdsal, the different question sets employed in Education and Business are not norm referenced and the results are not corrected for student motivation bias. However, both colleges have several years of experience behind current form usage. Moreover, the need for norm referencing seems to diminish as the extent of factual questions (as opposed to opinions) increases. That is, if 90 per cent of a class agrees that more than, say, 3 semi-weekly classes were canceled without explanation, there is cause for alarm. There is no need to know by way of a norm that other faculty are similarly missing class.

In the Dean Reports the Fine Arts college indicates the need

for "School/program-generated student rating forms for classroom courses and creative, applied, and performance-oriented classes." In response, the School of Music developed a student questionnaire that was determined jointly by the Music Student Council and the Music Faculty. This suggests that questionnaire items thought to be important to students in a given class or department are not necessarily those that appear on some generic and precast form. In general, every college has developed questionnaires beyond SPTE and IDEA in order to provide student commentary that is closely related to the nature of student interest and/or to the nature of instruction.

Relative to teaching, the evaluation of research/creative activity appears to be of less interest to the Regents. Research evaluation may be of less interest in the university as well. Recall that it is omitted completely from the Dean Reports and the request for those reports from Provost Cottle. Moreover, there is no effort to establish an extensive coding system commensurate with the one developed for teaching evaluation. The Regent's guidelines simply inquire if some four criteria are taken into account (#5). The first deals with "Information on the quality of research" (#5a), and 31 of 35 chairs state that it is included. Perhaps it would be of some interest to know how this is determined as well as why four department chairs answer in the negative. Most chairs (33/35) also agree that "The amount of research" (#5b) is considered, and that (32/35) they take into account "The media in which findings were disseminated" (#5c).

But on the question of "The reception and importance of the

research" (#5d), only 22 chairs of 33 responding said that it is counted in research evaluation. Eight chairs report that it is not included and three do not know whether it is or is not taken into account. Aside from the fact of chairs who gauge research quality but deny judging the importance of the research, there may be a basic and ingrained asymmetry in the manner of evaluating teaching, service, and research. In all areas, it is the reception of faculty work that is a crucial meter of intellectual contribution. Exclusive focus on the reception of teaching is open to question. On the write-in portion of the survey, a few chairs mentioned a) citations of faculty research in the research of others, b) research of national and international significance, and c) externally funded research.

Service evaluation from the Regent's guidelines shows interest in only a few criteria (#6). Scope is severely narrow and the question of reception is not even broached. Most all of the chairs (33 to 35 of 35) agree that service assessment includes: a) Committee assignments, b) Faculty senate service, c) Professional speeches, d) Participation on editorial and advisory boards, and, where applicable (27/35), e) Grant reviews. Write-in responses include duties with respect to association meetings (program chair, program board, discussant) and participation in juries and creative exhibits. Very few chairs mentioned service or research service (service research) requiring discipline-related work on behalf of governments (city, county, state, federal), non-profit organizations, and school boards. None of the chairs acknowledge consulting (work for pay) in the chair survey, but from the Dean Reports

it is a factor for some departments, usually with respect to discipline-oriented service research or to discipline-oriented service teaching.

At the level of college dean it is possible that service is ignored in the determination of merit. In the Dean Reports, Dr. R. Malcolm Richards, dean of the Business college, reported that after reviewing unit evaluation practices:

On the subject of service effectiveness, I would suggest that evaluations are based more on the perceived quantity of effort rather than in relationship to quality.

Evaluation Follow Up (Regent's Guidelines)

Subsequent to faculty evaluation, recent policy requires that "There is a plan for discussing each faculty member's annual evaluation with an opportunity for the faculty member to respond" (#8). Chair response is that 25 say there is such a plan, 7 say there is no plan and 2 chairs claim not to know. Only 20 chairs agree that "Strategies for linking evaluation of faculty outcomes with assistance and support are evident" (#9). A separate, but related, question asks if "Procedures are in place for the linking of faculty evaluation outcomes with assistance for renewal and development and when necessary reassignment or other personnel actions" (#11b). Only 16 chairs agree that such procedures are in place.

