



Faculty



Senate

HIGHLAND HEIGHTS KY 41099 859-572-6400

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

October 28, 2002

Meeting begins at 3:00 PM

UC Ballroom

AGENDA

Call to Order, Adoption of Agenda

Approval of Minutes – September, 2002 Meeting

Guests

Rogers Redding, Provost & VP for Academic Affairs

Officer Reports

- | | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| • President | Steven Weiss |
| • Vice-President | Perilou Goddard |
| • Secretary | Carol Bredemeyer |
| • Parliamentarian | Ed Brewer |

Committee Reports

- Professional Concerns Chuck Frank

Voting Items:

- Web Evaluations Description
- Amendment to the Faculty Policy and Procedures Manual—Full-Time Non Tenure Track, Temporary Faculty

- Curriculum Ron Shaw

Voting Items:

Literature & Language:

- New minor in Workplace Writing
- Major changes to the minor in Creative Writing

Political Science

- A certificate program in Non-Profit Management

Social Work/Human Services

- A certificate in Social Justice

- | | |
|------------|-----------------|
| • Benefits | Diane Gronefeld |
| • Budget | Dennis Lye |

New Business

Announcements

Adjourn



Faculty Senate

HIGHLAND HEIGHTS KY 41099 859-572-6400

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 28, 2002

"There is no more vulnerable human combination than an undergraduate."

-John Sloan Dickey, 1955

PRESENT: Scottie Barty, Carol Bredemeyer (Sec'y), Ed Brewer (Parliamentarian), Paul Cooper, Penny Summers, Patty Fairbanks, John Filaseta, Chuck Frank (Chair, PCC), Mary Gers, Perilou Goddard (VP), Diane Gronefeld (Chair, Benefits), Cynthia Kelly, Vinay Kumar, Tom Leech, Alar Lipping, Dennis Lye (Chair, Budget), Maggie McGatha, John Metz, Melissa Moon, Terry Pence, Vijay Raghavan, Holly Riffe, Michael Rose, Cady Short-Thompson, Jim Thomas, Steve Weiss (President)

GUESTS: Annie Dollins, Rogers Redding, Katherine Meyer, Patty Connelly

The meeting was called to order by President Weiss at 3:03pm. He noted that handouts of the UCC items were available since links to them were not available with the agenda.

The minutes of the September 23, 2002 meeting were approved.

In the absence of President Votruba, Provost Redding made remarks. There is no news on the state budget. The Visions, Values, Voices (VVV) process is about halfway through its conversations. He noted some emerging themes. As far as distinguishing characteristics, the up close and personal atmosphere, small classes, the focus on quality, how to grow and maintain that quality, and the need to expand full time tenure track faculty. Off campus comments include that we need to encourage students to go to college, especially outside Campbell, Kenton, and Boone counties. There seems to be a lagging image perception about what we're doing.

In response to a question, Dr. Redding said that a committee will be appointed to recommend admission standards to his office. He also reported that Dean Jim Gress of the College of Education, who suffered a stroke, was still in Good Samaritan Hospital. He faces a long recovery, but has a strong support system of family and colleagues.

President Weiss announced that services for Thomas Fontova, a student who passed away last week, would be tomorrow at 11am at the Church of the Good Shepard in Montgomery.

OFFICER REPORTS

President: The committee searching for a director of the Institute for New Economy Technologies (INET) has interviewed one candidate so far. He has met with the Provost to discuss initiatives such as admission standards and tweaking of the Faculty Handbook. NKU has a new logo, which was unveiled at the Capital Campaign event. He also asked that faculty e-mail him about adverse working conditions (e.g., 30 year old carpeting, lack of ceiling tiles, office sharing).

There were no reports from the other officers.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Since it was the first meeting of the year with voting items, the President reviewed some parliamentary procedure. A speaker may speak only once on a motion until others have been heard and they may speak only twice on any motion.

Professional Concerns (Chuck Frank):

1. Online evaluations – specifications for IT to determine to create or buy a new system. This doesn't commit us to any system. The chair also pointed out that a lot of human effort is also involved in the current system. Legal counsel will be researching whether we can require students to do the evaluations. The motion PASSED.
2. Handbook revision – appointment of temporary faculty. There were questions about de facto tenure and annual reviews. A motion to refer the issue back to the PCC for further study PASSED.

Curriculum (Ron Shaw): President Weiss apologized for the links to the voting items not being available. He said if there was an objection to any item, it would not be considered today. There was an objection to the Social Justice proposal and no move to overrule the objection.

1. Literature & Language – New minor in Workplace Writing, requiring a 2/3 majority. The proposal PASSED 23-0.
2. Literature & Language – Changes to the minor in Creative Writing. The proposal PASSED.
3. Political Science – Certificate program in Non-Profit Management. After some discussion, a motion to POSTPONE the proposal to the November meeting passed.

Benefits (Diane Gronefeld): The committee is evaluating proposals and will have a final vote on November 6. There is funding for 27 sabbaticals and 19 applications were received. There were 15 project grant proposals for \$52,000; \$50,000 in funding is available. There is funding for 12 summer fellowships; 13 applications were received.

