

University Faculty Meeting

Friday, October 25, 2019

Noon – 1:00 PM

LBC 108

Meeting called to order at: 12:02 PM

Provost Painter welcomed the group, introduced Julie Hunter, Director of University events.

Ms. Hunter reviewed the recently announced changes to Commencement in spring 2020, which includes moving ceremonies back to the Edmunds Center on campus. The Commencement website is up to date and more information will be provided as it develops. Graduate Commencement will occur on Thursday evening, the Undergraduate Awards and Recognition on late Friday afternoon, and the undergraduate Commencement will be divided into two events on Saturday, with the Schools of Business Administration and Music sharing Commencement in the morning and the College of Arts and Sciences holding their Commencement in the afternoon.

Since seating is limited, each commencement will be a ticketed event. University events will work with SGA on how it is best to distribute the tickets.

Provost Painter commented that by moving the Undergraduate Awards and Recognition later in the day and to the Edmunds Center, the hope is to make it an event that people want to attend. The ceremony will likely be followed by a reception.

Lisa Coulter, Director of Assessment, Chair University General Education Committee (UGEC) (accompanied by Drs. Megan O'Neill, Tom Vogel, Carolyn Nicholson).

Dr. Coulter reviewed why we undertake General Education assessment; our SACs standards require we have learning outcomes and a means to assess them. Those outcomes include:

writing, information literacy, speaking, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, human cultures and the natural world, values, and the integration of learning.

The learning outcomes, as well as the rubrics to score them, are developed by faculty.

Faculty are asked to submit artifacts, which are derived from a random sampling of students from selected courses. Once submitted, the artifacts are evaluated for scoring and the results of assessment are used to improve courses and outcomes

Dr. Coulter provided a series of slides which reflected the results of assessment review from 2009-15. She also reviewed plans for 2019-20; including collecting artifacts from FSEM and P courses, scoring samples and completing the assessment cycle, reviewing GLOs and rubrics from Values courses, collecting samples and assessing the speaking, critical thinking and integration of learning GLOs in the School of Music.

Reports reflecting the assessment activities are available on the Provost's website.

Who is responsible /owns assessment?

- Assessment coordinators
- UGEC committee
- Faculty who

- write and revise GLOs and rubrics
- teach courses and collect samples
- score samples
- help draft reports and use results for continuous improvement

Dr. Coulter encouraged faculty to respond when asked to provide scoring of rubrics or to provide artifacts and explained the importance.

Dr. Kimberly Reiter introduced the information on which the faculty would vote – i.e. the discontinuance of submitting z-scores as part of student evaluations of teaching (SET).

Motion:

Stetson University Faculty Policy Document – Student Evaluations of Teaching
Policy regarding z-scores calculated from student evaluation of teaching

Presented to Faculty Senate on 8-26-19; passed on to full Faculty.

1. Quantitative reports of student evaluations at Stetson currently included z-scores as a comparative metric. These scores are calculated by averaging the means of the 15 questions into 5 categories and then comparing those averages to the average and standard deviation by course level and college. Z-scores that are one half of a standard deviation above or below the comparison mean are flagged as possibly exemplary or possibly needing improvement.
2. As discussed in the SET task force report, these z-scores are calculated from statistically inappropriate means derived from biased underlying data. They are highly subject to influence from outliers and are often compared in categories that are not actually similar.
3. As an institution of higher learning that uses quantitative reports for evaluations, it is incumbent upon us, the faculty, to avoid simplistic and statistically inappropriate measures that are highly prone to multiple forms of bias in our faculty evaluation.
4. Beginning in spring 2020, quantitative reports of student evaluations will no longer include z-scores.
5. Candidates submitting portfolios for pre-tenure reviews, tenure or promotion may include past z-scores as evidence if desired by the candidate. No candidate is required to submit z-scores as part of a portfolio beginning in spring 2020.

Motion passes 94 in favor, 22 against.

Provost Painter discussed the agenda for today's meeting and how it was a healthy agenda with items that should be of interest to all; a mixture of shared information, voting on policy, and academic assessment.

Recently there has been discussion about the policies regarding program initiation, program discontinuance and faculty termination. Most of the attention has been on the policies on program discontinuance. Provost Painter has issued a formal response to the proposed policy from the faculty senate. Faculty should review it and be aware of the wording and read the report which clarifies his comments in the proposal.

The way this process has been handled is not a healthy process. The Provost's role is a role that resides between the President and Board of Trustees and the faculty. He must balance the roles in a shared governance model. The faculty senate has attempted to make the provost the final determination on

these policies, when in fact the review of faculty termination policies and programs falls under the bylaws for the responsibilities of the Board of Trustees.

Through this review process, multiple deans and interim deans have interacted with the Provost on these policies; he has also interacted with President Libby and Board of Trustees chair Joe Cooper. Indeed, President Libby stated to the provost, and the provost relayed to the senate, that it is unacceptable to her for the provost to be the final determiner on faculty continuance.

This process did not have the collaboration required to have the relationship we seek between faculty and administration. In fact, it has been erosive and destructive, and described by one faculty member as corrosive, which is also true. Issues like these end up dividing us.

During this review, Provost Painter looked at policies and procedures at other institutions to see if they aligned with Stetson's. President Libby discussed it with more than 2 dozen other presidents. We have not found a single institution that has a policy that aligns with the policy the senate proposes.

The provost responded to questions from the faculty regarding the proposed policies, his position, and the policies that he reviewed from other universities.

Meeting adjourned at 1:01 PM