Chair Training (Regent's Guidelines).

How well has the University prepared chairs-directors in the interest of faculty evaluation? Approximately two-thirds (20/32) of them answered no to "Procedures are in place for the training of department chairs in the administration of faculty evaluation"

(#11a). The Office of Academic Affairs reports that such training has been offered via periodic seminars. But chair responses shown above suggest that this training is not effective with regard to issues of scope, criteria, variety and how a chair is to search for achievement (say, by interview in the professor's office). At best, it is not apparent whether the response by chairs reflects the lack of awareness of such training or an understanding that it is not useful, relevant, or generally worthwhile.

Evaluation Procedures (Committee).

The Committee asked if "A written form is used to guide faculty in the selection of material for the annual merit pay evaluation" (#12). Most chairs (29/34) agree that a written form is used. But on "The form is designed by departmental faculty" (#13), only 18 chairs agree that this is so. When asked if "The form is designed by persons other than the departmental faculty" (#14), 14 chairs say yes. Three of 35 chairs ignored the question. According to chair responses, instruction forms used in Business, Fine Arts, and most of the departments in Liberal Arts and Sciences are not designed by departmental faculty. As an example of instructions not designed by departmental faculty, the Business college used the following instructions for calendar 1993 merit evaluations.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Instructions. Summarize below evidence of teaching effectiveness. (Attach additional evidence.)

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

Instructions. List your most significant publications accepted in 1993. (Attach copies.)

SERVICE

Instructions. List your most significant service assignments in 1993.

Otherwise, 29 of 34 chairs say that the "Department receives faculty annual report data in sufficient time for careful study prior to merit pay recommendations" (#15). Almost all of the chairs (33/35) claim that "A permanent long-term record of faculty annual report data is maintained in the department office" (#16). In addition, some chairs (16/34) think that such files are maintained in the dean's office and 3 (3/33) chairs think they are maintained in the office of the Academic Vice President. In contrast, a recent Business School dean (R. Malcolm Richards) offered the following (Dean Reports) with respect to teaching evaluation"

The School does not currently maintain a historical data base for purposes of monitoring teaching effectiveness over time; nor does the department/school retain such data. When such data are provided--typically in conjunction with promotion and tenure evaluations, the data come from the faculty member.

Merit Pay Determination (Committee).

In 21 (of 34) departments chairs respond that "Departmental merit pay recommendations are determined exclusively by the chair" (#17). This includes all the departments in Engineering and all the reporting departments in Health Professions. Only 11 chairs indicate that "Departmental merit pay recommendations are determined by the chair and a faculty committee" (#18). On a more serious note, about 40 per cent (13/34) of the chairs answer no to

the proposition that "Faculty are informed of departmental merit pay recommendations as soon as these are determined" (#19). This includes all the departments in Engineering and Business. One chair volunteered that informing faculty of departmental merit pay recommendations is: "Not allowed. Vice President's office has asked [us] not to inform [faculty] until the final decision has been made."

Chairs (27/34) reported that "Departmental merit pay recommendations are sometimes altered by either the dean or by the academic vice president" (#20). Moreover, only 11 chairs agree that "In case of changes in departmental pay recommendations made by persons outside the department, the affected faculty are informed of the change" (#21). In short, merit pay recommendations determined at the site of merit evaluation (departments) are altered by administrative authorities that are progressively removed from evaluation activities, and there is neither an information flow back to faculty nor any required accountability for these actions. In light of the foregoing responses, it is to be expected that only 16 (of 34) chairs claim that "Faculty have access to an appeals procedure regarding merit pay increases" (#22). Ten chairs deny that such a procedure exists and eight chairs do not know. According to chair responses by college, it appears that such appeals procedures only exist within Education, Fine Arts, and the majority of departments in Liberal Arts.

Pay Not Related to Annual Merit (Committee).