Budget (Dennis Lye): The committee is working on budget priorities and should have them ready for the November meeting. They are also working on equity issues.

There was a question about access to benefits by gay/lesbian partners. President Weiss indicated that the Executive Committee would discuss how to proceed with this issue.

There was no New Business.

Announcements

1. There will be a lecture "Wall Street v. Main Street", dealing with corporate ownership of media, sponsored by the Communications Dept. on Thursday, Nov. 14 at 6:30 in Landrum 110.
2. The Kentucky Academy of Science will hold its annual meeting on campus November 7/8.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:26pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Bredemeyer, Secretary

Web-Based Evaluation System for NKU Courses
System Description (Preliminary)
9/23/2002

A working group composed of IT staff and Faculty Senate representatives will use this document to produce a specification of a web-based evaluation system for NKU courses. The resulting specification will sent out for a cost estimate.

This document concentrates on the form and capabilities of the proposed system. It is meant to communicate system requirements to IT specialists and web programmers. It does *not* intend to specify policy or content; that is the purview of the Faculty Senate and University Administration, and such specifications will be outcomes of the collegial process. Neither does this document provide a rationale for the adoption of such a system; documents from the Faculty Senate Professional Concerns Committee can be consulted for representations of past and present discussions of the issue.

This outline is intended to be specific enough to permit the cost of development to be estimated, while being general enough to allow flexibility in the structure and content of the system that is ultimately adopted.

I. Evaluation Form Format

- A. Four parts
 1. 6 common university questions.
 2. 6 discipline / department specific questions.
 3. 6 class section specific questions.
 4. 6 questions collecting student demographic information that the system cannot extract from SIS (e.g., expected course grade; average hours outside of class spent on this course per week).
- B. Questions are multiple-choice (2-5 radio buttons) plus space for comments, as on current paper forms. The text field for comments should be of fixed size and require no scrolling. That is, a given comment should be limited to a single screen on the display when viewed by a student completing the form or by a faculty member viewing the form (*see illustration, next page*). A dimension of approximately 8 lines by 50 characters is recommended. This is meant to limit the amount of text the user may enter, and will make the text easier to read.
- C. The user may decline to answer a question by not checking any radio button; this is to be considered a valid response. However, the system should provide a final reminder/review of unanswered items when the student submits the form to assure that no question is accidentally left unanswered.
- D. Students should be able to scroll through the entire set of questions; questions are *not* presented or submitted one at a time. A single *Submit* button is used for the entire form.
- E. The name of the course and instructor should be visible at all times while the student fills in the evaluation form.

NKU COURSE EVALUATION: PHY 880 - Dirac - Microsoft Internet Explorer

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

Address <Q:\University\OnlineEvalGroup\q.html> Go Links Norton AntiVirus

1. The instructor's preparation for class meetings was

1. ☒ excellent.
2. ☐ above average.
3. ☐ average.
4. ☐ below average.
5. ☐ poor.

Comments:

The cookies were always freshly baked!

PHY 880 Quantum Field Theory - Instructor: Paul Dirac

*Rough sketch of
evaluation form.*

II. Submission of Questions

- A. *At the beginning of the academic year:* an individual authorized by the Faculty Senate submits a set of common university questions and a set of common student demographic questions to the "Web Evaluation Management Group" in IT.
- B. *Each semester:* In each academic department, the department chair submits sets of common department or discipline questions for courses that semester. (These department or discipline questions will be determined by vote of the faculty members in that department.) A default set of 6 questions is available.
- C. *Each semester:* Each instructor submits a set of questions for each section he or she is teaching that semester. An instructor may write his/her own questions or select items from a catalog of optional questions made available online. A default set of 6 questions is available for instructors who do not wish to submit any questions.
- D. The text field for question entry should be of fixed size and require no scrolling. A dimension of approximately 8 lines by 50 characters is recommended. This is meant to limit all questions to a reasonable length.
- E. Questions will be submitted via web forms through faculty Norse Express accounts. A confirmation will be sent via email. Up until a given date (announced in advance), departments and instructors may change their sets of questions.
- F. Department chairs and instructors entering questions may elect to import a set of questions from a previous semester, up to one calendar year earlier. Here "import" means the text of these questions is pasted into the web forms to allow further editing before submission. Chairs should have the option of importing the approved set of questions from one discipline in the department (e.g. PHY) to another (e.g. AST).

- G. The deadline for submission of these questions should be as late in the semester as feasible.
- H. After the final submission deadline, instructors may view the complete online questionnaire through their Norse Express accounts, but all inputs will be locked out.

14. Enter body of question:

Enter at least two multiple-choice options:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

[Click here when finished designing this question. You may edit your questions later.](#)

*Rough sketch of
question
input form.*

III. Online Evaluation Sessions

- A. The *evaluation window* for the term is defined here as that period during the term within which instructors can establish the evaluation period(s) of their classes. It should be possible to specify or change this window (start/end dates and/or length) each semester, but the deadline for setting this window must be earlier in the semester than the deadline for department and instructor input. The evaluation window for the term would be determined by the collegial process and entered by the authorized representative of the Faculty Senate.
- B. The *evaluation period* of a course section is defined here as that period of time during which students enrolled in that course section may fill out its online questionnaire. This period will be at least one week, must fall within the overall evaluation window for that term, and may be set or changed by the instructor up until the deadline for submission of department and instructor questions.
- C. If it is determined by the collegial process that all evaluations are to be completed within the same evaluation period, the system should allow that period to be set for all course sections.