The Kansas Legislature appropriates monies for faculty salaries and for changes in those salaries based on merit. Not all of

these monies are allocated to the departments for the purpose of final merit salary determination. As a result, and over a period of several years, the nexus between appropriations and classroom faculty merit may be broken. Three survey questions deal with the possibility that the salary of some teaching faculty is based primarily on considerations other than merit.

It is possible for gross inequities to occur between the salaries of administrators returning to the teaching faculty in departments and those of other departmental peer faculty. Chair answers to the survey show eight affirmative responses and seven no's on the following statement: "Faculty returning to the department from an administrative position are paid similarly to incumbent faculty of the same rank and experience" (#23). While 17 chairs say they do not know about this, the seven chairs who are now experiencing pay beyond merit for returning administrators might be a source for further exploration.

In order to make the next two survey issues clear, the Committee prefaced them both with "aside from annual merit." The second survey issue shows the extent to which chairs do or do not attempt to maintain salary differences by rank. Two-thirds of the chairs (19/32) agree with the following: "Aside from annual merit, faculty do not receive pay increases that would place them at or above the pay level of persons in the next higher rank" (#24). But 9 chairs responded with no, i.e., that there are pay increases that do indeed jump across ranks. Four chairs say they do not know whether pay increases do or do not cross ranks, and 3 of the 35 chairs ignored the question. This is a delicate matter, and the reasons

for it require further inquiry.

The third question bears on the use of annual merit monies in hiring new faculty. Salary inversion, salary compression, and inequities of salaries within ranks exist. The majority of chairs (27/35) agree that "Aside from annual merit, newly-hired faculty are sometimes paid more than incumbent faculty at the same rank" (#25a). But 14 chairs state that newly-hired faculty are sometimes also paid more than incumbent faculty at the next higher rank (#25b). This fact calls for an explanation. Why not promote new hires to the next rank if they are to be paid according to it?

IV DEPARTMENT PRACTICES AND REGENT'S GUIDELINES

One charge to the Committee is that it should identify departments whose practices are not consistent with Regent's policy and/or guidelines. Given the large number of diverse elements that are required for compliance, it is probable that all departments meet some of them, but that no department meets all of them. In the Committee's draft compliance report (Appendix V), it is noted that departments avoiding the use of measures of student learning and teaching materials are not in compliance with Regent's Policy. In addition, Engineering and Business have avoided departmental faculty in determining merit standards and both colleges fail to inform departmental faculty of departmental merit pay recommendations. Education is the only college that has codified the nearly exclusive use of student ratings in establishing teaching merit.

The University is not in compliance with Regent's policy concerning the training of department chairs for the administration

of faculty evaluation. It is not in compliance on the count of using evaluation as the basis for support, renewal, assistance and development. The problem of a weak linkage between merit evaluation and the use of merit monies appropriated by the legislature is noted. Not all monies so appropriated are bound to merit increases for incumbent faculty. There are administrators, new administrators, new faculty, unfilled positions, persons who teach without faculty status, and shrinkage that must be considered. In addition, deans may hold back a part of merit monies to use in adjusting faculty salaries after the departmental evaluations and pay recommendations have concluded. Individual faculty tend not to be informed of these changes and the administrators responsible for the changes need not account for them.

V. DE FACTO UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES

From the sources reviewed above, the University has very few guidelines for faculty evaluation that are common across academic units. All departments employ a short-hand description of faculty work, such as: a) teaching, research, service; b) teaching, creative activity, service; c) teaching, scholarship, service; or, d) teaching, scholarship, service, administration. Since these stem from a period when no thought was given to some weighting or to some ranking scheme, it may be that the descriptive terms are no longer the most appropriate ones to use. Further, all departments break each of their descriptive phrases into component activities. These vary widely across departments and colleges. In some departments the components are ranked (at least into equivalence

classes). In others, the elements list is far beyond what any single professor could undertake (attempting to achieve exhaustion), then particular applicable items are selected on an ex post facto basis as both the composition of work and the basis for merit evaluation.

It appears that no department has an explicit list of undesirable or prohibited work activities. That is, faculty engaged in work that is not on the components list may report it nevertheless. It is unknown whether "off-the-list" activities are invited or if they figure in the annual merit evaluation.

All departments have some method of translating various work components (once decided) into merit pay recommendations. But the procedures for doing this vary a great deal across departments and colleges, and the method whereby procedures are individualized is unclear. There are no standards for an information flow from the evaluating "center" to the professor.

VI. RECOMMENDED UNIVERSITY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

The Senate charge to the Committee contains several categories of recommendation requests (Appendix I). This section attempts to deal with all of them. Above all, the Committee is operating from the perspective that variety in departmental evaluation procedures should be preserved, subject to providing a fair evaluation for each individual and subject to departmental mission.

A. General Policy Considerations.

1. Every person with teaching responsibilities is to be evaluated, whether or not they hold faculty rank and whether or not

ments and colleges, and the method whereby procedures are individualized is unclear. There are no standards for an information flow from the evaluating "center" to the professor.

VI. RECOMMENDED UNIVERSITY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

The Senate charge to the Committee contains several categories of recommendation requests (Appendix I). This section attempts to deal with all of them. Above all, the Committee is operating from the perspective that variety in departmental evaluation procedures should be preserved, subject to providing a fair evaluation for each individual and subject to departmental mission.

A. General Policy Considerations.

1. Every person with teaching responsibilities is to be evaluated, whether or not they hold faculty rank and whether or not they are in the Academic Affairs division of the University.
2. There should be a common calendar by which time departmental or unit evaluations and pay recommendations are complete and ready for transmittal to the Dean. In order to avoid duplication, this calendar should include the evaluation of untenured faculty.
3. Department evaluation procedures should provide for at least two contiguous years in each annual review.
4. The academic school or department should be established as the primary site of evaluation. The following records should be established and maintained at the departmental office:
 - a. Departmental evaluation policy.
 - b. Departmental instructions to faculty.
 - c. Departmental evaluations for each person.
 - d. The link between evaluation and departmental pay recommendation for each person.
 - e. The rationale for changes in departmental evaluations and pay recommendations made by persons outside the department.
5. Procedures and records regarding the annual evaluation for merit pay changes should be expressly confined to that purpose. There should be no information requested for annual evaluation that is not intended for that purpose, and the individual should be informed of any submitted informa-

tion that was not reviewed by departmental evaluators.

6. There should be developed procedures for an open information flow between affected parties and an opportunity for individual appeal at each stage of the process.

B. Departmental Faculty.

1. The faculty of each department should establish a written policy for annual faculty evaluation.
2. Chairs and Deans should review departmental policy and meet with the departmental faculty in the interest of any changes that should be made.
3. The faculty of each department should cast a secret ballot every third year on the following policy: The department desires to elect a committee of at least three faculty (staggered terms) for the purpose of faculty evaluation and merit pay recommendations. The evaluation committee will have no ex officio or permanent members otherwise. The committee will meet with the departmental chair in establishing the departmental recommendations to the Dean.

C. Department Chairs.

1. Chairs should transmit departmental pay recommendations for the entire department to each individual faculty as soon as these are developed and ready for transmittal to the Dean. At that time, faculty should be invited to appeal their individual pay recommendation.
2. Chairs are encouraged to meet with individual faculty prior to evaluation in the interest of gathering information that may not be written. Similarly, chairs should consider how staff can be employed in helping to minimize the burden on faculty in complying with the annual information requests.

D. Academic Vice President and Deans.

1. Since chairs form the crucial link between faculty and higher administrative levels, and since that role is likely to become more demanding, the Academic Vice President and/or the Deans may have to consider uniform 11-month appointments for all chairs.
2. Administrators above the department level should inform affected faculty of any changes in departmental pay recommendations so as to establish a written record (for transmittal to the department) and to provide an appeal opportunity.
3. Higher administrators are responsible for informing chairs on the art of faculty evaluation and on the availability of remedial opportunities in case of detected shortcomings. It is recommended that the central administration provide initiative and leadership in developing a Handbook for

Department Chairs.