- D. The system will automatically send email reminders to students reminding them of the evaluation period of each course section in which they are enrolled.
- E. Students enter the web evaluation system through their Norse Express accounts. They can only fill out an evaluation form once for each course section / instructor combination. A final *Submit* button brings up a message box warning the student that this submission is final. If a student abandons a form before hitting *Submit*, all responses are lost (and he or she may start again later). Abandonment can be accomplished by hitting a *Cancel* button next to the *Submit* button or by timeout if the student fails to input data to the form within a specified time interval (to be determined by the collegial process).
- F. Students may decline the opportunity to evaluate a class by pressing a button labeled “*I do not wish to participate in the evaluation of this class*” at the start of the form. This ends the session. It should be possible to disable this feature, if so determined by the collegial process.
- G. For classes with multiple instructors, students may be asked to complete multiple forms, one for each instructor. The decision to exercise this option will be made at the departmental level at the beginning of each semester. Thus, for course sections with multiple instructors, the system must be able to provide either a single form for the section or multiple forms, one for each instructor, with instructor and student access identical to those provided for a section with a single instructor.

IV. Processing and Dissemination of Evaluation Responses

- A. Evaluations are confidential and are not stored with any indicators of a student’s identity (e.g. name or student ID).
- B. If possible, demographic information on the student responder (such as gender, class rank, and so on) should be ascertained automatically, rather than by questions in Part 4 of the questionnaire.
- C. During the evaluation period for each course section, the instructor and department chair can view the number of students who have submitted an online evaluation form for that section.
- D. Within a month after the grade submission deadline, full evaluation reports will be emailed to instructors. The report will be in two email attachments for each course:
 - A PDF document containing responses to each question along with a listing of all student comments, on a student-by-student basis, analogous to the current return of the original paper forms for each section to an instructor. However, if so determined by the collegial process, it should be possible to omit student demographic information items from these returned forms. The statistical summary information returned to the instructor will include all the information reported from the current paper evaluation forms, such as (on the common university questions) averages for the university, college, department, discipline, and instructor. In addition, numerical summaries of responses to questions as a function of student demographic information categories (e.g. gender) should be included, and/or a summary of correlation coefficients and their *p* (significance) values. (*See Appendix.*)
 - An Excel file containing the student response information contained in the PDF file, without the text of the student comments. Each row in the spreadsheet corresponds to one

student response, analogous to one copy of a paper evaluation, with comments omitted. *This file is merely for the convenience of faculty members who wish to perform their own analysis of the data.*

- E. Within a month after the end of the semester, chairpersons will receive the PDF files sent to each instructor *except that responses to (and associated numerical summaries of) instructor-specific questions may be omitted, if so determined by the collegial process.* The chairperson will also receive a single Excel file containing collective information on all department courses.
- F. The “Web Evaluation Management Group” will archive these files for one year. Instructors and chairs are responsible for archiving this information for the long term, as they deem appropriate.

V. Encouraging Student Participation

- A. The system will be able to place a hold on the records of students who fail to participate in an online evaluation of any class. This hold may be released by (a) academic advisors, or (b) participation in online evaluations during a subsequent semester. (This capability may or may not be used, as determined by the collegial process.)
-

APPENDIX: Proposed Content of Statistical Summaries

1. UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS

- a. For each section/instructor combination:
frequency of response, mean, standard deviation for each item.
- b. Instructor summary - all sections combined:
frequency of response, mean, standard deviation for each item.
- c. University summary, college summary, department summary, discipline summary:
frequency of response, mean, standard deviation for each item.

2. DEPARTMENT/DISCIPLINE QUESTIONS

- a. For each section/instructor combination:
frequency of response, mean, standard deviation for each item.
- b. Instructor summary - all sections combined:
frequency of response, mean, standard deviation for each item.
- c. Department and/or discipline summary:
frequency of response, mean, standard deviation for each item.

3. INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONS

- a. For each section/instructor combination:
frequency of response, mean, standard deviation for each item.
- b. Instructor summary - all sections combined:
frequency of response, mean, standard deviation for each item.

4. DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

*Mean, standard deviation of each evaluation item as function of each demographic,
—or—
Correlation (with significance) between each evaluation item and each demographic:*

- a. for university questions, broken down by university, college, department;
- b. for department/discipline questions.

Proposed Amendment

Northern Kentucky University
Faculty Policy and Procedures Manual

Part 1- Section I.D

FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK, TEMPORARY FACULTY
(page 2a)

Temporary appointments are one-year, temporary, terminal appointments that can be repeated ~~for a maximum of three (3) years~~.

Justification:

1. The Non-Tenure Track Faculty requested this change.
2. The three-year rule prevents us from rehiring teachers with experience in teaching our courses.
3. The three-year rule is widely disregarded by departments.