4. In order to solve the problem of administrators returning to departmental faculty at inordinate salaries, it is recommended that all administrators holding faculty rank in an academic department be informed annually at contract time of what their pay would be if they would return to the department. That pay level would be determined annually by the affected department.
5. It is recommended that administrators at all levels develop a method of reporting to the general faculty how legislative salary appropriations were allocated.

E. Student Evaluations of Faculty.

Of all the ways of gathering information from students, the most popular method involves the use of a questionnaire. Unlike other faculty evaluation procedures, this one is currently outside the scope and/or oversight of faculty governance. Therefore:

1. It is recommended that the Faculty Senate establish an Ad Hoc Committee for the purpose of investigating the most frequently-used questionnaires to the end of reporting on the following questions.
 - a. How do advocates avoid the charge that the results comprise conjecture?
 - b. What informative content is provided? That is, can the user detect what faculty did to achieve good ratings and what the faculty did to receive low ratings?
 - c. How does the use of student surveys protect faculty from violations of academic freedom?
 - d. Are there any due process issues associated with use of survey results in faculty evaluation?
 - e. On balance, would it be an improvement if students were given a sample copy of the questionnaire at the beginning of the semester?
 - f. Is there a need for the Faculty Senate to establish a standing committee for the purpose of advising the Senate on the use and/or abuse of student ratings, or to serve as a hearing body for faculty that may have concerns?
 - g. Which students should be entitled to complete the survey form? Current practice involves only those who attend class on the day the survey is distributed.
 - h. Are there any new or suggested constraints on faculty behavior with respect to parties or dinners for students, field trips for students, off-campus class meetings with the professor, and any other activity that could be viewed as ingratiating?

2. It is recommended that surveys intended for faculty evaluation conform to certain administrative practices:
 - a. Faculty do not have access to blank survey forms and they have no responsibilities to administer the survey nor to report survey results. It must be strictly a "hands off" or a disinterested procedure.
 - b. Personnel who distribute and collect the surveys will acknowledge by their signature that they indeed conducted the survey for a particular class and they will record the number (n) of students present at the time the survey is taken.
 - c. Signatures and completed surveys will be sent to the department chairs after the results are tallied. This enables department faculty to apply standards concerning the response rate, the minimum number (n) of responses, and whether responses from more than one semester are to be combined prior to drawing any conclusions.

F. Weights Applied to Faculty

The advent of weights regarding classroom faculty is rooted in administrative initiative. The rationale, meaning, application, and restrictions lie outside the role of faculty in establishing an evaluative procedure. Therefore:

It is recommended that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee undertake an exploration of weights in order to advise the Senate on appropriate action. Among the issues to be resolved:

- a. What is the rationale for weights? Do they represent an improvement in faculty evaluation?.
- b. Who should decide whether a given academic unit even establishes weights?
- c. Is it possible to give the weights unambiguous meaning?
- d. If weights are to reflect work duties, should they vary among individuals, even in the same department, if the job duties are different?
- e. Should the weights be expressed as ranges instead of a fixed point, even for the same individual?
- f. Does the existence of weights imply that each academic unit must develop some equation for their application? How are the weights applied otherwise?

FACULTY SENATE

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, March 13, 1995.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Allen, Badgett, Bair, Benson, Brown, Burk, Byrum, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Celestin, Chambers, Chaudhuri, Ciboski, Clark, Combs, DeSilva, Duell, Eaglesfield, Erickson, Foster, Fowler, Gupta, Hanrahan, Hawley, Hay, Hitchcock, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Hughes, Hundley, Kelly, Kraft, Lancaster, Lansing, Mandt, Matson, Miller, Parkhurst, Paske, Saalman, Schommer, Sharp, Swan, Talia, Terrell, Wahlbeck, Williamson, Yeager, Zandler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bajaj, Boneh, Campbell, Christensen, Gythiel, Sutterlin

GUESTS: James S. Clark, Lynnette Murphy

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

1. Passed resolution supporting President Hughes decision about Cessna Stadium
2. Accepted Report and Recommendations from the Strategic Planning Task Force

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by President Cavarozzi at 3:30 p.m.

II. INFORMATION STATEMENTS:

President Cavarozzi introduced Regent Tom Hammond who addressed the Senate.

Regent Hammond discussed several issues that the Regents are currently working on: (1) the development of a joint governance board of the Board of Education and the Regents, 2) faculty evaluations, and (3) faculty workloads.

Regent Hammond explained most provisions of the faculty evaluation policy have been approved except the issue of student evaluations. He expressed his belief that student evaluations should be done on a yearly basis but he stressed that they will not be the only factor in the evaluation process. Faculty workload is another issue Regent Hammond felt needs to be addressed by the faculty. He stressed that the myths about faculty workload are a major public relations problem and that the faculty and the Regents need to do a better job explaining what faculty do and why it is important. The Regents will be studying the economic impact of faculty research to show how important higher education is to the state. Regent Hammond then called for questions from the Senate.

Senator Erickson asked what evidence there was indicating the current faculty evaluation system does not work. Regent Hammond explained that the Kansas Legislature wants some questions answered, and the Regents and the faculty need to work together to address this issue before the legislature does.

Senator Paske asked if the Regents realized how much time the faculty spend on addressing issues like faculty evaluations, faculty workloads, and program review.

Regent Hammond stressed the importance of accountability to the public, but he was not sure how else, other than yearly student evaluations, this could be done. President Cavarozzi mentioned that all six Regents schools had approved yearly evaluation, but not

standardized questions. Regent Hammond hoped a compromise could be reached where two or three broad questions could be included on all evaluations.

Senators Byrum and Terrell recommended that assessment criteria should be a local issue. Regent Hammond agreed.

Senator Clark and Senator Erickson asked how the Regents defined "workload" when so many faculty activities are so difficult to describe. Regent Hammond explained that they will be working from various documents including the Jordan report that identifies various activities with explanations for the differences between Regents' institutions. He again stressed the importance of the faculty getting its messages to the public.

Senator Swan asked if research benefits would focus on money brought into the state or would it also include the content and value of research. Regent Hammond explained that they are planning to look at research grants brought into the state and the benefits of the research from a system-wide standpoint so all the institutions would benefit.

President Cavarozzi mentioned that findings from Program Review indicated that 80% of the general education classes were being taught by tenured /tenure track professors. Regent Hammond that this is the kind of information that needs to get out to the public.

Senator Lancaster asked about the quality of the education delivered by the junior colleges and what the Regents and legislature could do to monitor this. Regent Hammond replied that the joint-governance committee will be discussing this issue. He added that the junior colleges have a great deal of support in the legislature, and that this issue may not be addressed until a budget crisis is reached.

Senator Byrum asked how Wichita State University ranks in providing information to the Regents. Regent Hammond replied that Wichita State University provides materials well in advance, and whenever information is needed, it is usually given.

Senator Duell asked what the faculty could do to help with public relations activities. Regent Hammond explained that the Regents are discussing funding a new position for public relations system-wide that will work with the Regents institutions to place information where it can be most effective.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of February 27, 1995 were approved as distributed.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. General Education Committee Report:

Senator Matson presented a report from the General Education Committee. He explained that the committee still needs to fill out the "issues and perspectives" courses. Currently there are 16 issues and perspectives courses in place with promises of 30 more. Senator Matson estimates that there will be 20-25 issues and perspectives courses in place for the fall semester. The committee is planning four workshops during the second and third week in April to aid the faculty in incorporating speaking, writing, math, and library research across the curriculum into their classes. He also informed that Senate that advising workshops will be offered on April 7, from 1:30 until 3:30 p.m. Senator Matson explained that the committee is working on making the catalog more user-friendly. All general education courses will be marked in the catalog along with a phrase explaining where the course fits into the curriculum.

Senator Byrum explained that large departments have experienced frustration when submitting "issues and perspectives" courses because

of the limitation of two courses per department. He felt that allowing two issues and perspectives courses per semester rather than only two per department would be a better option. Senator Matson explained that the committee is working under the guidelines of the ad hoc document adopted by the Senate four years ago. The committee is responding to concerns about this issue.

Senator DeSilva asked how the guidelines for the "issues and perspectives" courses are being reviewed. Senator Matson replied that the committee is looking at several different options and encouraged faculty to write to the committee at Box 25.

Senator Carroll asked if courses would be cross-referenced between departments. Senator Matson explained that there are only two interdisciplinary courses double-listed; others would not be.

**B. Resolution-Faculty Senate Executive Committee
(an attachment to March 13, 1995 Agenda)**

President Cavarozzi presented the resolution from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to the Senate for discussion.

Senator Hundley read from a letter from James Mendenhall entitled "Why sign a blank check." Senator Mandt mentioned that he also had received the letter but felt that President Hughes had reached the only conclusion that could be reached.

Senator Brown mentioned a report from Mr. Mendenhall and Dr. Ken Pitetti concerning development of Cessna Stadium. Senator Hawley informed the Senate that she had talked with Dr. Pitetti about this proposal and his concern is that any remodeling that is done will be handicapped-accessible. Senator Swan suggested that perhaps a more reasonable approach would be to talk about this after the superstructure has been torn down and to focus on making the remaining structure handicapped-accessible.

Senator Byrum suggested a return to the discussion of the resolution. He felt the intention of the resolution was to encourage President Hughes to address the issue and move us forward. He reminded the Senate that a resolution does not prohibit the President from making his decision, but it does alert him to the sensitivity of the question. President Cavarozzi responded that the decision has already been made by President Hughes and approved by the Regents. She asked President Hughes to add any comments. President Hughes informed the Senate that the Legislature's Joint Building Committee approved his request, saying that it was the only decision they could make. President Hughes went on to explain that the Facilities Director of the Board of Regents reported that the stadium steel superstructure should never have been built in the first place because of the deterioration of steel. He plans to discuss with the Board of Regents the latest SOS (Save Our Stadium) proposal. President Hughes went on to explain that testing has found asbestos in the structure which will add to the costs.

Senator Hoyer moved adoption of the resolution. Seconded by Senator Swan. Resolution was adopted unanimously.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

President Cavarozzi presented the report of the Strategic Planning Task Force for the second reading and approval.

Senator Sharp remarked that he felt it had been good that the task force recognized the need to have some environmental planning to identify factors that may impact the University. However, he stressed that one must have a means to identify which factors are the most important and stressed the need for strategic planning to set goals to help in this evaluation. He finds it unacceptable that WSU is not ready for strategic planning. He cited the current enrollment

Continued -
See 4-10-95
minutes

problems as an example of the need for planning. He said that if the faculty does not plan, then someone else will do it for them.

Senator Carroll suggested that a member of the community should be added as a representative. She also mentioned that not all the colleges were represented, and suggested that more members might be added. Senator Mandt responded that the committee will be expanding and contracting as needed to address different issues. He added that he would support a suggestion that the four faculty representatives come from different colleges.

Senator Swan requested that representation be made from the faculty or dean level. Senator Mandt stressed the need to go beyond the "parochial" representation of colleges and look at the University as a whole.

Senator Wahlbeck suggested that the University President should not be left out of this committee. Senator Mandt responded that President Hughes feels that he should not be a formal member of the committee but would attend as he sees the need. Senator Mandt stressed that this is an advisory committee to the President. Senator Carroll responded that, since this is an advisory group, then representatives from all the colleges are very important as is the role of a member of the community. Senator Mandt agreed and explained that this should be an inter-face group with part of the job is being in touch with both the university community and the Wichita community.

Senator Bair moved to receive the report. Seconded by Hoyer.
Approved.

Senator Swan moved to adjourn. Seconded by Senator Williamson.
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Kelly
Secretary